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1. **Background**

1.1. **Project information**

Internal and international migration movements in the greater Mediterranean region have a direct and long-lasting impact on the development of urban areas, as these are often the destinations of migrant populations. In order to maximise the social and economic development potential of these migrant populations cities need effective migration governance capacities, particularly as regards integration, inclusion and access to human rights and services.

In this context, the *Mediterranean City-to-City Migration Project* aims to contribute to improved migration governance at local level in cities in Europe and in the Southern Mediterranean region. The project is implemented by a consortium led by the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) in partnership with the United Cities and Local Governments Network (UCLG) and the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) and with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) as associate partner, in the framework of the Dialogue on Mediterranean Transit Migration (MTM)\(^1\). The project is funded by the *European Union* through the Directorate General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement negotiations and co-funded by the *Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation*. In the first phase of the project the city network was comprised of the cities of Amman, Beirut, Lisbon, Lyon, Madrid, Tangiers, Turin, Tunis and Vienna.

Project activities are grouped in a *dialogue* component, which facilitates the exchange of experiences and policy options among the cities, a *knowledge* component, which takes stock of the migration situation in the participating cities, and an *action*-oriented component, which produces a set of recommendations on migration governance at local level, and offers pilot projects in the Southern cities participating in the project.

Set out as part of the knowledge component, the *City Migration Profiles* provide sound evidence based on migration in the participating cities by providing an overview on i) the migration situation and current developments; ii) immigrants’ enjoyment of human rights and access to services; iii) integration and inclusion policies and initiatives and iv) an overview of relevant actors in the cities.

1.2. **List of Abbreviations**

- **ACM** Alto-Comissariado para as Migrações [High-Commissariat for Migrations]
- **ACIDI** Alto-Comissariado para a Imigração e Diálogo Intercultural [High-Commissariat for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue]

---

\(^1\) The MTM is an informal consultative platform between migration officials in countries of origin, trans-it, and destination along the migration routes in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AML</td>
<td>Área Metropolitana de Lisboa [Lisbon Metropolitan Area]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAII</td>
<td>CLAII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIC</td>
<td>Conselho Municipal para a Interculturalidade e Cidadania [Municipal Council for Interculturality and Citizenship]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CML</td>
<td>Câmara Municipal de Lisboa [Lisbon Municipal Council]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAI</td>
<td>Centro Nacional de Apoio ao Imigrante [National Support Centre for Immigrants]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>Instituto Nacional de Estatística [Office for National Statistics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALOP</td>
<td>Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa [Portuguese-speaking African Countries]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMIIL</td>
<td>Plano Municipal para a Integração de Imigrantes de Lisboa [Municipal Plan for the Integration of Immigrants in Lisbon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEF/MAI</td>
<td>Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras/ Ministério da Administração Interna [Border and Alien Service/Ministry of Internal Affairs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLIM</td>
<td>Associação Solidariedade Imigrante [Immigrant Solidarity Association]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. City Synopsis

The key aim of this study is to give an account of the migration policy and situation of immigrants in the city of Lisbon. However, we would like to begin by making two important points:

1) Although focused on the city of Lisbon, this profile will sometimes widen its remit to look at other municipalities surrounding the capital. This decision is justified by the fact that some immigrant groups moved to the city’s outskirts, in the wake of an urban expansion process that gained momentum from the end of the 1970s (see section 6.7 of this profile for more details). Given that a considerable portion of immigrants in Greater Lisbon area reside in the outskirts of the capital, often working or studying within the city itself, this needs to be folded into our account at certain points in the profile. Hence, besides the city or municipality of Lisbon, some vectors of our analysis will focus on Greater Lisbon or the Lisbon Metropolitan Area (AML - Área Metropolitana de Lisboa), which offer a contextualizing frame. The contours of these geographical and administrative boundaries can be consulted in Annex 2 (Figures 1 and 2).

The Lisbon municipality (município de Lisboa) is 100 square km and a population of 504,471, according to data from 2015. Greater Lisbon (Grande Lisboa) is a sub-region, part of the Lisbon Region (Região de Lisboa, formerly Região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo) and the Lisbon County (Distrito de Lisboa). It has an area of 1.381 square km and includes 9 municipalities and a population of 2,242,326. The municipalities are Amadora, Cascais, Lisboa, Loures, Mafra, Odivelas, Oeiras; Sintra and Vila Franca de Xira. The Lisbon Metropolitan Area (Área Metropolitana de Lisboa, AML) includes 18 municipalities of the Greater Lisbon and Setúbal Peninsula regions. It is the most populous metropolitan area in the country, with 2,821,697 residents as of 2015. As mentioned above, the 18 municipalities that make the AML are clustered in two sub-regions – Greater Lisbon and Setúbal Peninsula. The following municipalities are include in the AML are Alcochete, Almada, Amadora, Barreiro, Cascais, Lisbon, Loures, Mafra, Moita, Montijo, Odivelas, Oeiras, Palmela, Seixal; Sesimbra, Setúbal, Sintra, Vila Franca de Xira. Lisbon, Loures, Mafra, Moita, Montijo, Odivelas, Oeiras, Palmela, Seixal; Sesimbra, Setúbal, Sintra, Vila Franca de Xira.

2) On occasion this study will bring to the fore the situation of the Portuguese Roma communities living in Lisbon. The greater majority of people in this group has Portuguese nationality and are not immigrants. And yet, for reasons of historical, political, social and cultural nature, a widespread ignorance of this community’s reality remains. Furthermore, these are communities toward which many non-Roma Portuguese citizens hold a negative view across the social (public opinion), media (newspaper) and institutional (public service) levels, to the point that “Roma are still
regarded as the most impoverished ethnic group, living in the worst housing conditions, with the lowest educational level and the main target of racism and discrimination in modern societies”, according to various researchers and international institutions (Magano and Mendes, 2014: 19). In view of this vulnerability, ACM (the state body responsible for the reception and integration of immigrants) seeks to make interventions in these communities. “Ethnic-based statistics” cannot be produced in Portugal, but recent estimates by ACM (in the document “Estratégia Nacional para a Integração das Comunidades Ciganas 2013 – 2020” [National Strategy for the Integration of Roma Communities], 2013: 13) calculate that approximately 40,000-60,000 Roma Portuguese reside in the country, roughly a third of whom live in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area.

2 Still, the lower threshold varies substantially depending on the source (cf. Mendes, Magano and Candeias, 2014: 23-24).
### General overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City area (km(^2)) (year of the measurement)</th>
<th>In 2011, the <strong>Lisbon municipality</strong> had an area of 85 km(^2), and reached 100 km(^2) in 2014. This urban expansion, alongside a decline in the number of residents in the city, meant that the density of the population decreased from 6,390 to 5,128 inhabitants per km(^2).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Political and administrative context

Lisbon is the capital of the Portuguese Republic (*República Portuguesa*), and is therefore the site of legislative (parliament) and executive (government) bodies. Portugal is a unified, non-decentralised state, even if the Island Territories of Madeira and the Azores enjoy the status of autonomous regions, with their own regional government (*Governo regional da Madeira* and *Governo regional dos Açores*). Over the last few years, some measures for administrative decentralisation were put in place, with a transference of powers from central to local authorities, and from municipalities to *freguesias* – the smallest administrative units, the rough equivalent of boroughs (heretofore referred to as boroughs). Article 23 of Law 75/2013, 12 September, lays out the main responsibilities of municipalities at present: a) Rural and urban equipment and facilities; b) Energy; c) Transport and communications; d) Education and vocational training; e) Heritage, culture and science; f) Leisure activities and sports; g) Health; h) Welfare and social work; i) Housing; j) Civil defence; k) Environment and sanitation; l) Consumer defence; m) Development support; n) Land use planning and urbanism; o) Municipal police; p) External cooperation.

In 2013, an administrative amendment to the reform of the boroughs came into force, reducing the 53 former Lisbon boroughs down to 24. The rationale behind this decision was the desire to make municipal services more efficient against the background of cuts to public spending and a decline in population. At the regional level, the **Lisbon Metropolitan Area Council** (*Junta da Área Metropolitana de Lisboa*) was given the responsibility of coordinating between the various municipalities in the region as well as between local and central government.

### Share in national urban population

According to the **2011 Census**, the nearly 3 million inhabitants (2,824,906) of the **Lisbon Metropolitan Area** were 37% of the country's total urban population and 27% of the entire population of Portugal that year. In 2011, the 542,917 residents of the **city of Lisbon** were 7% of the country's urban population and 5% of the total resident population (10.5 million). This ratio remained unchanged in 2015, despite the steep decrease in the population residing in Lisbon (38,446 less residents when compared to 2011) and the slight decrease in the AML population (3,209 less, when compared to 2011). This ratio remained unchanged in 2015, despite the steep decrease in the population residing in Lisbon (38,446 less residents when compared to 2011) and the slight decrease in the AML population (3,209 less, when compared to 2011). This ratio remained unchanged in 2015, despite the steep decrease in the population residing in Lisbon (38,446 less residents when compared to 2011) and the slight decrease in the AML population (3,209 less, when compared to 2011).

### Language(s)

Portuguese
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Structure</td>
<td>504,471</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total city population</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population aged 0-9</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population aged 10-24</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population aged 25-44</td>
<td>37.90%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population aged 75+</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Estimativas Anuais da População Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE and SEF/MAI, População Estrangeira com Estatuto Legal de Residente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners as a proportion of the population</td>
<td>12.2% (66,184 individuals foreign-born)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INE, Censo 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>12.4% (Lisbon Metropolitan Area)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Inquérito ao Emprego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>11.8% (Lisbon)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INE, Censo 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market</td>
<td>49.5% (Lisbon Metropolitan Area)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Inquérito ao Emprego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active population (unemployed + employed)</td>
<td>260,405 (48% of Lisbon’s population in 2011)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INE, Censo 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main sectors of activity (%) (Lisbon)</td>
<td>89,2</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>INE, Censo 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual rent for housing per m2</td>
<td>1766€/m2 (Lisbon)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>INE - Inquérito à Avaliação Bancária na Habitação</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price for buying a housing unit</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>INE, Censo 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average monthly spending with acquisition or renting of housing unit</strong></td>
<td>344.86€/month (Lisbon)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average disposable annual household income</strong></td>
<td>27,68€ (Lisbon Metropolitan Area)</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average net annual household income</strong></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INE, IDEF - Inquérito às Despesas das Famílias (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average area of living accommodation (m2/person)</strong></td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of urban population living in slum area</strong></td>
<td>0.07% (Lisbon)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11% (Greater Lisbon)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11% (Portugal)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons at risk of poverty of social exclusion</strong></td>
<td>19.5% (Portugal)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: There is no data by municipality</td>
<td>EU-SILC 2015 (provisional data), in: II DIAGNÓSTICO SOCIAL DE LISBOA – 2015-2016 (Rede Social de Lisboa, 2016: 68)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lone parent households per 100 households with children aged 0-17</strong></td>
<td>18.16% (AML)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.32% (Lisbon)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

| **Early leavers from education and training** | 1.71% (Lisbon) | 2011 |
| **Students in higher education** | 112,687 (Lisbon) 136,552 (AML) | 2016 |
| **Proportion of working age population without primary education** | 6.8% (Lisbon) | 2011 |
| **With upper secondary education** | 16.9% (Lisbon) | 2011 |
| **With tertiary education** | 31.1% (Lisbon) | 2011 |

³Available at: [http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/DOCS/Planos_estrategicos/planos_municipais/desenvolvimento_social/DIAGN%C3%93STICO_SOCIAL_relat%C3%A7%C3%B3rio_2016_SINOPSE_22-07-2016-A.pdf](http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/fileadmin/DOCS/Planos_estrategicos/planos_municipais/desenvolvimento_social/DIAGN%C3%93STICO_SOCIAL_relat%C3%A7%C3%B3rio_2016_SINOPSE_22-07-2016-A.pdf)
3. National Context

3.1. Overview of Migration Patterns in Portugal

Portugal is an intriguing case study in terms of its migratory trends. In line with other Southern European countries, particularly those that joined the EU at a later date (such as Spain and Greece), it shifted from a country that had been predominantly a country of emigration (more pronounced from the 1960s to the 1980s) to a country of destination for immigrants (in the 1990s and 2000s). More recently, the financial and economic crisis led to a new spike in emigration from the country, as attested by the evolution of the migration balance indicated by Figure 3.1.

Historically, immigration can be broken down into various stages:

1) 1974-1976 peak (stretching into the following years), as a result of the decolonisation process in the wake of the 1974 Democratic Revolution and the Independence of the former Portuguese colonies in Sub-Saharan Africa, which triggered a massive return of Portuguese citizens living abroad (the so-called "returnados", returnees) and the immigration of thousands of people born in the former colonies (particularly Cape Verde, Angola and Guinea-Bissau); 2) The post-1993 immigration wave was a result of the growing appeal of a peripheral country who had entered the EU recently (1986). These countries had a rising demand both for qualified and unqualified labour, in the context of economic growth and changes in the EU funding framework. This twofold demand was brought about by the low educational level of a large portion of the Portuguese population, alongside the exit of an important segment of the active population during the dictatorship, particularly in the context of the colonial wars, who had settled in countries like France, Brazil, USA or Canada (Baganha and Góis, 1998/1999). In this period, besides people from the PALOP (Portuguese-speaking African Countries), most of whom took on more menial work, Brazilians and Eastern Europeans started to arrive in the country (Padilla e Ortiz, 2012; 3). Towards the end of the decade (circa 2000), the immigration patterns began to diversify, both in terms of the countries of origin and occupations. Eastern European immigrants, coming from the Ukraine, Romania, Moldova and Russia, were already a part of the demographic landscape and migratory flows from countries from East and South Asia, especially China, India, Pakistan and (later) Bangladesh and Nepal, increased throughout the early years of the twenty-first century.
Generally speaking, with a certain degree of simplification, one can claim that the pervasive immigration model in Portugal from the end of the 1990s and the end of the 2000s obeyed a logic that primarily met the needs and established practices of employers. This resulted in poor working conditions and the exploitation of many immigrant workers, particularly those coming from outside the EU. This process often began with illegal entry into the country, followed by a variable period of clandestine integration into the labour market (the period of more ruthless exploitation), ending in a belated public regulation process which, while solving the formal status of the immigrant, did little to alleviate their disadvantaged place in the labour market (cf. Malheiros and Esteves, 2012). Over the last few years, the economic and financial crisis had a significant impact on unemployment rates and labour precarity, and meant many immigrants became even more vulnerable. One of the strategies they adopted in the face of this growing labour instability and social precarity was re-emigration to other destinations or the return to their countries of origin. There has also been a clear decline in new immigrants, attested by the lower numbers of new resident status for work reasons. Against this background, the data made available by the "Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras" (SEF; Border and Alien Service: http://sefstat.sef.pt) indicate a gradual downturn in immigration flows and a decline in the foreign population residing on national territory.

As far as the number of foreign residents is concerned, it is only after 2010 that official sources point to a negative growth rate (Figure 3.2). This reduction can be explained mainly by the naturalisation of immigrants, a process that increased substantially after the new 2006 Nationality Law (“Lei da Nacionalidade”) had come into force (Figure 3.3) and by the exit of some immigrants from the country. One can also make the claim that part of this decrease is linked with a certain number of immigrants falling back into an illegal residence status in the country, having failed to renew their residence permit.

In 2015 the countries of origin for migrants living in Portugal were as follows: 27% originate from the European Union (particularly Romania, 8%; United Kingdom, 4.4%; and Spain, France and Germany, 2%-3% each); 9% from the Ukraine; 24% from African countries (of

---

4As for entry flows, 2009 marks the beginning of the decrease in new entries, with a downturn of approximately 15%, compared to 2008; in 2010 there is a decrease of 17%, compared to 2009; in 2011 a decrease of 11% and in 2012 15%.
which 22% from the PALOP); 20% from Brazil and 12% from Asian countries (mostly China, 6%, followed by India, 2%, and Nepal, Bangladesh and Pakistan, 1% each). These immigrant groups amount to 96% of the total of number of foreigners with official resident status and they tend to concentrate in the south of the country, particularly in the districts of Lisbon, Setúbal and Faro (Figure 3.4). According to SEF data (2015), 69% of foreigners living in Portugal live in these three districts\(^6\). If one analyses the presence of the four major regions of origin other than the EU (Brazil, PALOPs, Eastern Europe, East and South Asia), one sees that over 65% of the population of each of these groups lives in these districts. EU citizens are also disproportionately present in these areas, with the particularity that one third of them resides in the Faro district (in the Algarve region, the furthest south), where many foreigners from Northern Europe chose to live after they retire, while another third live in the Lisbon.

**Figure 3.2. Stock of foreign citizens with official resident status in Portugal, by continent of birth, 1974-2014**

![Stock of foreign citizens with official resident status in Portugal, by continent of birth, 1974-2014](source)

Source: Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras ([www.sef.pt](http://www.sef.pt))

**Figure 3.3. Evolution of Portuguese citizenship status granted, 1999-2014\(^7\)**

![Evolution of Portuguese citizenship status granted, 1999-2014](source)

Source: Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras and Conservatória dos Registos Centrais, in Observatório das Migrações (ACM)

---


\(^7\) It refers to deferred or concluded processes of attribution of nationality. Note that from 15 December 2006 a new Nationality Law came into force (Lei n.º 37/81, 3 October, changed and republished by Lei Orgânica n. 2/2006, 17 April, in force since 15-12-2006), which altered the regime for attribution and acquisition of Portuguese nationality by immigrants and immigrant descendants. Cf. in Healy (2011).
3.2. National Migration Policy

Policies directed at the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities in Portugal are mainly carried out by the ACM (formerly ACIDI) which, since 2007 (Decreto-Lei 167/2007, May 3), has the explicit mission to “cooperate in the framing, execution and assessment of relevant public, cross-sector and sectoral policies geared toward the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities (Roma communities), as well as to foster a dialogue between the various ethnic, cultural and religious groups”. From that year onwards, the ACM has devised the “Planos de Integração dos Imigrantes” (PII; Immigrant Integration Plans). This was a political programme aimed at improving the integration of immigrants at multiple levels, within certain sectors (such as labour, health, education), and across sectors (gender equality, racism and discrimination). This was outlined on the basis of an articulation between different ministries and civil society contributions and proposals, namely by the then-named COCAI (“Conselho Consultivo para os Assuntos da Imigração” – Consultative Counsel for Immigration Issues; meanwhile replaced by the “Conselho para as Migrações” – Migration Counsel), immigrant associations, “Comissão para a Igualdade e contra a Discriminação Racial” (CICDR, Commission for Equality and against Racial Discrimination), the research network of the “Observatório das Migrações” (Migration Observatory, formerly Immigration Observatory) and public consultation (in the case of the Second Plan, in the Government Portal)\(^8\).

The Plan for Immigrant Integration (Plano para a Integração de Imigrantes - PII 2007-2009)\(^9\) included 122 measures, among which measures to fight early school leaving and school progression among immigrant descendants, reinforcement of vocational training, professional

---

\(^8\) Cf. II Plano para a Integração dos Imigrantes 2010-2013 (2010: 4-5)

and labour integration (e.g.: “Programa de Intervenção para Trabalhadores Desempregados Imigrantes” – Intervention Program for Unemployed Immigrant Workers, included in the “Plano Nacional de Acção para a Inclusão”, National Action Plan for Inclusion), intensification of programmes for the teaching of Portuguese as a second language, promotion of access to housing, health services and justice, among many other fields. The Second Plan (PII 2010-2013) consisted of 90 measures and included two new areas of intervention: the promotion of diversity and interculturality, and immigrant senior citizens (in line with the celebration of the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations). Thus, this Second Plan covered the following areas: 1 — Reception; 2 — Culture and language; 3 — Employment, vocational training and entrepreneurial dynamics; 4 — Education; 5 — Social solidarity and social security; 6 — Health; 7 — Housing; 8 — Justice; 9 — Racism and discrimination; 10 — Access to citizenship and civic participation; 11 — Immigrant associations; 12 — Immigrant descendants; 13 — Immigrant senior citizens; 14 — Relations with countries of origin; 15 — Promotion of diversity and interculturality; 16 — Gender issues; 17 — Human trafficking.

From the point of view of the Plans’ quantitative meeting of the previously-outlined execution indicators, the balance was, in both cases, rather positive (81% for the First Plan and 79% for the Second Plan)\(^{10}\). Yet, as Costa points out (2016: 56), a portion of the indicators formulated for assessing the fulfilment of the stated aims of the plan do not allow us to gauge the “effective impact these measures have had on immigrants’ living standards or on their integration into Portuguese society”.

The previous government (2011-2015) changed ACIDI’s name to ACM, and also recalibrated its key mission, changing it to the following: “To cooperate in the delineation, execution and assessment of public, cross-sector and sectoral policies related to migration, relevant for attracting migrants in national, international and Lusophone contexts, for the integration of immigrants and ethnic groups, particularly Roma communities, and for the management and promotion of diversity among different cultural, ethnic and religious groups.” (Artigo 3.º, n.º 1 of DL 31/2014). It is ACM, within the frame of its new mission statement and primary responsibility – which is defined as that of “promoting Portugal’s international image as a migratory destination”, that lays out the “Plano Estratégico para as Migrações” 2015-2020 (Strategic Plan for Migrations)\(^{11}\) (“Resolução do Conselho de Ministros”, n.º 12-B/2015, 20 March). This mission speaks to a clear wager on the part of the Portuguese government, on the competitive global “talent” hunt, as it tried to make the country more attractive to international investors and highly qualified immigrants.

The 2015-2017 Strategic Plan (Plano Estratégico para as Migrações 2015-2017) includes 106 measures underpinned by five priority axes: Axis I – Policies for immigrant integration; Axis II – Policies for the promotion of the inclusion of new Portuguese citizens (i.e. immigrant descendants); Axis III – Policies for the management of migratory flows; Axis IV – Policies for the reinforcement of migratory legality and the quality of migration services; Axis V – Policies for incentivising, accompanying and supporting the return of Portuguese emigrants. Besides the novelty of extending its scope to Portuguese citizens residing away from the national territory, underscoring the imperative to stake a claim in the competitive global “talent” hunt, this plan is also marked by the shift to a decentralised model, grounded on local integration.

\(^{10}\)According to the “Relatório de Execução Final” of the “I Plano para a Integração dos Imigrantes” 2007-2009 (20010: 85) and “Relatório de Execução Final” of the “II Plano para a Integração dos Imigrantes 2010-2013” (2014: 73), available at: http://www.acm.gov.pt/-plano-estrategico-para-as-migracoes-pem-

\(^{11}\)Available at: http://www.acm.gov.pt/-plano-estrategico-para-as-migracoes-pem-
policies, namely through Municipal Plans for the Integration of Immigrants (“Planos Municipais para a Integração de Imigrantes”), funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals.

One should also highlight the creation of a National Strategy for the Integration of Roma Communities (“Estratégia Nacional para a Integração das Comunidades Ciganas 2013-2020”, ENICC)\(^\text{12}\) (Resolução do Conselho de Ministros nº 25/2013) which, for the first time, lays out a national plan\(^\text{13}\) specifically directed at these communities, even though dedicated offices and projects already existed, such as the Office for the Support of Roma Communities (“Gabinete de Apoio às Comunidades Ciganas”; ACIDI/ ACM), or the Pilot Project for Municipal Mediators (“Projecto-Piloto de Mediadores Municipais”), launched by this office in 2009, in partnership with 15 municipalities, and now including another six (ACIDI, 2013: 13). This National Strategy emerges out of the adaptation into the national context of the “European Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020” (COM (2011) 173, April 5)\(^\text{14}\). Besides the four priority intervention axes proposed by the EU institutions – Education, Employment and Vocational Training, Housing and Health – the ENICC also includes a cross-sector axis, which encompasses the following areas: “Knowledge on Roma communities and Strategy follow-up”, “Discrimination”, “Education for Citizenship”, “Roma history and cultures”, “Gender equality”, “Justice and security”, “Mediation” and “Social security”. ACM is the institution in charge of coordinating the National Strategy and the Consultive Counsel for the Integration of Roma Communities (Grupo Consultivo para a Integração das Comunidades Ciganas, CONCIG), already created within the scope of the ENICC, and including various stakeholders within the Roma community as well as academic experts, and has the task of accompanying and monitoring the process.

Another example of a programme aimed at immigrants, immigrant descendants and ethnic minorities is the “Programa Escolhas”, a programme created in 2001\(^\text{15}\) with the purpose of preventing criminality among the youth from the so-called “troubled neighbourhoods”\(^\text{16}\) in the districts of Lisbon, Porto and Setúbal. In 2004, its aim shifted from a focus on the prevention of criminality and integration towards the promotion of social inclusion of children and youth from socially underprivileged backgrounds. The programme also resisted a top down approach, and changed to a local-based logic of planning, implementation and assessment, wherein institutions (associations, schools, training centres, etc.) in each specific area form local partnerships to fulfil their goals. Currently in its 6th Generation (2016-2018), the programme covers five strategic intervention areas: 1) Education and training; 2) Employability and employment; 3) Participation, civic and community rights and duties; 4) Digital inclusion; 5) Empowerment and entrepreneurship.

In addition to the aforementioned plans and programmes, specifically targeted at immigrant and ethnic minority communities in Portugal, it is worth mentioning other initiatives that also reach out to these populations. Such is the case, for instance, of the National Plans for

\(^\text{12}\)Available at: http://www.igfse.pt/upload/docs/2014/EstrategiaNacionalparaIntegracaodasComunidadesCiganas.pdf
\(^\text{13}\)Aided by a study/diagnosis by Mendes, Magano and Candeias (2014) that covered several Roma communities living across the national territory. Available at: http://www.poatfse.qren.pt/upload/docs/Documentos/estudo_enicc.pdf
\(^\text{14}\)Statement by the European Commission on 5 April 2011, in the wake of a request and recommendation by the European Parliament to the European Commission and European Council for the definition of European strategy aimed at the integration of these communities.
\(^\text{15}\)Funded by “Direção Geral de Educação e Instituto da Segurança Social” and co-funded by the European Social Fund /Portugal 2020 and “Programas Operacionais Regionais de Lisboa e Algarve”
\(^\text{16}\)On the official website of “Programa Escolhas”: http://www.programaescolhas.pt/apresentacao
Inclusive Action ("Planos Nacionais de Acção para a Inclusão", 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006 e 2008), integrated into the European Social Policy Agenda (2000) and the Social Emergency Program (2011)\(^\text{17}\). These plans are not initiatives directed specifically at immigrants or Roma communities, but since a significant portion of these populations was identified as being in a situation of poverty or social exclusion, they became the target groups for some of the measures taken within their frame (cf. Costa, 2016: 37).

### 3.3. Institutional Framework

Portugal is comprised of a continental territory and island regions (Madeira and Azores). It has a centralised government, with regional cabinets on the islands. Municipalities include a local parliament (assembleia municipal) and a local cabinet, which emerge from local elections that take place every four years. The Municipal Councils (Câmaras Municipais) have gained a growing degree of autonomy since 1997, as a result of the gradual implementation of administrative decentralisation measures.

Legislation on immigration is created in the national parliament (Assembleia da República) and carried out by the central government. As to the regulation of the entry of foreign nationals into the territory, and of their permanence, the responsible bodies are the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Ministério da Administração Interna, more specifically, SEF), the General Directorate for Consular Affairs and Portuguese Communities (Direcção-Geral dos Assuntos Consulares e Comunidades Portuguesas, DGACCP, a part of the ministry of Foreign Affairs - Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros) and the Institute for Employment and Professional Training (Instituto do Emprego e da Formação Profissional), which coordinates the data system for employment vacancies that are not met by citizens residing in Portugal, whether Portuguese or foreign nationals (migrant quota system).

ACM is the chief responsible for the implementation of the central policies on the reception and integration of immigrants since 2007 (and emigrants since 2015), answers exclusively to the central government, and may establish partnerships with local government bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Government</th>
<th>Description of competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alto-Comissariado para as Migrações (ACM)</strong>&lt;br&gt;[High-Commissioner for Migrations]</td>
<td>State body under the remit of the Presidência do Conselho de Ministros (Chair of the Ministry Council) whose function is to coordinate the Sectoral Integration Policies. ACM's mission is to “To cooperate in the delineation, execution and assessment of public, cross-sector and sectoral policies related to migration, relevant for attracting migrants in national, international and Lusophone contexts, for the integration of immigrants and ethnic groups, particularly Roma communities, and for the management and promotion of diversity among different cultural, ethnic and religious groups.” (Lei Orgânica do ACM/ Decreto-Lei nº 31/2014). Within the ACM there are various departments and teams, such as: CNAIs; CLAIs; Gabinete de Apoio às Políticas Locais [Office for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SEF**  
(Ministério da Administração Interna)  
[Border and Alien Service (Ministry of Internal Affairs)] | Support to Local Policy; Gabinete de Coordenação do Plano Estratégico para as Migrações [Office for the Coordination of the Strategic Plan for Migrations], Planos Sectoriais e Conselho para as Migrações (Sectoral Plans and Migration Council; formerly COCAI); Gabinete de Educação, Formação e Mediação Intercultural [Office for Education, Training and Intercultural Mediation]; Comissão para a Igualdade e Contra a Discriminação Racial (CICDR – Commission for Equality and against Racial Discrimination); Gabinete de Estudos, Relações Internacionais e Direitos Humanos (Office for Research, International Relations and Human Rights; responsible for the Migration Observatory, among other competences); Gabinete de Apoio Técnico às Associações de Imigrantes (GATAI – Office for Technical Support to Immigrant Associations); Gabinete de Apoio às Comunidades Ciganas [Office for Support to Roma Communities]; etc.  
Implementation and oversight of immigration and asylum policies; it has authority over the entry, permanence, exit and expulsion of foreign citizens within the national territory, while also having responsibilities in areas such as: Admission, oversight of Right to Remain, Criminal Investigation, Expulsion, Visas and Residence Permits, Asylum, Passports and Nationality. |
| **Ministério da Solidariedade, Emprego e Segurança Social**  
- Instituto do Emprego e Formação Profissional (IEFP);  
- Autoridade para as Condições do Trabalho (ACT)  
[Ministry of Solidarity, Employment and Social Security – Institute for Employment and Professional Training (IEFP) - Labour Standards Authority (ACT)] | Implements policies on employment, qualification and social security.  
IEFP is the state body that oversees national employment issues. Its mission is to promote the creation and quality of employment and to fight unemployment, by means of active employment policies, namely professional training. IEFP is also the institution responsible for the public coordination of temporary and dependent work that is not taken up by national citizens, EU citizens, or citizens outside of the EU who legally reside in Portugal  
ACT is a government office that seeks to foster improvement in working conditions across the continental territory through oversight over the conformity to labour norms in private labour relations. It also promotes health and safety in work places across all private sectors of activity. |
| **Instituto da Segurança Social, I.P.**  
(Ministério da Solidariedade, Emprego e Segurança Social)  
[Institute of Social Security, I.P. (Ministry of Solidarity, Employment and Social Security)] | ISS is a public institution with a legal responsibility to fulfil some of the duties of the Ministry of Solidarity, Employment and Social Security (MSESS), under the oversight and tutelage of its minister. It carries out its initiatives across the whole of the Portuguese continental territory through the Central Offices, the 18 District Offices, the National Pension Office (Centro Nacional de Pensões) and has a wide network of Public Service Offices. Its mission is to guarantee and promote citizens’ social protection and inclusion, within the scope of the social security service, recognising their rights and ensuring their fulfilment of their obligations. Its strategic goals are the following: to guarantee social protection and inclusion; to make sure contributions and instalments (such as taxes) are collected; to }
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MNE)/Directorate-General for Consular Affairs and Portuguese Communities (DGACCP) | Responsible for diplomacy and relations with third countries. **DGACCP:** Besides coordinating and executing policies that offer support to Portuguese emigrants and communities abroad, this organisation has a duty to guide and supervise the action of the consular offices in visa matters, as well as to take part in negotiating and denouncing agreements on visas, circulation of people and other border procedures. |
| Ministério da Justiça [Ministry of Justice] | Responsible for granting Portuguese Nationality to foreign nationals (since Lei Orgânica n.º 2/2006) |
| Ministério da Educação e Ciência (MEC) Direcção-Geral da Educação (DGE) [Ministry of Education and Science (MEC) Directorate-General for Education (DGE)] | **DGE:** The body responsible for carrying out policies regarding the pedagogical and didactic component of pre-school education, primary, secondary and extra-curricular education. The body also offers technical support in its formulation, particularly in matters of curricular development, teaching tools, assessment, educational support and complements. |
| Ministério da Saúde - Direcção-Geral da Saúde (DGS) [Ministry of Health – Directorate-General for Health (DGS)] - Serviço Nacional de Saúde (SNS) [National Health Service] | **DGS:** DGS’s mission is to regulate, guide and coordinate actions for the promotion of health and prevention of illness, to outline the technical conditions for the appropriate level of health care, to plan and programme national policies to uphold high standards of care in the health system, as well as ensure the delineation and execution of the National Health Plan ("Plano Nacional de Saúde", PNS) as well as coordinate the Ministry of Health’s foreign relations. **SNS:** The State guarantees the right to health protection through the National Health Service, which encompasses all the state health care providing institutions and services under the remit of the Ministry of Health. It is funded by tax payers. Included in the National Health Service are all public services and bodies that provide health care, namely: healthcare centre clusters, hospitals and local health units. |
| Câmaras Municipais [Municipal Councils] | Executive body of the Municipality, responsible for promoting and safekeeping the resident population, in articulation with the boroughs, |
namely in matters of:
  a) Rural and urban equipment and facilities; b) Energy; c) Transport and communications; d) Education, teaching and professional training; e) Heritage, culture and science; f) Leisure activities and sports; g) Health; h) Social action; i) Housing; j) Civil protection; k) Environment and sanitation; l) Consumer rights; m) Promotion of development; n) Land use planning and urbanism; o) Municipal Police; p) External cooperation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juntas de Freguesia [Borough council]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive body of the Borough, responsible for promoting and safekeeping its interests and that of its residents, in articulation with the municipal authorities, namely in matters of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Rural and urban equipment and facilities; b) Public Utilities; c) Education; d) Culture, leisure activities and sports; e) Primary healthcare; f) Social action; g) Civil protection; h) Environment, public health and hygiene; i) Development; j) Land use planning and urbanism; k) Protection of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The borough's duties also cover areas such as planning, managing and carrying out investment in the cases and according to procedures established by the law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-state Actors*

Note: The authors opted to include here two of the main non-state actors operating at a national level, with special competences/leverage in the field of Immigration and Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description of competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIM (IOM – UN Migration Agency)</td>
<td>IOM assists and works together with the Portuguese Government in migration management in the fields of assisted voluntary return (Projecto ArVore) and reintegration, counter-trafficking, migration and development, labour migration and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR – Conselho Português para os Refugiados [Portuguese Council for Refugees]</td>
<td>CPR is a Non-Governmental Development Organization (NGDO), established in 1991, that aims to receive and integrate refugees, promote humane and sustainable asylum policies, raise awareness on this question and general human rights among the Portuguese population. It is the operational partner for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Portugal, with which it has had a Cooperation Protocol since July 1993, aimed at the legal and social protection of asylum seekers and refugees. In 1998, the CPR became the national representative of this organisation. Since the changes in the Asylum Law (Lei de Asilo 27/2008) introduced by Law 26/2014, CPR holds a key role in asylum and refugee matters, namely in the direct support provided to those seeking international protection and in managing CPR equipment and facilities (Centro de Acolhimento para Refugiados – Refugee Reception Centre; Centro para Crianças Refugiadas – Refugee Children Centre).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4. Regional and International Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Instrument</th>
<th>Date of signature</th>
<th>Date of ratification</th>
<th>Reservations/Interpretative statements</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol to the Refugee Convention, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AR, EN, ES, FR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (C097)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AR, EN, ES, FR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (C105)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AR, EN, ES, FR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (C143)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AR, EN, ES, FR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (C189)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AR, EN, ES, FR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other relevant international cooperation instruments include the agreements between Portugal-Cape Verde (1997), Portugal-Brazil (2000, 2003) and Portugal-Ukraine (2003).

Cape Verde:

- “Protocolo sobre Imigração Temporária de Trabalhadores Cabo-Verdianos para Prestação de Trabalho em Portugal” (Protocol on Temporary Immigration of Cape Verdean Workers for the Provision of Work in Portugal; Praia, 18 February 1997): applicable to workers from Cape Verde who, through pre-established contracts, duly registered by the Portuguese Ministry of Employment and Social Security, settled in the country for a limited period of time to engage in professional activity as salaried workers (cf. SEF, 2010: 24).

- Joint Declaration on a Mobility Partnership between the EU and Cape Verde (5 June de 2008), formally signed in the margins of the Justice and Home Affairs Council, by Cape Verde, Portugal, Spain, France, Luxembourg and the European Commission. It established the admission of certain categories of Cape Verdean workers, namely for non-permanent work and in the form of circular migration (idem).

Ukraine:

- “Acordo sobre Migração Temporária de Cidadãos Ucranianos para a Prestação de Trabalho” (Agreement on Temporary Migration of Ukrainian Citizens for the Provision of Work; Kiev, 12 February 2003): it promotes the temporary migration of Ukrainian citizens to Portugal for non-permanent professional activities (cf. SEF, 2010: 28)

Brazil:

- “Tratado de Amizade, Cooperação e Consulta” (Friendship, Cooperation and Consultation Treaty; Porto Seguro, 22 de abril de 2000): it enabled Brazilian citizens to apply to different types of statuses: (1) “Estatuto de Igualdade de Direitos e Deveres” (Status of Equality in Rights and Duties), which is granted to immigrants on the condition that they have resided legally in Portugal for a period of three years; (2) “Estatuto de Igualdade de Direitos Políticos” (Status of Equal Political Rights), where recognition of political rights depends on the previous or simultaneous attribution of the Status of Equality and the Status of Rights and Duties and the Status of Political Rights, which depends on the previous attribution of the former statuses.

- “Acordo sobre Facilitação de Circulação de Pessoas” (Protocol on the Facilitation of Movement of Persons; Lisbon, 11 July 2003): it established a regime of visa-exemption for stays of up to 90 days (extendable for an equal period), for artistic, cultural, scientific, entrepreneurial, academic training, journalistic or sports purposes (cf. SEF, 2010: 30-31)

- “Acordo sobre Contratação Recíproca de Nacionais” (Protocol on the Reciprocal Hiring of Nationals; Lisbon, 11 July 2003): known as the “Lula Protocol”, which allowed citizens engaged in salaried employment to obtain a work permit, when already in national territory – a form of exceptional regularisation (idem).
4. City Context

4.1. Overview of Migration Patterns in Lisbon

According to data from SEF, in 2015 51,690 foreign nationals lived in Lisbon, most of them from countries outside of Europe\(^{19}\). This figure represents 8%-9% of the total of residents in the municipality\(^{20}\). Lisbon is one of the country’s municipalities (alongside Sintra, also located in the Lisbon metropolitan area) with the largest absolute number of foreign nationals. According to data from SEF, the growth of the foreign population in Lisbon runs counter to the overall trend for a decline in population across the AML, as well as in the country as a whole in the last few years (Table 4.1). The 2011 Census revealed that 5.8% of the resident population in Lisbon were foreign nationals. Brazilians were the more highly represented group, with 10,288 citizens (32.2% of the total of foreign nationals living in the capital), followed by Cape Verdeans (2,500), Chinese (2,072), Angolan (1,805), Ukrainian (1,454) and Romanian (1,426). It is worthy of note that the total of immigrants originating from the EU living in the capital is slightly higher than that of those coming from the PALOP, which is tied to a trend towards some dispersion among immigrants from African countries, who have moved to the suburban municipalities of the Lisbon Metropolitan Area, such as Amadora, Odivelas, Loures, as well as some in the south bank of the Tagus (e.g.: Almada, Seixal).

\(^{19}\)Citizens from EU countries or countries in the European Economic Area (EEA, also including Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway), or the Principality of Andorra and Switzerland must request from SEF the registration certificate, if they wish to remain in Portugal for a period longer than three months. According to the SEF website, the registration certificate can, in most cases, be obtained immediately. For more information, see: http://www.sef.pt/portal/v10/PT/aspx/apoioCliente/detalheApoio.aspx?fromIndex=0&id_Linha=4351

\(^{20}\)Since the last population census was conducted in 2011, we cannot know with exactitude what is the current number of residents in the city, so as to compare it with SEF records. Furthermore, the numbers recorded by SEF tend to be higher than those in the Censuses, because the concept of foreign national in the Censuses includes only those who have had legal residence in the country for at least a year while for SEF it is framed by the legal diploma that regulates regular entries, permanence and exits (for more details, see Oliveira e Gomes, 2014: 21-22).
Table 4.1. Foreign population residing in Portugal, the AML and Lisbon, with residence permit, long-term visa, or registration certificate\(^{21}\) (2006-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>420189</td>
<td>435736</td>
<td>440277</td>
<td>454191</td>
<td>445262</td>
<td>436822</td>
<td>417042</td>
<td>401320</td>
<td>395195</td>
<td>388731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AML      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Number   | 226641 | 232167 | 223236 | 219491 | 213131 | 206956 | 205669 | 200302 |      |      |
| Variation rate | - | - | 2.4 | -3.8 | -1.7 | -2.9 | -2.9 | -0.6 | -7.1 |      |

| Lisbon   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Number   | 43527 | 44548 | 44784 | 45626 | 45915 | 46426 | 50047 | 51690 |      |      |
| Variation rate | - | - | 2.3 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 7.8 | 3.3 |      |

Source: SEF (http://sefstat.sef.pt/)

Through the data in the 2011 Census, one can also ascertain the spatial distribution of the foreign population in Lisbon (see Annex 2, Figures 3-7). The first thing to note is the greater presence of foreign nationals in the centre and outskirts of the city, especially in the stretch to the east from the Rua da Palma-Almirante Reis axis, and then in the most peripheral borough to the North of Ameixeira-Charneca (Figure 4.1). A more detailed analysis of the geographical distribution of foreigners according to nationality shows diversified patterns of residence, from larger groups with greater levels of geographical dispersion across the city (e.g.: Brazil and EU-27) and other groups that show a greater tendency for spatial concentration (e.g.: PALOP, China and India).

Citizens from the PALOP are overrepresented in Lisbon’s internal peripheral crown (boroughs of Ameixeira-Charneca, Carnide and Marvila), often following relocation from slums into social housing projects built there over the past few decades, or else in two of the boroughs in the city centre (São Paulo and Socorro), areas that housed the first wave of immigration after the independence of the former colonies. Brazilian citizens, tendentially more scattered, are the majority of foreign nationals in areas such as Benfica and São Domingos de Benfica, but are also overrepresented in areas of greater ethnic diversity, such as Arroios-Anjos. The group of immigrants from East and South Asia, mostly composed of Chinese, Nepalese, Indians and Bangladeshis, are more concentrated around the area just

\(^{21}\)See ft. 19 on the registration certificate for EU or EEA (Andorra or Switzerland) citizens.
to the east of the historical centre, particularly in the Martim Moniz area and along the Avenida Almirante Reis.

In brief, the spatial distribution of the non-European citizens in Lisbon is marked by some concentration in the inner city and in the boroughs on the border between the municipality and the neighbouring ones. Lisbon central area can be seen as a social gateway in the city, being widely recognised and valued for its ethnic and cultural diversity. This zone is also a common meeting point, precisely for being a reference in terms of cultural diversity, ethnic retail, gastronomy and overall interculturality. By contrast, the more peripheral areas of the city, where some immigrant populations and social housing projects are concentrated, tend to be perceived as marginal spaces, where socio-spatial segregation is more marked and phenomena such as immigrant-owned businesses are less common.

Figure 4.1. Concentration of foreign population per 1,000 inhabitants, by borough, 2011

4.2. Local Migration Policy

4.2.1. Integration, diversity and migrants’ rights policies

References to the “social” integration of the immigrant population in Lisbon’s policy and strategy documents date back to at least 1992, when the first Lisbon Strategic Plan (Plano Estratégico de Lisboa – PEL, 1992) was published. This document voiced the council’s “concern with the social inclusion of the more disenfranchised immigrant and ethnic minority groups” and outlined “policies and initiatives aiming to counter the ghettoisation of African immigrant communities” (PMIIL 2015-2017, vol. I: 15). However, this policy document made only one single reference to the city’s cultural diversity, evoking Lisbon’s cosmopolitan nature that dates back to the era of the “Discoveries”. Indeed, the action plan outlined in the 1992 PEL document lacked any specific guidelines geared towards the promotion of interculturality (cf. Fonseca et al., 2011: 20). The authors point out, however, that even if a cultural dimension was distinctly absent from political discourse until a few years later, some
municipal officers had in fact acted positively in support of the principle of religious freedom over the preceding decades, by “allocating municipal facilities to a handful of faith-based organizations, and municipal plots in prime locations for the construction of new buildings destined for the religious practices of the Muslim and Hindu communities” (Fonseca et al., 2011: 19).

The creation of the Municipal Council for Immigrant Communities and Ethnic Minorities (Conselho Municipal das Comunidades Imigrantes e das Minorias Étnicas – CMCIME) in 1993, was testimony to the emergent recognition of the need to foster the participation of “immigrant communities and ethnic minorities in the policies aimed at their integration into society” (Diário Municipal nº 16596, 1 April 1993, as cited in Dionísio, 2009: 98), through the associations that represent them in the Council, even if this body is merely consultative. Like other initiatives dealing with immigration and cultural diversity, the Council would lose its leading role in the beginning of the twenty-first century, during the terms of office of the Partido Social Democrata (2002-2007). Only in 2009, with the return of the Partido Socialista (PS) to power (albeit without a parliamentary majority) would the Council be reactivated, under a new name (Conselho Municipal para a Interculturalidade – CMIC; Municipal Council for Interculturality) and with new statutes (cf. Fonseca et al., 2011: 21).

A key legislative measure for the decentralisation of the policies for the promotion of social rights at the municipal level was a Ministry Council Resolution (Resolução do Conselho de Ministros nº 197/97, of 11 November) that “tasked the local authorities to put in place in their territories a Social Network (Rede Social)”, grounded from the start on Local Social Action Counsels (Conselhos Locais de Ação Social), at the municipal level, as well as Borough Social Commissions (Comissões Sociais de Freguesia). The aim was to “foster cooperation between the local authorities (municipalities and boroughs), the central administration, public bodies and private not-for-profit institutions involved in social action in their territories, so that they could find common ground and work together towards the prevention and solution of social problems and the definition of shared priorities”22. The Lisbon Social Network (Rede Social de Lisboa) would only be officially established in 2006, with 111 signatory organisations, including the CML, public bodies or agencies, Private Social Solidarity Institutions (Instituições Particulares de Solidariedade Social – IPSS), Borough Councils, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and other Associations and Foundations operating in Lisbon. In 2012, it already included 1148 entities, among which 5 immigrant associations23, and is currently the body responsible for the elaboration of the city’s Social Development Plan (Plano de Desenvolvimento Social).

One of the main strategic marks in matters of immigration and cultural diversity in Lisbon planning was the document “Lisbon, 2012 – A Strategic Vision” (Lisboa, 2012 – Uma Visão Estratégica; CML, 2002), which established the notion of diversity as one of the key priorities in the capital’s urban development, “cutting across urban re-qualification, social cohesion, the bilateral creation and production of cultural events and the promotion of the city as a cosmopolitan and multicultural centre” (Fonseca et al., 2011: 22)24. But it was only from

---


24 It also established that: “To foster social cohesion promote multicultural diversity actions must be taken toward promoting interculturality and supporting immigrant communities, as well as to facilitate the socio-economic integration of ethnic minorities and underprivileged communities and to support ethnic retail” (CML, 2002: 85, apud PMIIL 2015-2017, vol. I: 16).
2007-2008 onward that these questions began to figure in the political calendar in a more consistent way, anchored on the strategy to make Lisbon more attractive in a global context of competitive and creative cities” (idem).

A political example of this wager was the Lisbon Strategy Charter (Carta Estratégica de Lisboa 2010-2024; approved in 2009), that acknowledged the potential of immigration and diversity in the capital’s “socio-cultural development and cohesion”, through the shift from a multicultural model to a “transversal interculturality”, as stated in PMIIL 2015-2017 (vol. I: 17). Another instance is the document entitled “Key Options in the 2009-2012 Plan” (Grandes Opções do Plano 2009-2012), whose Cultural Policy Strategy Strategic Plan (Plano Estratégico da Política Cultural) recognises that “only an open, cosmopolitan and tolerant city can assert itself as a global centre within the network of creative cities” (in CML, n.d., as cited in Fonseca et al., 2011: 23). Or the document “Lx-Europa 2020 - Lisbon within the Frame of the Next EU Programming Cycle” (Lisboa no Quadro do Próximo Período de Programação Comunitário), published in 2012 by the Lisbon 2020 task force, which underlines the importance of interculturality in section 4.2.3.2 – “To value interculturality and promote citizenship” – by way of three axes: to promote cultural dialogue and initiatives, to support associativism and network-based actions and promote local participation and initiatives (cf. PMIIL 2015-2017, vol. I: 18-19).

More recently, the Social Rights Action Plan (Plano de Acção dos Direitos Sociais, 2014-2017) – part of the Administration Programme for the City of Lisbon 2013-2017 (Programa do Governo da Cidade de Lisboa) – underlines the valuable contribution and importance of the integration of immigrants, interculturality and inter-religiosity, in particular in its Section 9 (Intercultural and Inter-faith Dialogue), which lists the following missions: 1) To support and include immigrants; 2) To promote the integration of immigrant communities, ethnic, cultural and religious groups; 3) To promote participation in the field of interculturality and inter-faith; 4) To boost existing networks of cooperation in the fields of interculturality and inter-faith. Some of the key measures of these missions are: elaboration of a Strategic Charter for Immigration in Lisbon (Carta Estratégica para a Imigração em Lisboa), through the approval of the Municipal Plan for the Integration of Immigrants in Lisbon (Plano Municipal para a Integração dos Imigrantes de Lisboa); the introduction of the service of CLAII (Local Centre for Support to Immigrant Integration – Centro Local de Apoio à Integração de Imigrantes) in all the CML centralised help desks; promotion of access to education and Portuguese language learning; to develop information campaigns on social rights directed to Roma communities and refugees in the reception centres, and general public awareness campaigns geared toward dismantling stereotypes on Roma communities; making available temporary accommodation to receive refugees (Temporary Refugee Reception Centre – Centro de acolhimento temporário de refugiados de Lisboa, operational since February 2016); to CMIC and FMINT (see Section 4.2.2); reinforcement of cooperation with civil society organisations and with ACM, toward the integration of new foreign residents, immigrants and refugees; creation of an “Africa House” (Casa de África), a space that could work as a meeting point for various African communities in Lisbon.

The Municipal Plan for the Integration of Immigrants in Lisbon (PMIIL 2015-2017) is the most recent municipal instrument, having been outlined in ACM’s Strategy Plan on Migrations (Plano Estratégico para as Migrações). Both the stage of diagnosis of the immigrant population and the stages for devising the measures to be taken included various moments in which local stakeholders (e.g.: various CML departments; CML-subsidiary companies or bodies; various organisations included in the CMIC that agreed to take part in the process;
individual immigrants with no associative ties; experts, etc.) (cf. PMIIL 2015-2017, vol. 1: 28-34). Through this process of public scrutiny several measures emerged, and can be broken down into the following axes: 1) Citizenship and Participation (promotion of immigrant rights across various fields, such as reception, housing, health, civic and political participation, education, associations); 2) Employment, entrepreneurship, education and training; and 3) Diversity (which includes fields such as relations with countries of origin, inter-faith and intercultural dialogue, cultural and urban dynamics, racism and discrimination and social exclusion)\textsuperscript{25}.

\textsuperscript{25} Available at: \url{http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/noticias/detalhe/article/cml-aprova-1o-plano-municipal-para-a-integracao-dos-imigrantes}
Table 4.2. Synthesis of the evolution of municipal strategies for the Integration of Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Period</th>
<th>Programme/Plan</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Cultural dimension</th>
<th>Policy(ies)/Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-2000</td>
<td>Plano Estratégico de Lisboa</td>
<td>Social inclusion of poor immigrants and ethnic minorities; Fight the ghettisation of those communities</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1993: Conselho Municipal das Comunidades Imigrantes e das Minorias Étnicas (CMCIEME), the precursor of CMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>Resolução do Conselho de Ministros nº 197/97 de 11 de Novembro</td>
<td>Promote the cooperation and partnerships between Municipality, Parishes, Central administration and public or private entities which play a relevant social role in the territories (prevention and solution of assessed problems)</td>
<td>Not assumed explicitly</td>
<td>Social Network (Rede Social), based on the Local Councils for Social Action (Conselhos Locais de Ação Social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2012</td>
<td>Lisboa, 2012 – Uma Visão Estratégica</td>
<td>Urban development strategy cross-cutting areas such as: urban renewal, social cohesion, creation of cultural events and promotion of Lisbon as a cosmopolitan and multicultural city</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2024</td>
<td>Carta Estratégica de Lisboa 2010-2024</td>
<td>Assumes immigration and diversity as potentialities of the city; transition from a multicultural model to a “cross-cutting interculturality”</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-</td>
<td>Lx-Europa 2020 - Lisboa no Quadro do Próximo Período de Programação Comunitário</td>
<td>Promotion of Interculturality and Citizenship</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Foster cultural dialogues and initiatives; support civil society organisations and local partnerships/networks; foster civic participation and community-based initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>Plano de Acção dos Direitos Sociais 2014-2017 (Programa do Governo da Cidade de Lisboa 2013-2017)</td>
<td>Advancement of Immigrants’ rights, Interculturality and Interreligiosity</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Municipal Plan for the Integration of Immigrants; promotion of access to Education and Portuguese language learning; inform Roma communities and refugees of their rights; raise public awareness against discrimination towards Roma communities; provision of temporary housing to refugees; revitalisation of CMIC and FMINT dinamização do CMIC e do FMINT (Municipal Forum for Interculturality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>Plano Municipal para a Integração dos Imigrantes de Lisboa</td>
<td>Advancement of Immigrants’ rights, Interculturality and Interreligiosity</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Several initiatives in the following areas: 1) Citizenship and Participation (hosting of immigrants/refugees; housing; healthcare; civic and political participation; education; community organising and civil society organisations); 2) Employment, entrepreneurship and qualifications; 4) Diversity (incl. transnational relationships, intercultural and interreligious dialogue, cultural and urban relationships, Racism and discrimination, Social exclusion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2. Mainstreaming of migration in local planning

As mentioned in the previous section, the tackling of the issues that arise from immigration by local authorities has, for nearly two decades (from 1990 until around 2008), stayed within the bounds of social inclusion and, to a lesser extent, the cultural realm. We can point to two exceptions during this period: (i) the Municipal Council on Immigrant Communities and Ethnic Minorities (Conselho Municipal das Comunidades Imigrantes e das Minorias Étnicas – CMCIME), created in 1993 and later renamed CMIC, in 2009, and (ii) the document “Lisbon, 2012 – A Strategic Vision” (Lisboa, 2012 – Uma Visão Estratégica), approved in 2002 (CML, 2002).

The first of these initiatives (CMCIME) was anchored on the participation of civil society organisations that promoted the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities. This was consciously a preliminary attempt to include a series of issues affecting these groups in the political sphere. However, its merely consultative nature, given there was no obligation to transform the association's proposals into municipal policies, and the fact that this body would become virtually inactive (around 2004), was a key critical factor for many associations, which eventually lost interest. From the point of view of the ruling right-wing government at the time, the associations were criticised for their poor organisation and lack of a practical direction (cf. Sardinha, 2009: 260).

The second initiative, prospective in nature (a strategic guideline document) was framed within a logic of a mainstreaming of immigration issues within the fields of urban planning and requalification (Lisbon, a City of Neighbourhoods – Lisboa, Cidade de Bairros), social and cultural cohesion (Lisbon, a City of Cultures – Lisboa, Cidade de Culturas) and economic development (Lisbon, a City of Entrepreneurs– Lisboa, Cidade de Empreendedores). Still, only with creation of the Social Network (Rede Social; 2006) can we say that there is a practical cross-sector effort to address immigration issues at the local level. The multi-sectoral (and tendentially inter-sectoral) framework of this instrument lay the ground for the various stakeholders in the city, among them some of the representatives of immigrants and ethnic minorities, to be able to raise issues and concerns across various spheres (social, economic, cultural, urban planning, housing, etc.) and make them known to local partners (in the borough and/or municipality).

The CMIC, which took over from CMCIME (created in 2009), is a further example of a tendential mainstreaming of immigration in local administration, even if it remains only a consultative body, i.e. with no power of decision. The FMINT (Municipal Interculturality Forum – Fórum Municipal da Interculturalidade) which was created within the frame of the CMIC is yet another example,

27 The guidelines that frame and substantiate the FMINT were set out and laid out within the scope of the Municipal Council for Interculturality and Citizenship (Conselho Municipal para a Interculturalidade e a Cidadania – CMIC). Since 2009 three specific Forums were organised: “Promotion of Inter-cultural Dialogue – Educational Experiences” (Promoção do Diálogo Intercultural – Experiências Educativas) whose purpose was to create an opportunity for sharing the experiences and projects of the various associations; “Lisbon and the Deprivation of the Rights of Immigrants – a Common Challenge” (Lisboa e a Destituição dos Direitos dos Migrantes – Um Desafio para Todos)
a space for reflection and debate on immigration, diversity and interculturality, drawing on the participation of various communities residing in the Lisbon municipality.

The "BIP/ZIP" Programmes (since 2011) and "BIP/ZIP Lisbon - Local Partnerships" (Parcerias Locais; since 2016) are a municipal public policy instrument inscribed within the Local Housing Program (Programa Local de Habitação) and aimed at fostering partnerships and small-scale local interventions to improve the city’s “habitats”, through financial support to local projects. The Programme is tailored exclusively to the support of activities and projects to be developed in the so-called Priority Intervention Neighbourhoods and Areas (Bairros e Zonas de Intervenção Prioritária) that have signed the document ‘Carta dos BIP/ZIP de Lisboa’, approved by the Municipal Assembly in 2011. Finally, one should also mention the PMIIL 2015-2017, the Municipal Plan for the Integration of Immigrants in Lisbon (Plano Municipal para a Integração de Imigrantes em Lisboa), which emerged from ACM’s Strategic Plan on Migrations (Plano Estratégico para as Migrações), operating at national level and included in the Social Rights Action Plan (Plano de Acção dos Direitos Sociais; 2014-2017) mentioned in the previous section. This Municipal Plan is so far the most important step forward in terms of an intervention programme that is effectively cross-sectoral or more fully committed to the mainstreaming of immigration and ethnic minority issues. It is grounded on diagnosis, implementation (through thematic task forces) and assessment processes that local agents take part in, namely many of the associations that integrate the CMIC.

4.2.3. Good practices

CNAI: National Immigrant Support Centres (Centros Nacionais de Apoio ao Imigrante) were created in Lisbon and Porto in 2004 (and in Faro in 2009) to address various difficulties experienced by immigrants during their integration into Portugal. Cultural, organisational and legal differences, alongside the many services immigrants have to resort to, led ACM (at the time formally known as High Commissariat for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities – Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Minorias Étnicas) to create a central point that could gather together, in the same space, various services, institutions and Immigrant Support Offices (so-called “one-stop shops”) which housed services such as Social Security, Education, Health, Justice (more specifically, the Institute for Registry and Notary Services (Instituto dos Registos e Notariado – CRC), SEF and the Labour Standards Authority (Autoridade para as Condições de Trabalho), among others. There are currently three CNAI, in Lisbon, Porto and Faro.

whose main goal was to promote a debate among the social agents concerned, so as to foster and agree on strategies geared toward overcoming the problems of disenfranchisement among immigrants in the city of Lisbon; and “Intercultural Dialogues” (Diálogos da Interculturalidade), as part of the Social Network Forum Programme (Fórum da Rede Social), divided into three round-table discussion on the following topics: “Human Rights in a Time of Crisis: Inclusion, civic participation and participatory democracy”; “Turning the crisis into an opportunity: the inclusion of interculturality in the guidelines for the mission Lisboa/Europa 2020” and “The contribution of immigrant communities: entrepreneurship and economic activity”. In: http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/intervencao-social/interculturalidade/forum-municipal-da-interculturalidade-fmint
http://habitacao.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1296662615D3bGB5er5Wi19HJ6.pdf
**CLAlis**: Local Immigrant Integration Support Centre (Centro Local de Apoio à Integração de Imigrantes); it was created in Lisbon as a result of an agreement, signed in 2005, between the CML and the ACIME, now ACM. It is a decentralised space devoted to service and information (a "one-stop shop") that aims to offer local responses to the general needs of immigrants. This includes accommodation and integration, in terms of the legalisation of their migratory status, nationality, family reunification, housing, employment, social security, voluntary return, health, education, professional training, entrepreneurship, support to associations, among other issues.29

**Roteiro Lisboa Imigrante da Câmara de Lisboa**: Lisbon Council’s “Lisbon Guide for Immigrants”. This is a guide containing the key information for whoever chooses the city of Lisbon as a place to live, with useful advice and information for those who do not speak the language, listing services, Citizen’s Bureau (Lojas do Cidadão, *one stop shops* for all citizens, with various services and institutions), boroughs, citizens services and health centres.30

**Festival Todos**: This festival is an annual initiative promoted by CML/Lisbon, a Crossroad of Worlds (Gabinete Lisboa Encruzilhada de Mundos – GLEM) together with Cultural Producers Academy (Academia de Produtores Culturais). It was created in 2009, with the aim of promoting the intersection between cultures and inter-faith dialogue through contemporary art (music, theatre, new circus, dance, performance, photography, urban art, world food and tours and talks on various social and artistic topics). It changes venue every three years, to counter the idea of "ghetto-neighbourhoods", the label given to areas with a high concentration of immigrants and ethnic minorities.31

**Festival Imigrarte**: This festival seeks to promote the art and cultures of resident immigrant communities and fight for equal rights for these groups, and against all forms of discrimination, racism and xenophobia. It takes place every year, organised by the association SOLIM Immigrant Solidarity (Associação Solidariedade Imigrante), alongside several local partners.

**Festa da Diversidade**: “Diversity Feast”, as the name translates, is an initiative by SOS Racism association (Associação SOS Racismo), in partnership with CML, involving various civil society organisations with important work in the fight against racial discrimination. This feast is a meeting of cultures by means of diverse languages such as music, theatre, dance, gastronomy, and an exhibition of anti-discrimination materials.

Not all of these initiatives were assessed by all the interviewees and participants of the workshops. However, on the whole, there is a positive opinion of "one stop shops" because they make immigrants’ access to various services easier, even if one organisation (Interview 6) defends that there should be no separation between services for immigrants and services for Portuguese nationals. There is wide recognition of the important role played by festivals in the city’s cultural life and in the promotion of interculturality. Still, another of the associations

---

29 In: [http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/intervencao-social/interculturalidade/centro-local-de-apoio-a-integracao-de-imigrantes-claii](http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/viver/intervencao-social/interculturalidade/centro-local-de-apoio-a-integracao-de-imigrantes-claii)


32 Interviews conducted and workshop organised in the framework of MC2CM project for the elaboration of the present report
interviewed (Interview 3) feared that the CML focuses its investment too much on the cultural sphere, overlooking other key areas, such as social initiatives for the integration of immigrants. Other important practices are mentioned in sections 6.8 and 6.9.2.

4.3. Institutional Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CML – Lisbon Municipal Council (Câmara Municipal de Lisboa), including its various portfolios and departments | Decree 30/2015, 12 February, established the regime of delegation of competences to municipalities and municipal bodies of social responsibilities in the following spheres: Education (e.g.: Municipal or Inter-municipal Strategic Education Plan, etc.); Health (e.g.: Municipal and Inter-municipal Health Strategy, under the scope of the National Health Plan (Plano Nacional de Saúde); management of Health units, management of resources, amenities and infrastructures, etc.); Social Security (they may, in articulation with Local Social Action Councils, implement new intervention mechanisms and strategies in local social action, etc); Culture (management of cultural amenities and infrastructures, such as museums, libraries, theatres, and their cultural programmes, etc.). See Table in Section 3.3.

Non-governmental organisations active in the city in the area of migration and integration (including migrant organisations) which participated in the City Stakeholder Group workshop

Note 1: Several of the following organisations have their Headquarters in Lisbon but also work on a national level;
Note 2: Workshop organised in the framework of MC2CM project - Many more NGOs are active in the city33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALCC – Association for Lusophone Culture and Citizenship (Associação Lusofonia Cultura e Cidadania)</td>
<td>To promote the social and professional integration of immigrants and immigrants’ descendants (particularly from the PALOPs and Brazil) Funding: mainly international, national and local projects or protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association ComuniDária</td>
<td>To support, through education for citizenship and cultural initiatives, all women and girls in a situation of risk, labour exploitation, gender violence and discrimination Funding: mainly international and local projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturface - Cultural Association for Development (Associação Cultural para o Desenvolvimento)</td>
<td>To promote cultural dialogue between peoples through multiple artistic disciplines Funding: mainly international, national and local projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 See http://lisboasolidaria.cm-lisboa.pt/documentos/1410187585K7hBF6zq0Fs36iL3.pdf, for a list of CMIC members, which naturally does not include all the organisations involved in the fields of immigration and interculturality in Lisbon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Ukrainians in Portugal</td>
<td>To facilitate the integration of Ukrainian immigrants in Portugal and foster Ukrainian culture among immigrants and their descendants. Funding: mainly donations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGUINENSO - Guinean Association for Social Solidarity</td>
<td>Promotion of the social integration of immigrants within the local community. Funding: mainly national and local projects and protocols.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS Racism</td>
<td>To fight against racism, xenophobia and racial/ethnic discrimination, promoting interculturality. Funding: mainly national or local projects and protocols, donations; own revenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique House</td>
<td>Promotion of economic justice, social integration and interculturality. Funding: mainly national projects, own revenue and donations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil House in Lisbon</td>
<td>Promotion of the social integration of Brazilian immigrants, of Brazilian culture and interculturality Funding: mainly national and local projects or protocols.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUBE - International European Club</td>
<td>To promote the participation, empowerment and social inclusion of children, youth and adults in a vulnerable situation Funding: mainly national and local projects or protocols.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Community of Lisbon</td>
<td>Promotion of Islamic faith, inter-faith dialogue and philanthropic activities. Funding: own revenue and donations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Refugee Council</td>
<td>To promote the legal and social protection of asylum seekers and refugees Funding: ACNUR, European Refugee Fund, Corporate Social Responsibility, and international, national and local projects and protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Catholic Work on Migrations</td>
<td>To promote and support the integration of the Portuguese diaspora and of immigrants in Portugal. Funding: mainly own revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work of the Oblate Sister of the Holy Redeemer</td>
<td>To promote the social integration of women in a situation of social exclusion and improve the living conditions of sex workers Funding: mainly local projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon Diocesan Secretariat for the Roma National Pastoral</td>
<td>Promotion of the social integration of the Roma people. Funding: national and local protocols and projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Solidarity</td>
<td>Promotion of the defence of immigrants’ rights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1. Coordination and Cooperation at City Level

There are various mechanisms for institutional cooperation that mediate between local authorities, state bodies, private commercial organisations, non-profit organisations and NGOs. The city’s social networks (Lisbon Social Network – Rede Social de Lisboa; CLAS-Lx Lisbon Local Council for Social Action – Conselho Local de Acção Social de Lisboa; Borough Social Committees – Comissões Sociais de Freguesia) are some of the key examples of regular and ongoing cooperation at the local level, with important responsibilities for the promotion of social integration for more vulnerable citizens (e.g.: CLAS-Lx has the duty to sign off on the Social Diagnosis and the Lisbon Social Development Plan. In sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.3 we mentioned various other examples of instruments, programmes and projects based on local cooperation.
between the municipal council and non-governmental organisations. CMIC, FMINT, or PMIIL 2015-2017, are probably the most paradigmatic co-operative programmes between local associations and the council in terms of planning and governance on the issue of migrant integration, interculturality and inter-faith dialogue.

The CML was clearly invested in this cultural dimension, through the organisation of or support for festivals that promote and celebrate diversity, namely the “Festival Todos” (organised by CML), “Festival Imigrante” (organised by SOLIM – Solidariedade Imigrante, with CML as a partner, among other organisations) and “Festa da Diversidade” (organised by SOS Racismo, with CML as a partner). Besides these initiatives, which have involved or still involve partnerships between the municipal authority and some of the associations that work in the field of integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities, there are other cooperative and support mechanisms from the council to civil-society organisations that operate in this field.

One of the means of support that organisations more often highlighted in the interviews for this report was the allocation (lease) of spaces for association headquarters, usually in vacant council-owned flats or buildings. The opinions of the heads of associations on this matter is not, however, part of a consensus. In some cases, they are satisfied by the allocation of the space (e.g.: Interviews 8 and 10), while in others they are critical of the way the allocation of spaces is managed by the municipal council for a number of reasons: some associations are still waiting for a space to be allocated to them (e.g.: Interviews 6 and 9); another says the space was in a very poor condition (Interview 4); and there are others that need more space for their activities but did not get it since such spaces were offered to other organisations that were de facto inactive (Interview 13).

Most associations do not receive financial support from the CML, although the council has funds available to support organisations that work effectively to serve the municipal public good, as laid out in the municipal regulatory document on subsidy attribution (RAAML: “Regulamento de Atribuição de Apoios pelo Município de Lisboa”) or through programme-contracts. However, some of the organisations interviewed take part or have taken part in municipally-funded projects subject to tender procedures, such as the above mentioned BIP/ZIP Programmes, aimed chiefly at improving living conditions within neighbourhoods or areas previously identified as targets of priority intervention.

Most of the heads of the associations interviewed hold the view that the CML has shown a growing awareness of issues related to immigrant integration, namely through the attempt to build bridges between the municipal executive and grass-roots organisation that work within this field. They see this as positive, even if they acknowledge there is a long road ahead in creating a more effective articulation and institutional/political cooperation between the council and local organisations:

“As for the CML I think you feel their desire to keep in step with the multicultural trend, but then they don’t engage in the true and proper work of integration. I do think there has been some progress. There is a big and noticeable shift, which is the fact that CML has been reaching out to immigrant associations, and that in itself is a step in the right direction. CML has been more

34 http://www.cm-lisboa.pt/servicos/pedidos/apoio-institucional/apoio-financeiro-geral
present and reachable, which is a big step, since I don’t think that was the case before” (Interview 3)

This willingness of the council to support and engage more civil society organisations is sometimes thwarted by a series of constraints, mostly in terms of the legislation that defines the range of municipal competences:

“As for practical results [in terms of the CML’s attempts to alter the SEF Decree that limits the regularisation of immigrants], there isn’t much to show, but at least we have seen some changes. In terms, for instance, of support to associations, support to their activities. There’s been more of that. They’ve shown a greater concern, willingness to debate, and to act. They are indeed more aware and more engaged. But again, that in itself doesn’t accomplish anything, because that’s not where the problem lies [at the level of the local authorities].” (Interview 11)

In this particular case, the regularisation of immigrants is up to the central administration, so the CML is not able to change their legal status. However, there are some who argue that the council should join the associations of civil society in the defence of the rights of these immigrants, as one of the interviewees suggested:

“Let us imagine that these matters do not fall within the CML’s responsibilities, but then the CML could be our ally in addressing the government, demanding that steps be taken to improve conditions for its resident citizens, whether Portuguese or immigrants. The CML should play a key role in this process.” (Interview 6)

Another issue raised on several occasions by different organisations was the series of bureaucratic obstacles imposed by the CML, which often hinder or prevent certain activities that would otherwise be promoted by local associations:

“As far as I’m concerned, in Lisbon, the bureaucracy has become increasingly complicated, permits, licenses, all of these things. To tell you the truth, to obtain a license for an event in a public space, if you want to abide by the law, there’s just no way.” (Interview 2)

4.3.2. Coordination and co-operation with the regional and the national level

The cooperation between the Lisbon Municipal Council (CML) and national authorities in relation to the matter of immigrant integration is grounded on its articulation with the High-Commissariat for Migrations (ACM), through the national “one stop shops” – CNAI (Centro Nacional de Apoio ao Imigrante), created in 2004 in Lisbon – and the local “one stop shops” – CLAl (Centro Local de Apoio à Integração de Imigrantes), founded in 2005 in Lisbon (see 4.2.3 Good Practices). Besides these mechanisms, there are several projects organised by the ACM with the CML as a partner. Among these one should highlight PMIIL (which emerged out of the PNM, the National Plan for Migrations), or the ACM meeting under the name “Fora de Portas” (Outdoors), aimed at giving visibility to the ACM and its partners (e.g. immigrants associations and associations of the Roma community), an event that takes place annually in various Portuguese cities.
In 2016, in the process of creating a Working Group for the European Agenda on Migration, in order to enforce its implementation in Portugal (which included initiatives and recommendations in the matter of the relocation and re-accommodation of refugees), the CML laid out a Municipal Plan for the Reception of Refugees in the city (Plano de Municipal de Acolhimento de Refugiados na cidade – PMAR LX), where the ACM acts as the Working Group's coordinator for several other public institutions (both central and local) and civil society organisations on the national level, alongside local and international networks are involved\(^\text{35}\). GAIR (Gabinete de Apoio à Integração do Refugiado; Office for Support to Refugee Integration), also created in March 2016, is an ACM Office that aims to articulate the responsibilities of ACM and other institutions that receive and accommodate refugees. Besides overseeing the work carried out by local institutions, this office has trained technicians to work directly with these groups.

4.4. International cooperation

Municipal level (Lisbon):

- “Projeto DELI” (Diversity in the economy and local integration) (2014-2016)
- “Rede de Cidades Interculturais” (Intercultural Cities Network/Council of Europe)
- “Rede Europeia de Cidades para Políticas Locais de Integração de Imigrantes” – CLIP (European Foundation/EC)
- “Rede Portuguesa de Cidades Interculturais” (Portuguese Network of Intercultural Cities)
- “EuroCities”
- PMAR-LX: “Programa Municipal de Acolhimento de Refugiados na Cidade de Lisboa” (ACNUR – Municipal Programme for the reception of Refugees in the city of Lisbon)

\(^{35}\text{Cf. }\text{http://www.amlisboa.pt/documentos/1444307049B9bHL8dw2Fm66PP9.pdf}\)
5. Immigration Situation in Lisbon

5.1. Overview

A large portion of the immigrants residing in Portugal are concentrated in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area (AML), which includes the city of Lisbon. In 2011, immigrants living in the AML were 51.6% of the country’s immigrants and the relative percentage of immigrants living in Lisbon, in relation to the total of the city’s population, was 8.1%, according to the Census. As a means of comparison, in 2011, the relative percentage of immigrants in the AML against the total resident population was slightly lower (at 7.7%) and, at national level, even less where immigrants were 4.1% of the total population in Portugal.

The crisis had a noticeable impact on the decline of the entry flows into the country (measured by means of residence permits granted to citizens of non-EU countries and also EU citizens who want to live in the country for a period of more than 3 months). This might not be the only factor, given the aforementioned increase in the amount of people granted citizenship status, as shown in Figure 3.3. However, at the city level, this decline is much less accentuated, as illustrated by Figure 5.1. In any case, 2014 seemed to mark a point of shift, suggesting a slow recovery and stabilisation of the flows of entry until 2015.

Figure 5.1. Residence permit applications in Portugal, AML and Lisbon (2008-2015)

Source: SEF/INE
5.2. Migrant population

Looking at the data on entries in greater detail, we can see a few distinct patterns emerge in terms of the geographical distribution of citizens from outside the EU (Figure 5.2). Both at the metropolitan and municipal level, there is a greater accentuated decline in requests for residency permits among Brazilian citizens, with no signs yet of recovery. The current political and economic situation in Brazil, however, may well trigger a return to Portugal of the immigrants that had returned to their country of origin and/or new flows of Brazilians into Portugal. The two main immigrant groups that have increased in number in Lisbon and, to a lesser extent, in the AML, in the wake of the social and economic turbulence over the last few years in their own regions, are citizens from Eastern and Southern Asia and the EU (EU-12, that is to say, from the countries that joined the then-EEC until 1986). After a counter-cyclical increase in 2011, the entries of citizens from African countries (from PALOPs, for the most part) have since dwindled in both geographical units, even though this decline is less accentuated in the capital.

Figure 5.2. Requests for residence permits in the Lisbon municipality (2008-2015), by major nationality clusters

Source: SEF/INE

5.2.1. Migration channels and legal status

Law n. 23/2007, 4 July, streamlined the bureaucratic system of admission and residency, and allowed the granting a single visa for settling or residing in Portugal. This is different from the former situation, where different types of visas were given for different residential needs (residency, study, and work, of which there were 4 types). According to Oliveira and Gomes (2014: 42-44), the crisis diversified the profile of entries into the country after 2008. There was an increase in the entries of students, researchers and the highly-qualified and, less noticeably, pensioners. The entries for less economically valuable workers, which were always quite low (the peak of visas granted for this motive
was in 2008, at roughly 2,000), decreased even further however in the wake of the crisis. In 2007, whereas family reunification was the main reason behind entries into the country, this scenario gradually shifted so that, in 2012, education accounted for the greatest number of applications (almost two thirds that year)\textsuperscript{36}.

The entries of Cape Verdean and Brazilian nationals are mostly tied to educational reasons, while among Chinese, Ukrainian and Moldovan citizens family reunification is the grounds given for the majority of residence permits. The downturn in the granting of work visas and permits may be explained by the national recession, which meant that the country was no longer an appealing destination for economic migrants. It can also be explained by the more forbidding legal demands that governed the granting of residence permits for professional reasons (whether salaried or self-employed). In principle, these permits should be applied for in a Portuguese Consulate in the country of origin, accompanied by a job offer certified by the IEFP (Instituto do Emprego e Formação Profissional; Institute for Employment and Professional Training), which is only applicable if there are no candidates to the position already legally settled in the country. In other words, in practice, a substantial portion of entries will continue to take place through a tourist visa, which fall into an irregular overstay and/or permanent residency.

Recently, Order n. 7/2016, 21 March, issued by the National Director of SEF, changed the rules in place that governed the entry and residence of foreigners illegally residing in Portugal. The change limited the possibility of initiating the legalisation process only to immigrants with a Schengen visa (a visa granting entry in all EU countries that have signed the Schengen Agreement) and who are able to prove that their entry into the country took place before the expiry date of that visa, offering evidence of that entry to the Portuguese police authorities. This Order makes it impossible, then, for the regularisation of foreign citizens residing in Portugal within the scope of exceptional track set out in Articles 88, 89-2 of law n. 27/2007, dated 4 July. In other words, this applies to all foreigners who arrived in Portugal before March 2016 and who are not legal resident, given that their period of entry cannot match the requirements.

To this one should also add the obstacles that migrants face in the Social Security and Tax Offices, which have seemingly been instructed by SEF to reject the registration of immigrants to those services. Even for immigrants whose regularisation was already in process before the relevant date, it is likely that they will not be able to obtain it, either because they cannot meet the bureaucratic requirements demanded of them. This can either be the result of the duration of the process (three years, on average, for immigrants with over a year of work and residence) or the cancellation of previous appointments for obtaining a Residence Permit until December 2016.

According to some of the organisations interviewed, there are even cases of immigrants whose regularisation process was complete in terms of the bureaucratic procedures, but who have been waiting for the resident card for more than a year (Interview 6). Since

\textsuperscript{36}Data from the Ministry of External Affairs ("Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros"), published by Oliveira and Gomes (2014: 43)
this card is valid for only a year and requires annual renewal for the holder to remain in a regular status, several immigrants are at risk of losing this status without ever having effectively been granted it. Even though this is a national and not municipal responsibility, several among those interviewed for this study pointed to this regulation as one of their greater obstacles in the way of immigrants in Lisbon gaining access to their rights (Interviews 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18).

Law n. 27/2008, amended by Law n. 26/2014, defines the framework for asylum seekers. Portugal has received a very low number of asylum requests – between 2009 and 2014 the annual average was 257. However, between 2013 and 2014, there was a higher number of requests, given the influx of Syrians (in 2013) and Ukrainians (in 2014)\(^{37}\). In May 2015, the European Commission agreed on the adoption and implementation of the European Agenda on Migration which, among other measures, foresees the relocation of people in need of international protection (refugee status) from Italy and Greece into other EU Member-states, in an attempt to put into practice the principle of intra-European “shared solidarity”. Under the scope of this programme, Portugal pledged to receive, in the course of the next two years, 4,574 asylum seekers. According to the most recent estimate, between January 2016 and May 2017, Portugal received 1,306 asylum seekers relocated from refugee camps in Italy and Greece. However, over that same period SEF registered 555 departures, i.e., approximately 42% chose to leave the country, mostly to other European countries\(^{38}\).

The CML has committed itself to receiving 10% (approx. 500) of the total of asylum seekers relocated in the country over the next two years. 90% of asylum seekers will thus be scattered across the national territory (mostly in the interior of the country). The express aim, according to the ACM, is to not “put too much pressure” on the more central municipalities of the AML and the AMP (Porto), so as to prevent the potential stigmatisation of the asylum seekers and make their integration easier (Interview 1). The CML devised a Municipal Plan for the Reception of Refugees (“Plano Municipal para Acolhimento de Refugiados” – PMAR-LX) and signed a protocol with JRS (“Serviço Jesuítica de Apoio aos Refugiados” – Jesuit Refugee Support Service) for the reception of refugees, and the latter will be responsible for the Lisbon Temporary Reception Centre for Reception of Refugees (“Centro de Acolhimento Temporário para Refugiados de Lisboa”), inaugurated on March 2016.

5.3.2. Main countries of origin

The main nationalities of foreign nationals that entered into Portugal in the last eight years is slightly different from the stock of foreigners residing in Lisbon that appear in the


2011 Census. While Brazil, Cape Verde, China and Angola were the four most represented nationalities in the city in 2011, requests for residence permits (flow) show the rise of other foreign nationals in the capital (Table 5.1). India, Spain, Greece and Morocco, alongside Brazil and Cape Verde, are the main countries of origin for foreign nationals that entered in the period between 2008 and 2015. The entries of Indian citizens are the highest (2.6 times higher than the annual average of Brazilians). On the other hand, within the AML, Brazil, Cape Verde, Romania, Guinea-Bissau, China and Angola, still amount to two thirds of the recent flows, with 66% of the 23,883 annual requests for this area.

Table 5.1. Annual average of applications for residence permits in Lisbon and AML (2008-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 20 nationalities</th>
<th>Lisbon</th>
<th>Top 20 nationalities</th>
<th>LMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>Brasil</td>
<td>7601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasil</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>2721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>Roménia</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espanha</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Guiné-Bissau</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grécia</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrocos</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alemanha</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>São Tomé e Príncipe</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moçambique</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Ucrânia</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irlanda</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Itália</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiné</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Espanha</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>França</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburgo</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Moldova (República de)</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eslovénia</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Alemanha</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polónia</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Reino Unido</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadá</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Paquistão</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rússia (Federação da)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estônia</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Bulgária</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Estados Unidos</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé e Príncipe</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Guiné</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEF/ INE

5.3.3. Gender distribution and age structure

The gender distribution of foreign nationals living in the AML shows a global decline of male immigrants in the period 2008-2015 (Table 5.2). In the city of Lisbon, however, men still represents a little over half of foreign nationals, showing that this global trend was not imitated here. The gender distribution reveals other interesting patterns. While there
is a global gender balance in the period under analysis, Asian immigrants show a greater masculinity ratio (more men), which is also the case among immigrants from Oceania. By contrast, immigrants from South and Central America (especially Brazil) show the opposite trend, i.e. a higher feminisation of immigration. European flows, for the most part originating in EU-12 countries (which joined the EU until 1986) have oscillated in that same period. In the years 2012-2013 there were more female than male entries and over the past two years (2014-2015), there was again a higher percentage of male entries (53%), going back to the trend in 2008. The slightly higher proportion of women from African countries suggest a reinforcement of the trend for family reunification, going against the trend in previous years.

Table 5.2. Evolution of resident foreign nationals with regular status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AML (% men)</th>
<th>Lisbon (% men)</th>
<th>Foreigners AML</th>
<th>Foreigners Lisbon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>190,423</td>
<td>43,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>196,798</td>
<td>44,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>189,220</td>
<td>44,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>188,259</td>
<td>46,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>181,901</td>
<td>45,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>176,963</td>
<td>46,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>176,927</td>
<td>50,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>173,521</td>
<td>51,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEF

An analysis of the age structure of the 2011 Census, since the variable age is lacking from much of the data both on entry flows and stocks published by SEF and INE, shows that foreign nationals stand out for their higher percentage of young adults and some senior citizens. This situation had already been emerged in the PMII Report 2015-2017 Vol. 1 (p. 38), which showed that non-EU foreign nationals, especially Brazilians, Indians, Bangladesh and Nepalese, and also Romanians, have the highest proportion of young adults. These demographic traits of the foreign population (particularly among those from outsider of the EU) contribute to the rise in the local birth rate and also to the high percentage of the population of working age, when compared to Portuguese nationals.
5.3.4. Level of education

The level of education of foreign nationals in Portugal is, when measured globally, higher than that of the Portuguese. According to the 2011 Census, 12.7% of the total of foreign residents held a university degree, against 11.7% among Portuguese nationals. 28.1% of foreign nationals completed secondary or post-secondary education, against 13.7% among the Portuguese and 15% have not finished any level of education, a number that reaches 19% among the Portuguese (Oliveira and Gomes, 2014: 69). However, the level of education is starkly uneven from one immigrant group to the next. While EU citizens or Eastern European citizens (Ukraine, Moldova) have high levels of formal education, immigrants from China, India or the PALOP tend to have lower levels. The situation in the AML is roughly in line with the national scenario (see Figure 5.3). Residents from the EU, Ukraine and Moldova show levels of education significantly higher than that of the Portuguese, while among the citizens from the PALOP we find a lower proportion of individuals with university education. In the case of Brazilian immigrants, there are some similarities with the Angolan nationals in Portugal, with lower rates of people with no complete level of education than the Portuguese, but equally with less people with university degrees than the national average among the Portuguese, which is partially offset by the high percentage of people with secondary or post-secondary education. Since there is no available data on the educational levels of foreigners entering the country, it is not yet possible to ascertain whether the changes in migratory patterns in the last few years have contributed to a higher or lower level of education of the population residing in the city and in the AML.

Figure 5.3. Level of education in AML by main nationalities (2011)

Source: INE/ Censo 2011 (in: Esteves et al., 2015: 118)
5.3.5. Sectors of activity

Statistical data on the resident population in Lisbon (2011 Census) reveals that the percentage of the population within working-age is greater among foreign nationals than that of the Portuguese (Table 5.3). If one analyses the communities with a higher proportion of economically active population, one Realises that they are mostly those linked with more recent migratory flows, such as the Nepalese (82.2%), Brazilians (75%), Ukrainians (74%), Romanians (69.1%) and Chinese (66.8%). As to PALOP citizens, the percentage of active persons (55.6%) is lower than among those from more recent flows, but still higher than the average among the Portuguese (46.2%).

The percentage of unemployed among foreign nationals (Table 5.3) is higher than that of the Portuguese population, which reflects the fragility of workplace terms and conditions for this group, which were aggravated by the crisis. One should also note that citizens from the EU-15 countries had only 3.9% of its resident population unemployed in 2011 in Lisbon and 6.3% among EU27 citizens, which offers a stark contrast with PALOP nationals. The latter is the region of origin with more dramatic unemployment levels (18.1%), particularly among citizens from Guinea-Bissau (24.4%) and Angola (18.9%).

It is worth underlining that Indian and Bangladeshi nationals, groups over-represented in self-employed business activities, especially small companies, have higher unemployment levels than the Portuguese, but lower than foreign nationals in general (10.8%) in the year of the Census. Unemployment rates among Eastern European citizens (Ukraine) were slightly higher than the average among foreign nationals, possibly due to the slowing down of the building sector, where traditionally many Eastern European immigrants worked before the economic crisis.
In terms of the socio-professional groups among the active foreign population, according to data from the 2011 Census, supplied by INE, one notes that the key areas are “commerce and services administrative employees” (29%), followed by “unqualified workers” in the same economic activity sector (17.1%). In third place we find “intellectual and scientific professions” (10.9%), which suggests a polarised insertion of foreign nationals in the Lisbon socio-professional structure (qualified vs. unqualified). Indeed, 43.5% of EU15 nationals and 31.5% of EU27 nationals hold positions within the category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Active Population (%)</th>
<th>Employed population</th>
<th>Unemployed population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total</td>
<td>477239</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Portugal</td>
<td>435659</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Foreigner</td>
<td>28811</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UE15 (excl. Portugal)</td>
<td>4114</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UE27 (excl. Portugal)</td>
<td>5891</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Brazil</td>
<td>9251</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PALOP</td>
<td>5839</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cape Verde</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Angola</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ukraine</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Romania</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. India</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Nepal</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. São Tomé and Principe</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bangladesh</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INE, Censo 2011
“intellectual and scientific professions”. The scenario changes radically when you look at the insertion of citizens from the PALOP, where 60% of the active population fit into the “commerce and services administrative employees”, with a significant percentage of unqualified workers (25.8%). As to citizens from Nepal, Brazil, São Tomé and Príncipe and Cape Verde, their activities are mostly linked with commerce and services (77.7%, 57.3%, 59.5% and 53.6%, respectively).

As for foreign nationals that fit into the category “small employers”, Chinese and Bangladeshi nationals stand out: small and medium-sized enterprises amount to 27% and 14.8%, respectively, which are the highest percentages of all the nationalities. Indian and Nepalese nationals also have a higher percentage of “small employers” than that of the total of the foreign population.
6. Immigrants' enjoyment of human rights and access to services and local authorities’ corresponding duties in Lisbon

6.1. Overview

From a formal and legal point of view, immigrants with a regular status, immigrant descendants and ethnic minorities should enjoy the same human rights and have access to the same services as Portuguese citizens. The same is not true, however, in terms of political rights (the right to vote and the right to run for public office), at least not unconditionally, since these rights are grounded on a principle of reciprocity (see Section 6.8). For undocumented citizens, the situation is different. These immigrants are deprived of various rights and barred from access to various public services under the same conditions as Portuguese citizens or other immigrants with a legal status. At present, these limitations sometimes amount to a complete deprivation of certain rights (e.g.: access to legal/formal work; access to social security). These limitations can also be partial, as they are given access to certain minimum on equal standing with citizens with a regularised status, but fit into a different regime in other services deemed non-essential. This asymmetry is quite noticeable in terms of access to health (see Section 6.5), for example.

Besides these limitations of a legal or formal nature, there are other constraints that prove de facto obstacles to the full enjoyment of rights and services by some immigrants, immigrant descendants or ethnic minorities. They include the language barrier, low educational levels, economic difficulties, labour precarity, racial/ethnic discrimination, prejudice and socio-cultural stigmatisation, residential isolation or segregation. One should point out that some of these problems also affect native Portuguese nationals, since they spring from economic and social difficulties that hinder the full exercise of citizenship and formally guaranteed human rights. However, immigrants and ethnic minorities often suffer cumulative disadvantages that accumulate as difficulties of a socio-economic nature, such as divisions and differentiations on grounds of race or ethnicity, which amplify the vulnerability of these groups and thus hinder their full integration. The areas deemed more critical by this study's participants are: regularisation and juridical issues, employment, housing, language learning, education and health.

As one can easily see, these issues have a deep impact on the possibilities of integration and building a dignified life. Some of them are the outcome of a legal-administrative framework that goes beyond municipal responsibilities (questions of regularisation, education). Others are strongly influenced by the fragile economic conjuncture of the last few years (access to employment). While others continue to
reflect the national legal framework but offer some margin of autonomy to municipalities, as is the case with housing and health.

Over the last few years, Lisbon Municipality has taken steps toward promoting the integration of immigrants, namely through the initiatives outlined in Chapter 4. The Municipal Plan for the Integration of Lisbon immigrants (Plano Municipal para Integração dos Imigrantes de Lisboa) is, according to some of the organisations interviewed, the local public instrument most suited to have a positive impact on some of these issues over the coming years. However, as this plan is still in its implementation stage, we cannot offer a substantiated assessment:

“In this matter I think that the Plan [PMIIL] that is in preparation, whether good or bad, the key thing is that it has concrete measures for the Municipality, I think that’s relevant, it’s a good thing... Well, naturally, what is now being implemented, you need to see how things will actually work before you realise if it’s a good practice or not, but everything seems to suggest that it will be put into place and have a positive impact.” (Interview 18)

However, not all the organisations interviewed agree with PMIIL. One of the organisations argued that to lay out a plan specifically aimed at the integration of immigrants would in fact highlight their differences in the eyes of the host society, thus contributing to the stigmatisation of these groups. This organisation defends, instead, that integration policies, as well as other measures directed at immigrants, should be directed to all citizens, immigrant or native, and regardless of whether they are in a regular or irregular situation (Interview 6).

6.2. Language Learning

Learning Portuguese is one of the issues that tendentially affects many of the immigrants that enter the country. This issue affects a person’s educational attainment (in the case of children and young adults), their insertion into the labour market, their access to goods and services, among other aspects that limit their full integration. The obligation to communicate in Portuguese is legally established as a prerequisite for obtaining a permanent residence permit and naturalisation\(^{39}\). It is important to note that while a significant proportion of immigrants into the country come from the PALOP and Brazil, some immigrants (particularly the oldest among the PALOP nationals) experience some difficulties with the Portuguese language, given the common use of creole languages in their countries of origin and, to an extent, even in Portugal, when they reside in neighbourhoods with a high co-ethnic concentration.

Three measures have proved particularly relevant in promoting the learning of Portuguese among immigrants:

---

\(^{39}\)Matching, at least, the A2 level (waystage/elementary) of the Common European Framework of reference for Languages.
1) “Teaching of Portuguese as a Non-native Language” (PLNM - Português como Língua Não-Materna), which appeared for the first time in 2001, specifically through “curricular activities specifically tailored for teaching Portuguese as a second language to students whose native language is not Portuguese” (Decree n. 6/2001), with pilot projects in the AML. In 2006 and 2007 PLNM was regulated as discipline in primary education (1-9th grades) and secondary education (10-12th grades), functioning within the scope of study or extra and specialised educational support. In 2011 and 2012 their status was reinforced, to become a curricular unit in primary and secondary teaching, with the same course load as the regular Portuguese discipline.40

1) The Programme “Portuguese for All” (PPT – Português para Todos), initiated in 200841, co-funded by the Portuguese Government and the HPOP (Human Potential Operating Programme, from the European Social Fund) and run by the ACM. It offers two options of Portuguese language courses for immigrant citizens and their descendants with a regular status42: a) Portuguese courses for speakers of other languages and b) Technical Portuguese courses, for those who are at A2 level and want to improve their language proficiency for economic activity purposes (e.g.: commerce, hospitality services, building sector, etc.). Some of the strong points of these courses were: gratuity, geographical decentralisation, flexibility in the hours of the classes, subsidies for participants (e.g.: food allowance), and the logic of partnership between CLAIIs, IEFP and the schools involved.

2) The third measure was the offer of literacy or Portuguese language courses for immigrants promoted by local associations, with the support of the ACM and co-funding by the Portuguese state and the European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals. The association “Rennovate Mouraria” (Renovar a Mouraria) and the Association Raízes (that supports young children and young people), both located in Lisbon, are two entities that have engaged in these initiatives, which has had quite a lot of participants.

Possibly due to budget cuts enforced upon the ACM in the last few years, there has been a decrease in the offer of these last two courses (“Portuguese for All” and “Portuguese for Immigrants”) over the last two years (2015-2016), a lack identified by several of the associations interviewed (e.g. Interviews 3, 6, 7, 11, 14, 18)43. Some of them have been trying to fill in this gap on their own initiative, through voluntary collaborators (e.g. Solidariedade Imigrante; Non-Resident Nepali Association), or crowdfunding campaigns to fund courses (e.g. Associação Renovar a Mouraria). More

---

40 For more, see Oliveira e Gomes (2014: 154-158).
41 PPT was preceded by the Programme “Portugal Acolhe” (Portugal Hosts), run by the IEFP (2001-2008).
43 Oliveira e Gomes (2016: 5) refer that in 2012 10,982 students enrolled in the program ‘Português para Todos’ no território nacional e em 2013 e 2014 participaram, respectivamente, 10.907 e 9.091 formandos. Realçam contudo que a taxa de certificação mais elevada desde 2008 ocorreu no ano de 2014 (66%).
recently, on 27 May 2016, the ACM launched an online Portuguese Language Platform (https://pptonline.acm.gov.pt/), which offers free language learning resources for speakers of several languages (English, Arabic, Mandarin and Romanian), without any restrictions as far as having a regularised resident status. Up until the end of June 2016, 772 people of 83 different nationalities had signed up to the course.

In short, even though language is officially recognised as a key factor for the integration and full exercise of citizenship\textsuperscript{44}, the cuts to funds destined to the promotion of Portuguese language courses seems to be depriving many immigrants of formal teaching, particularly newcomers. Furthermore, the fact that (attendance-based) courses in the “Portuguese for All” (PPT – Português para Todos) programme demand the regularised status of beneficiaries means immigrants in an irregular situation are barred from benefitting from these training actions. The newly-launched online platform does not demand any legal status to participants, which is a positive contribution for the integration of immigrants in an irregular situation, yet access to this modality of learning can be harder for those who do not have the necessary IT skills or easy access to the internet.

6.3. Education, Vocational Training

In Portugal, there is a constitutional right of access to education to all citizens, framed as “the right to equal opportunities in the access to education and educational attainment” (Article 74.1 of the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic – C.R.P.). The Constitution explicitly lays out the state’s duty to “offer the children of immigrants the support needed for the right to education to be enjoyed” (Article 74.2 (j) of the C.R.P.). School attendance is mandatory and free until the 12th grade of secondary education, or until the student turns 18. However, there are some constraints in access to education and educational attainment for the descendants of immigrants and ethnic minorities. One of the problems that occasionally affects the children of immigrants is the difficulty of enrolling in schools. Several interviewees (e.g. Interviews 3, 5, 6, 13, 18) made reference to this issue as one of the more worrying ones at present. For example:

“(…) Yet there have been cases here in the Lisbon area where people couldn’t enrol because they don’t have a regular situation in Portugal, they don’t have a residence permit. And so they can’t register their kids into a school. There are also cases where they can .(…) One example that is directly tied to our work here but which I was made aware of is that schools cannot accept a foreign citizen as the responsible parent or guardian of a minor if they don’t have Portuguese papers, as they cannot register them in the System. This is one of the issues.” (Interview 18)

\textsuperscript{44}In the words of Oliveira and Gomes (2014: 158): “The language-learning programmes in the host country have implications not only in terms of attenuating immigrants’ vulnerability and obstacles to their integration, but are also a decisive element in their access to citizenship.”
In the cases reported, the difficulty in the enrolment process was caused by the parents’ irregular situation, but some associations also told us they had heard complaints from parents who faced similar problems, the result of racial/ethnic discrimination or xenophobia, since the parents had a regular status. This discrimination takes place not only in the registry offices of the learning institutions but also inside the classroom, from elementary to university level teaching. This naturally tends to stand in the way of the chances of success of some of these children and youngsters, generating a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy of failure for these students in which the teaching staff tends not to invest as much as in others.

One of the cases reported offers an eloquent illustration of this:

“There was this little girl, who arrived from Guinea for medical treatment and in this case that was indeed why she had come. She had completed the 4th grade back in Guinea. So, logically, she is integrated into the 4th grade in Portugal but she struggles, has a hard time, a really hard time. And I was mediating, between the school and the family, and I was with this teacher and I realise at once that this teacher has absolutely no expectation for the educational project of this thirteen year old girl. So, for this teacher it is a given that this girl will end up as a cleaning lady like her mother. And this works as a vicious circle. This girl, no one expects anything of, because the teacher in question is racist and she will be discriminated against by the teacher, and on top of that her mother is illiterate. How can this girl ever have a successful school trajectory, when this is the scenario around her?” (Interview 3)

The cited passage also serves as an illustration to another issue, which is the lower educational level of some immigrant groups (as seen on Section 5.3.4) or the lack of knowledge of the Portuguese language, which makes it more difficult to accompany how children are progressing in school. Disadvantages in the education system are also a reality, perhaps an even graver one, among Portuguese children and youngsters from Roma communities, who for centuries have been excluded from access to education, until the 1974 Democratic Revolution. Besides the overall trend of Roma Portuguese adults having low levels of formal education, it is common, for a variety of reasons, for their children to leave school early. As one interviewee explained:

“There’s another thing, since it is a background where there are high levels of illiteracy, it is no shame for a girl or a boy not to finish their schooling. They grow up and are seen as men and women. All of a sudden, at fourteen or sixteen years old you’re already considered an adult, and you’re married, with no qualifications.” (Interview 17)

While there has been some progress in the last few years, as was acknowledged by another organisation that works with Roma children and youngsters (Interview 13), most young people still try to enter the labour market before they complete compulsory education (12th grade), according to the associations interviewed (Interviews 13 and 17)

\[45\] At university level, discrimination seems to be experienced more frequently by Brazilians students, who for some years now have had an ever more stronger presence in Portuguese university courses (Interview 5).

\[46\] See Magano e Mendes (2014).
The difficulties – caused by structural and institutional constraints relating to the access to education within the school pathway of immigrants and the Portuguese Roma community mentioned so far – are factors that must be taken into account in this diagnosis. One should however also underline that there is a great variety of school attainment pathways among immigrant children and youngster in the city of Lisbon, as pointed by Hortas (2013), on the basis of a case study with three school clusters in the central area of the city. And, despite the inequalities still in place between immigrants or immigrant-descendant students and native citizens the most recent PISA test (Programme for International Student Assessment), in 2016, shows that Portugal has been successful in closing of this gap in the last ten years. In fact, it was the country that showed greater progress in this matter across the whole of the OECD group\textsuperscript{47}.

The ACM Programme "Choices" (Escolhas), currently in its sixth generation\textsuperscript{48}, is an initiative that aims to promote the social inclusion of immigrant, immigrant-descendant and ethnic minority children and youngsters through the creation of partnerships between municipalities, borough councils, school clusters, Committees for the Protection of Children and Youngsters at Risk (CPCJ – Comissões de Protecção de Crianças e Jovens em risco), IEPF, immigrants’ associations and/or local associations and Private Social Solidarity Institutions (IPSS – Instituições Privadas de Solidariedade Social). From its inception, in 2001, until 2015, there were 293,164 enrolments in the Programme "Choices" across the whole of the national territory\textsuperscript{49}. In terms of its impact, it will have contributed to an improvement of over 30\% in the school performance of students within the Programme, according to data by Oliveira and Gomes (2015: 128).

In some schools in the city of Lisbon there are still other initiatives for the promotion of interculturality and social intervention, such as the project “Interconnect” (Interligar), developed by the association SOS Racismo\textsuperscript{50}, which works with schools “to fight against school failure and dropout, to promote participation in the community by residents and to improve school, social and personal competences of children, youngsters and their families in the Quinta da Torrinha neighbourhood, in the borough of Ameixoeira”.

\textsuperscript{47}In 2006, immigrant or immigrant-descendant students had results 55\% lower than their Portuguese colleagues, while in 2016 this difference decreased to 15.7\%. Once you take into account the socio-economic variables and the language spoken at home, progress was even more remarkable, with the difference coming down to 8\%. In other words, the performance of immigrants belonging to the same social status and who speak Portuguese at home recovered almost 50\% from the disadvantage they had when compared to native Portuguese in 2006. See more at: https://www.publico.pt/2016/12/06/sociedade/noticia/imigrantes-que-vivem-em-portugal-melhoram-resultados-no-pisa-1753948

\textsuperscript{48}It started in 2001, then as Programme for the Prevention of Criminality and the Insertion of Young People (Programa para a Prevenção da Criminalidade e Inserção de Jovens), targeting the more problematic neighbourhoods in the Districts of Lisbon, Porto and Setúbal. It is funded by the General Directorate for Education (Direção Geral de Educação) and the Institute for Social Security (Instituto da Segurança Social) and co-funded by the European Social Fun/Portugal 2020 and Regional Operational Programmes for Lisbon and the Algarve (Programas Operacionais Regionais de Lisboa e Algarve).


\textsuperscript{50}In: www.sosracismo.pt/projetos/projeto-interligar/
6.4. Employment and Entrepreneurship

The employment situation was especially affected by the economic crisis shock, which had consequences in terms of the levels of impoverishment and loss of buying power for most residents in Portugal, both Portuguese and foreign nationals. In parallel, it brought about problems that mostly affect immigrants, problems tied to obstacles in the process of status regularisation given the impossibility of registering with Social Security, difficulties in learning the language, discrimination in access to the labour market, labour exploitation, among other factors. Immigrants’ associations have played a crucial role in aiding and supporting the more vulnerable immigrants, many of whom were forced to resort to food banks managed by some of these associations in order to meet the basic needs of their families (Interviews 3, 8, 15, 16).

For immigrants that do not have a regular status yet, the situation can be even more dramatic, since they are not eligible for social benefits, which are difficult to obtain even for regular citizens, given the budget cuts in Social Security, particularly in the access to the Social Unemployment Benefit (Subsídio Social de Desemprego), and Child Benefit and Social Integration Income (RSI - Rendimento Social de Inserção). Eligibility requirements tightened and the amounts paid by the state between 2008 and 2014 were reduced (cf. Wall et al., 2013; Rosa, 2015). Irregular status also adds an extra pressure, pushing people into informal and precarious work, which quite often results in situations of abuse and exploitation on the part of employers, who thus get a cheap labour force with no legal or fiscal constraints (Interviews 6, 7, 16, 17, 18).

The 2011 Census confirmed the trend towards entrepreneurship among many immigrant groups. Given its central location and greater presence of immigrant communities, who widen the potential client base for these businesses, Lisbon has been, for several years, one of the areas with more foreign entrepreneurs. In section 5.3.5 we made reference to data from the 2011 Census related to Lisbon, which showed that the percentage of “small employers” is substantially higher among some groups of Asian immigrants (particularly Chinese and Bangladeshi) than among the native Portuguese population, even though their relative weight in the capital is lower than in the whole country51.

ACM has developed a series of projects/programmes to stimulate and develop “immigrant entrepreneurship”. Besides the initiative “Promotion of Immigrant Entrepreneurship” (PEI – Promoção do Empreendedorismo Imigrante), it recently created the “Pop Up Shop”, in CNAI, the GAEM (Office for the Support of Migrant Entrepreneurship - Gabinete de Apoio ao Empreendedor Migrante), directed at both Portuguese emigrants abroad and immigrants in Portugal who wish to open their own business in the country, and also the Mentors for Migrants Programme (Program

51The relatively high concentration of Chinese small owners/employers is 27% in the capital vs. 42% in Portugal, and of Bangladeshis 15% in Lisbon vs. 22% in Portugal, which is probably explainable by the greater concentration of these nationalities in Lisbon and the greater number of salaried job offers in the city, which brings down the relative ratio of employers.
Mentores para Migrantes), specifically directed towards Portuguese emigrants that want to return.

The CML has also been placing its bets on this move to entrepreneurship (not however directed at immigrants in particular), having received the title of “European Entrepreneurship Region 2015”, by the EU Committee of the Regions. Among various projects aimed at stimulating the “entrepreneurial spirit” and set up the conditions for entrepreneurs to develop their projects (e.g. Startup Lisboa, Lisbon Incubators Network (Rede de Incubadoras de Lisboa); Entrepreneurial Lisbon (Lisboa Empreende); Lisbon Programme for Young Entrepreneurs (Programa de Empreendedorismo Jovem de Lisboa)\(^{52}\), one should highlight the Diversity in the Economy and Local Integration (DELI – European Project Deli 2014-2016)\(^{53}\) and the creation of the Lisbon Social Incubator (Incubadora Social de Lisboa), located in the CML House for Social Rights (Casa dos Direitos Sociais), inaugurated in 2016).

Given the aforementioned constraints on immigrants’ insertion into the labour market, most of the organisations interviewed (e.g.: Interviews 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11), some of which develop their own projects in the field of support to entrepreneurship and business creation, believe that the issue of employability cannot be tackled merely through the promotion of entrepreneurship, a fallacy that some institutions seem to have fallen for (at local, national and international levels). On the contrary, they defend that what is needed is responses that articulate between the various spheres of public policy so as to remove these constraints and create more favourable conditions for the labour insertion of immigrants.

6.5. Health and Social Affairs

Access to Health is a universal right in Portugal, set out in Article 64 of the Constitution. Foreign citizens residing legally in Portugal are granted the same access to public health services and medication as the Portuguese. For this they need to obtain a “user’s card” from a Health Centre, given to anyone who presents a “permanence or residence permit” or “work visa”. With the publication of Decree n. 135/99, of 22 April, immigrants who do not hold a valid residence permit and who are in an irregular situation, still have access to the National Health Service by presenting a document from the borough council of their area of residence, attesting that they have resided in the country for more than 90 days. However, despite this legal protection, there are many barriers to immigrants’ access to health, as previously identified by Fonseca et al. (2007).

\(^{52}\) For more information, see Rede Social de Lisboa (2016: 66).

\(^{53}\) A European project that aims to support inclusive and innovatory policies and initiatives, directed at immigrant entrepreneurial fabric, promoting forms of local development that are sensitive to immigrants’ economic rights and foster socio-cultural diversity.
These obstacles emerge at once, in the process accessing the administrative service in hospitals and health centres, where irregular immigrants are all too often barred from the services. This is a discriminatory barrier that goes against the constitutional right to the protection of health for all citizens, regardless of their nationality and legal status. Processes of exclusion of immigrants from this fundamental right occur for various reasons, as explained by one of the interviewees that works in that field:

“On the one hand we have someone who, because they do not know their rights and believes they have no access or that there are obstacles, and is sometimes afraid to seek formal health services as they are in an irregular situation and are aware of it. On the other hand, there are administrative barriers, when someone comes to the service and they tell them their situation is irregular and they must previously sort out this that and the other, and so they are not served. This one of the tasks at hand, to debunk this idea and make people aware of their rights so that they can reclaim them, because sometimes the receptionist and administrators is not aware, so the obstacles, in health services for example, lie there to begin with. The patient comes to the hospital door and talks to the security guard or goes up to a counter and says they are in an irregular situation, and sometimes they tell them they cannot be seen. Or they might tell them they will be seen but they have to pay, and when you are in an irregular situation the cost can be drastic, as you are already in an underprivileged position. There have been cases, for instance, where patients say “I know I have the right to these services but I don’t want to be in debt to the National Health Service, because I don’t know when I’ll be able to pay it off and it will pile up”. And so they don’t use the service.” (Interview 14)

As a result, either because immigrants are not aware of their rights or because they are discriminated against at the reception desk (because they are irregular), or because of the fees they are forced to pay (32€ minimum, in Health Centres54, if it is only a consultation; if they need further treatment, the fee will go up; a hospital emergency service is over 50€), many immigrants are deprived of this right and, in most cases, they do not report this discrimination to the competent authorities (e.g.: the service’s complaints book; CICDR – Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination), which means these discriminatory practices are underrepresented in official records. Furthermore, those migrants that do resort to the National Health Service often face other obstacles, namely in terms of communication, if they are not proficient in the language. As the same interviewee explained:

“Sometimes there are also relational and communication difficulties, many misunderstandings when the person is not fluent in the language and sometimes when the services do not offer immediate or adequate translation services. The willingness of people on the other side of the counter to take the time to deal with others, when things take longer, I don’t want to say have the patience, but have the time to understand others, because sometimes all it takes is a bit more time and things sort themselves out and that does not happen often” (Interview 14)

54For a foreign national in a regular situation or a Portuguese citizen, the fee is 5€.
Most of the interviewees claim that many health centres and hospitals are ill prepared for the influx of immigrants, regardless of whether they are regularised or undocumented, but the latter naturally get the shorter end of the stick given their status. This occurs despite the creation of a Manual for the Reception of Foreign Nationals in Health Services (“Manual de Acolhimento no Acesso ao Sistema de Saúde de Cidadãos Estrangeiros”\textsuperscript{55}), which came into force in January 2014, and despite the awareness-raising and training programs for health service professionals specifically geared towards intercultural issues promoted by ACM, under the scope of the Strategic Plan for Migrations (“Plano Estratégico para as Migrações 2015-2020”) (Interview 1). It is to be hoped that the Development Plan for Health and Living Standards in the City of Lisbon (“Plano de Desenvolvimento de Saúde e Qualidade de Vida da Cidade de Lisboa”), which includes a specific section on the immigration issue \textsuperscript{56}, in articulation with PMIIL, which developed an axis especially geared toward access to healthcare \textsuperscript{57}, may contribute to the promotion of this fundamental human right in the near future.

6.6. Protection against Discrimination

In 1999 a body was created with competence to accompany the implementation of European legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination, namely the Race Equality Directive 2000/43/CE, which forbids and sanctions (direct or indirect) discrimination on racial or ethnic grounds\textsuperscript{58}. The said body, named Racial Commission for Equality and against Racial Discrimination (CICDR – Comissão para a Igualdade e Contra a Discriminação), is presided over by ACM and includes, besides the High-Commissioner for Migrations, officials from the Parliament (Assembleia da República), the government, immigrants associations, anti-racism associations, central trade unions, employers’ organisations, human rights associations as well as public figures appointed by the other members. Among other tasks, this body receives complaints, assesses them and forwards them to other competent bodies\textsuperscript{59}. In addition it opens up

\textsuperscript{55}Elaborated by the Central Administrative Office of the Health Service and General Health Directorate, in collaboration with the General Directorate for Social Security, ACM, North Regional Health Administration (“Administração Regional de Saúde do Norte) and Algarve Regional Health Administration (“Administração Regional de Saúde do Algarve”).

\textsuperscript{56}Available at: http://observatorio-lisboa.eapn.pt/ficheiro/Plano-de-Desenvolvimento-de-Sa%C3%A7e-e-Qualidade-de-Vida-da-Cidade-de-Lisboa.pdf.

\textsuperscript{57}This axis includes awareness-raising campaigns with immigrant communities, to inform them of their rights in terms of access to services, area-specific health promotion and illness prevention campaigns, surveys on the immigrants population registered in health centres and training of healthcare professionals.


\textsuperscript{59}Namely the Public Prosecutor (Ministério Público), Superior Council of Magistrates (Conselho Superior de Magistratura); Labour Standards Authority (Autoridade para as Condições do Trabalho); Support Unit for Migrant Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination (UAVM – Unidade de Apoio à Vítima Migrante de...
proceedings against the offenders who practised discriminatory acts, issuing reports on the sanctions to be applied by the ACM.

Data published in the website of the Migrations Observatory\(^60\) reveal that, between September 2005 and 2015, 759 complaints were filed with CICDR, which means an average of 76 complaints per annum\(^61\). The main areas of discrimination among all the complaints filed in that period were: work-related (19.4%), other services, i.e. public and private services, such as cultural venues, tribunals, post offices, etc (16.2%), police and official forces and retail (both at 11.7%). Nationality and/or ethnic and cultural identity of the complainants is defined by themselves, voluntarily, when they file formal complaints. Although many omit this information\(^62\), one can ascertain that in the period under analysis, Brazilian citizens are those that more often identify discriminatory practices, followed by citizens from PALOP countries, and Eastern European immigrants (Ukrainians, Romanians and Moldovans). The ethnic/cultural categories that can be surmised from the complaints, i.e., the formulations employed by the complainants, African citizens (or of African origins, in the categories “black”; African; PALOP) are those who more often identify acts of discrimination against them (with a peak of 38% of complaints in the period, in 2014), followed by Portuguese Roma citizens (with a peak of 29% of complaints, in 2015)\(^63\).

Although this data is not divided according to the location of that the discrimination took place (municipality/region), some studies reveal that they take place both in the AML and in other less culturally-diverse regions, although with some variations depending on immigrant/ethnic group in question and the context of the discriminatory act (public services, retail, work, school, etc.) (cf. Santos et al., 2007).

Some projects or initiatives may help reduce these negative experiences for immigrants and ethnic minorities, particularly projects of cultural mediation, promoted by ACM, in the CNAIs and CLAIIs (so-called “one-stop shops”) and by some municipalities, namely Lisbon. Another nationwide initiative aimed at the integration of the Roma community is the National Strategy for Roma Communities (Estratégia Nacional para Comunidades Ciganas), approved in 2013, and the Roma Communities Observatory (Observatório das Comunidades Ciganas) which devises, implements and assesses policies and programmes in this area. Qualification workshops and activities in the field of cultural diversity, aimed at public service technicians (particularly in the areas of health and social security), as well as at police and security forces were some of the examples offered by

---

\(^60\)Data available at: www.om.acm.gov.pt/documents/58428/207737/Queixas+Discrimina%C3%A7%C3%A3o+Racial+CICDR+entre+2000+e+2015.pdf/3fd45296-2b94-455b-b866-c8dcecf14fb77

\(^61\)Between 2000 and 2004, only 45 cases were filed directly with CICDR (cf. Santos et al., 2009: 22).

\(^62\)Varying between 26%-64%, for nationality, and between 25%-82%, for ethnic group.

\(^63\)After these groups, the category “Immigrants in general” is the one that covers a greater number of complaints, and the more residual complaints (between 1%-2.5%) are those that affect other specific groups, like Eastern European immigrants (a maximum of 2.7%) and South America (in 2011, 1.1%), Muslim (maximum: 1.7%), Jewish (in 2013, 3.3%), Asian (maximum: 2.4%) or “refugee” (in 2015, 1.2%).
the ACM official interviewed (Interview 1). And one cannot fail to mention the work carried out by almost all the organisations interviewed, who promote interculturality in the city (in neighbourhoods, schools, faith organisations, festivals and cultural and artistic gatherings, etc.) and who fight against, or attempt to promote the address of racist and discriminatory practices that come to their attention.

6.7. Housing

The right to all citizens to dignified housing, laid out in article 65 of the Portuguese Constitution (1976) establishes as the state’s responsibility to develop housing and land planning policies that guarantee this right. This constitutional provision is in contrast with a reality that, to this day, is marked by deep socio-spatial inequalities that seem to disproportionally affect immigrants in metropolitan areas.

Most slum houses, built by citizens who did not have the means to acquire their own homes\textsuperscript{64} or to rent accommodation, occupied a substantial part of the AML landscape in the 1980s and 1990s. Many of them were replaced by social housing neighbourhoods built by the municipal councils through programmes co-funded by the central state and the councils, particularly the Special Relocation Program (PER – Programa Especial de Realojamento, 1993), whose aim was to eliminate the country’s stock of precarious housing\textsuperscript{65}. Many of these collectives, comprised either Portuguese citizens, from the dominant ethnic group or of Roma ethnicity, or by foreign nationals (mostly originating in the PALOP), were registered in 1993 and later rehoused in social housing neighbourhoods, often several years later. For foreign citizens, especially those from the PALOP, PER enabled the percentage of this group residing in precarious housing to come down from over 20% in 1991 to less than 10% in 2001 (Malheiros and Fonseca, 2011: 138).

On the other hand, later waves of immigration, from the mid-1990s to the end of the decade, mostly comprised of citizens from Eastern Europe and Brazil, they faced other obstacles in the access to housing. Given the renting market was still insufficient and lacked dynamism, the acquisition of their own home was hindered by the difficulties that immigrants face in accessing credit\textsuperscript{66} and those that chose alternative solutions (unorthodox accommodation), were no longer covered by the PER, since the rehousing process only applied to the population registered as resident in the 1993 survey.

\textsuperscript{64}This is clearly the preferred option by the central state to solve the housing problems of the “middle class”: through financial subsidies (subsidised interest rates for private credit) from the 1980s onward (Serra, 2002).

\textsuperscript{65}The evolution of the number of non standard housing units in the AML is a clear demonstration of its importance and its decline. In the 1981 Census, 24613 non standard family housing units (of which 18,080 were slum dwelling) in the AML, which was 73.8% of the total of shacks in the country. In the 2011 Census, the number of shacks the AML was down to 485, and close to a quarter of the total of registered shacks in Portugal that year (2,052). Lisbon was the municipality with the greater number of shacks, with almost half of the registered total in the AML in 1981.

\textsuperscript{66}Namely through the demand for guarantors and in many cases specifically Portuguese guarantors (cf. Malheiros and Fonseca, 2011: 139).
The rigidity in the application of the PER programme in the AML municipalities is still an ongoing problem, insofar as municipal councils refuse to update their censuses, thus neglecting the right to rehousing of many residents in the remaining precarious neighbourhoods⁶⁷. The process has often involved a disregard for human rights, abuses of power and police violence, situations that have been reported regularly by some associations that work in this field, such as the Association Habita and SOS Racismo and which have deserved public condemnation by the Office of the Ombudsman and the recommendation of a revision of the PER program as a whole⁶⁸.

The crisis accentuated immigrants’ housing difficulties, creating a new panorama marked by:

1) Added difficulties in access to credit and family bankruptcies: the impossibility of paying the bank instalments by many families, the shrinking of the real estate sector and stagnation of the public incentives to house the population (Malheiros and Fonseca, 2011). The Portuguese banking system, which was already the target of criticisms because of its discretionary application of criteria for opening bank accounts and access to credit before the crisis, seems to have closed the doors even further to immigrants in the current recessive context⁶⁹.

2) Housing rents: one of the trends registered is the fact that rent costs for the foreign tenants are higher on average than those of the national population. Oliveira and Gomes (2014: 184) show that at the national level, 86% of foreign tenants pay €200 or more of monthly rent, whereas only 51% of Portuguese tenants fit into this category⁷⁰. The more recent immigration waves, from Eastern Europe, China or Brazil thus tend to pay higher rents than PALOP immigrants (and their descendants). Law 31/2012, of 14 August, known as the Rent Act (Lei das Rendas), accentuated this problem, as it made easier both an increase in the values charged by landlords and the eviction of tenants in case of default on rent payments.

3) Discrimination in the renting market is also a problem that affects many immigrants particularly those of African or Brazilian origin (Interviews 5, 9 and 11). These complaints are particularly high among Brazilian women, to whom a lease is often denied because

---

⁶⁷The municipality of Amadora is one of these examples. The council demolished the “Santa Filomena” Neighbourhood and is on course to demolish the “6 de Maio” neighbourhood, both with a majority of population of Cape Verdean origin.


⁷⁰From this reality one cannot simply deduce that landlords are taking advantage of immigrants' situation to demand higher rents, as it may simply reflect the fact that a substantial portion of Portuguese tenants have older rent contracts (before 1996), which were, until Law 34/2012 came into force, protected by rent freeze. This New Regime of Urban Renting (Novo Regime de Arrendamento Urbano, 2012) was geared toward creating dynamism the renting market through liberalisation of the rents on older contracts and a greater flexibility in the signing and changing of contracts, which makes easier to evict tenants that default on their payments.
they are associated with a negative image related to sex work, as previously identified in other studies (cf. Malheiros and Fonseca, 2011: 113).

4) Overcrowding: The option of sharing accommodation with co-ethnic individuals thus becomes a strategy in the face of the obstacles in access to housing. This is dictated by the immigrant’s economic difficulties or by the discrimination by landlords, explicit or implicit, which begins with the landlord's unwillingness to offer details on the housing, or more subtle, such as the demand to present a Portuguese guarantor or an permanent employment contract, which excludes a substantial portion of the immigrant population (Malheiros and Fonseca, 2011). One of the consequences of these adversities is the overcrowding of rented accommodation spaces, which disproportionately affects immigrants, as corroborated in several of the interviews (Interviews 3, 7, 8, 13)

6.8. Political Participation and Inclusion in Local Decision-Making Processes

Portuguese legislation only guarantees the full participation in all electoral acts (the right to elect and be elected) to Portuguese nationals. However, the Constitution (article 15, subparagraphs 3, 4 and 5) affords foreign citizens residing in Portugal the active capacity (the right to vote) and passive capacity (the right to be elected) in local elections (for borough and municipal councils), depending on reciprocity protocols. According to Law n. 50/96, of 4 September, only citizens from Cape Verde and Brazil have the right to take part in local elections, as they fulfil the reciprocity requisite (Barbosa, 2013). Given the political integration of the EU, under article 8 of the Maastricht Treaty (1992), any citizen from any other member state enjoys the same right as Portuguese citizens in local and European (European Parliament) elections. Citizens from other countries with which Portugal has a reciprocity protocol may vote after a minimum period of regular permanence of three years (Barbosa, 2013: 44). These limitations mean that 37% of

---

71 In 2011, 16.3% of the population residing on national territory lived in overcrowded housing. This problem affected, on average, 15.6% of the Portuguese and 36% of foreign nationals, which means foreigners were twice as vulnerable to this situation (Oliveira and Gomes, 2014: 186). At the time of the Census, overcrowded conditions affected more than half (52.2%) of immigrants from the PALOP, 37.4% of Eastern European, 22% of EU citizens (UE-27), 44% of Chinese and a third of Brazilians (ibidem: 188). The AML has the highest rates of overcrowded housing in the country (Greater Lisbon with 44% and the Setúbal peninsula with 40.2%). It is mostly in the outskirts, where we find the higher levels of deprivation, that we also find the higher overcrowding rates (Amadora, Loures, Sintra, Odivelas, with rates between 54.5% and 48%), while Lisbon (37.1%), Cascais (35%) or the peri-urban municipality of Mafra (32%), have significantly lower rates, even though they can still be considered quite high (ibidem).

72 I.e., protocols that guarantee that if the electoral capacity is recognised to Portuguese emigrants in a certain host country, immigrants from that country will enjoy the same rights in Portugal.


74 Other states with which there are existing protocols of reciprocity that allow for the active participation in local Portuguese elections are: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Iceland, Norway, New Zealand, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Declaration n. 4/2013, of 24 June).
foreign nationals residing in Portugal cannot vote or be elected (according to data from the 2011 Census, in Oliveira and Gomes, 2014: 172).

Some of the obstacles to the participation of immigrants in local democracy are formal, to begin with: limitations on the right to elect and be elected (in the case of local elections, for some groups, and in the case of national elections, for all immigrants). These are both through the imposition of the reciprocity principle, as by the demand for a minimum period of residence, criteria that exclude many foreign residents in Portugal. Other are of a material nature: social and economic difficulties affecting some immigrant groups and which contribute to their political marginalisation invisibility; insufficient diffusion of information on the political rights of the targeted populations; lack of faith in national politics of general political apathy on the part of immigrants (cf. Ruivo et al., 2013).

At the level of passive participation (being elected), when they appear in the lists of candidates to local elections, immigrants or immigrant descendants (especially of African origin) are almost always in non-eligible places and were often mobilised to the list to put across an image of the party as being plural and diverse. This should perhaps be translated as a co-optation of immigrant candidates/voters for a party's political agenda and not necessarily a reinforcement of the immigrant agenda from within the formal political arena (Zobel et al., 2013; Oliveira, Carvalhais and Cancela, 2014). This perception of a low electoral participation (both active and passive) was highlighted by some of the interviewees, who admitted that most immigrants they deal with tend not to vote in local elections (Interviews 4, 6, 16), and that when some descendants of immigrants appear in lists of parties running for election they are halfway down in the list or at the bottom, which means their realistic chances of being elected are very low (Interview 16).

In short, in terms of the formal participation in elections, the only way immigrants can attain full political rights is naturalisation, a process that has become more accessible after the revision of the 2006 Nationality Law. The latter gives greater weight to the principle of *jus soli*, allowing the descendants of immigrants who were born in Portugal, and whose parents have resided legally in the country for five or more years and who have completed the fourth grade of schooling in the country to gain Portuguese nationality.

Of course, political participation of (national or foreign) citizens goes well beyond the formal acts of representative democracy: associativism, social movements (trade unionism, for example), participation in grassroots or local-based community meetings or assemblies (e.g.: CML decentralised meetings; community groups that exist in various social housing neighbourhoods in the capital), participation (through the elaboration of proposals or by voting) in the Lisbon Participatory Budget (Orçamento Participativo de Lisboa), or taking part in public meetings for the land management and urban planning systems (Planos Director Municipal; Planos Gerais de Urbanização or Planos de Pormenor).
At the level of the Lisbon Municipality one should highlight the existence of CMIC, which several organisations recognise as having played an important role, even if they also point to serious limitations in it. These would include its limited consultative nature, which does not favour a true empowerment of the associations involved, the absence of political pertinence of some of the meetings, which end up being dominated by the problems faced by individual associations than in the joining of efforts towards a collective political agenda that promotes the rights and integration of immigrants (Interviews 3, 6, 8, 11).

Another important matter, and nearly consensual among all the interviewed associations is to do with the difficulties faced by the immigrant associations, who come up against severe financial constraints at present, to the extent that many of their activities cannot take place, or do so in a limited fashion. In most cases these constraints are met by means of more volunteer work, and also through the diversification of their funding sources (applying to international projects). Still, many claim that in the medium term the work of associations are not financially and humanly sustainable, given the overload of volunteer work required, often accumulate with the paid professional activity they also do (e.g. Interview 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10).

6.9. The public perception of migration and integration

6.9.1 The public perception and attitudes towards immigrants

The Lusotropicalist myth is still common in the country. This theory holds that the “Portuguese people” are not racist or that they have a specific form of racism given their long history of, and willingness to, miscegenate with other peoples. This sense also originates in the fact that there are many black people residing in Portugal have Portuguese nationality, and that most African immigrants originate from former Portuguese colonies. Various studies however have confirmed that Portugal is as racist as other European countries, both in terms of flagrant and subtle forms of racism (cf. Vala, Brito and Lopes, 2015 [1999]).

Various research projects on the AML show that specific groups are more subject to social stigma: African immigrants or Portuguese of African origin, especially young males, often associated with antisocial or deviant behaviours (Malheiros and Mendes, 2007); Roma ethnicity Portuguese citizens, whose age-old “bad reputation” that they are “violent, wild, thieves, dirty” is deeply ingrained and still prevalent (cf. Mendes, 2008: 14); and Brazilian women, the target of the stereotype of being “exotic and easy”, to which is

---

75 Only three association members downplayed this issue, as the contributions of their associates, either through membership fees or donations, offers them enough financial stability to carry out most their initiatives.
usually added the association with “prostitution” (Malheiros, 2007: 35; Padilla, 2007: 125).

The stigma that ethnic minorities are subject to (particularly Roma communities) stands in the way of their full integration, as they are discriminated against in the school system, in access to the labour market and housing, in their relation with police forces and, often, with the justice and penal system, as we were told by various organisations (e.g. Interviews 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 17).

Some of the organisations interviewed were also critical of the positive self-image of the Portuguese and pointed fingers in particular at the existing institutional racism, as summed up by one interviewee:

“(…)There’s been a paradigm shift, to an extent, in the sense that it is no longer tolerated for people to assume they’re racist, so that is frowned upon, viewed negatively. So racism now wears a camouflage. And this camouflaged racism is more and more evident in institutions. Institutional racism in Portugal is a dime a dozen. I mean, that’s… and we, who work as technicians, we feel it. It happens, it is real, it must be brought out into the open. People need to stop being afraid of saying that Portugal is a racist country.” (Interview 3)

The last round of the European Social Survey (2015) points to a possible improvement of this issue, given that Portugal is the European country where positive feelings exist toward the arrival of new immigrants from ethnic groupings other than the majority, as well as of immigrants of same ethnic group. It is also the country where belief in the economic benefits of immigration, or in the cultural value that results from it is higher (idem). However, despite these significant improvements, Portugal is within the average on most of the issues in the survey. In other words, despite the improvement, Portugal is still a country where receptivity and perception of immigration is divided, whose population shows neither enthusiasm nor out-and-out rejection of newcomers.

6.9.2 The public perception of local integration/inclusion policies

The general population’s perception on policies of integration or inclusion are a largely unexplored topic in the Portuguese case. One of the exceptions to this vacuum is an article by Ferreira (2015) that addresses the media discourse (2007-2011) on the Social Insertion Income (RSI – Rendimento Social de Inserção), in which the image that shines through is that a great portion of these processes are fraudulent, thus making the RSI “a symbol of a delinquent or deviant individual”, and is often associated with Roma

77 While media discourse does not match the population’s views entirely, the media have the power to shape social and political narratives deeply, and that a substantial portion of the population is susceptible to sensationalist headlines, which explains the national success of the press that focuses on these types of news.
people, the homeless, drug addicts, social housing residents (with a majority population of Africans and Roma), inmates, among others (idem: 161-163).

As to the perception of the institutions interviewed on the local policies of integration of immigrants varies depending on their sphere of action and how close they work with the Lisbon council. As referred in 4.3.1, most associations are of the view that the Lisbon council is sensitive to the situation of immigrants in the city and that this sensitivity has increased in the last few years, pointing to a positive evolution of the council executive toward these issues. However, almost all of them state that there is a long way to go before a fuller and more effective inclusion of immigrants is a reality.

There are some clashing points of view as to the role CML may play in this process. On the one hand, there is a consensus that there needs to be reversal of the SEF order that limits the possibilities of immigrant regularisation. This measure, in line with the securitarian rationale that has imposed itself in many EU countries, is unanimously recognised as an infringement on the right and legitimate expectation of immigrants to settle into the country legally. Moreover, this amounts to a step back in terms of the policies of inclusion for immigrants and in terms of the awareness of the host community implemented in the last few years, as one interviewee made clear:

“Another thing I’ve been giving some thought to quite often, because of accounts that I have access to here through people’s life trajectories, I show much of the work we’ve been making, years on end, of raising awareness in the host community for issues such as multiculturality will go to waste, for when you render it legitimate that technicians in public services consider this or that person different, that they are to be treated differently, because they don’t have the same rights as others, because they don’t have a visa, we go back to the issue of stereotypes and discrimination. (...) And the issue with this thought, we have to think that public integration policies, in all its senses, are crucial because they also change thoughts. And when these policies are very positive, and inclusive, and then they are taken away, all this awareness raising work in the host community may go to waste.” (Interview 5)

At present, this is one of the main grievances of immigrants associations, who demand a policy change from the central authorities. These moves possibly counter to supranational EU directives, which restricts the possibility of intervention by CML on this matter. On this issue, the opinion of the organisations interviewed varies between acknowledging that the municipal executive does not have any leverage at this level, and the idea that CML can use its leverage as the capital of the country to exert pressure alongside local organisations, on the central government (see excerpts from the interviews in section 4.3.1).

From the point of view of local integration policies, excluding issues of regularisation, most associations interviewed have a fairly positive view of PMIIL, in which many of them took an active part in terms of diagnosis and are currently involved in carrying out some of its initiatives, through work groups created for that purpose.
“In fact this municipal plan is, as I see it, properly defined, because this was not a plan devised by CML and carried out by CML, perhaps those who have not followed it from the start may think so. But it is not. It’s a work that was built from the ground up on the basis of the contribution of all or nearly all those present and who are a part of the community, or, at the very least, their representatives. So I think that it is well-structured plan, which now needs to be implemented. And to implement it is necessary to have the adequate means.” (Interview 10)

Still, some organisations claim that immigration should not be treated as an autonomous issue, separate from wider policies of integration or inclusion. In other words, rather than being treated as a target-population for specific measures, immigrant communities should be folded within the general municipal and national policies, and not separated from the rest of the country, since this may contribute to their isolation and stigmatisation:

“(…) Of course there have to be strategies in place and the local authorities should not abstain from general policies for inclusion, etc. fighting for dignified work, etc. but it should not tie immigration to very specific plans, it really shouldn’t. It should let the associative movement act freely and do what they think is best. Of course no association will be involved in acts of terrorism or some such thing, that’s not in the Municipal Plan, naturally. But if an associative carries out an associative activity, of a cultural or leisure nature or whatever nature, it fits perfectly into the logic and strategies of local power in terms of fighting against exclusion, in fighting for insertion into Portuguese society, any activity does. They don’t need to tie us up, almost making immigrant associations their dependents, when these are plans that even though they were agreed upon by all associations, many of them are linked with local power.” (Interview 6)
7. Reflections on migration data in Lisbon

The information contained in this report is the result of a process of gathering and analysis of quantitative and qualitative secondary and primary sources and, by means of a survey and semi-structured interviews, besides to workshops. The quantitative data presented come, for the most part, from official statistical sources, namely INE (Surveys; General Population Census), SEF/Ministry of Internal Affairs (Residence permits; Permanence visas), ACM (data from the Observatory on Migrations; the document “Monitorizar a integração de imigrantes em Portugal: relatório estatístico decenal”, a decennial statistical report on the integration of immigrants in Portugal) and CML (document sources, such as PMIIL or the Lisbon Social Diagnosis 2015-2016 (II Diagnóstico Social de Lisboa).

It is also important to register some important reflections on the existence, quality and availability of pertinent quantitative data for assessing the integration of immigrants in the city of Lisbon. Here are some of the key limitations encountered:

i) **Insufficient disaggregated data (sociodemographic and geographic variables):** this is the main limitation found in the elaboration of this profile, on two different levels – geographical variables and sociodemographic variables. Indeed, with the exception of the Census (the last of which is now 6 years old), it is particularly difficult to gather data at municipal level and on the immigrant population. In other words, most data available to characterise the city's population only distinguishes the demographic variables of gender and age, while most data that allow an analysis of the foreign population (which does exactly match the immigrant population) are aggregated for the whole of the national territory. Note also that there are scarcely available databases that enable the crossing of the categories foreign (immigrant) with other relevant demographic variables, namely gender, so that gender differences can be brought into the equation.

ii) **Restriction of the concept of immigrant to the category of nationality:** the analysis of the situation of immigrants in Portugal is faced with this methodological limitation, since most available data (e.g.: INE, SEF) merely refer to the category of nationality (foreign nationals vs. Portuguese citizens). This categorisation does not cover a high number of Portuguese nationals with foreign ancestry or naturalised Portuguese who were born abroad, thus omitting other typologies of relevant immigrants. Variables such as naturality (country of birth) and ethnicity, be it by way of their parents’ country of birth, or by the language spoken at home, would partially take account of this issue. While the first (naturality) is registered in Census and in some institutional surveys (e.g.: Employment Survey – Inquérito ao Emprego), making it easier to divulge them, the parents’ country of origin does not exist in these documents, because of flaws in the longitudinal series (cf. Malheiros and Fonseca,
2011: 27), and the question of the language spoken at home, as in other countries, is not addressed at all.

The question of ethnicity in its vector of “race/ethnic group”, which would be extremely useful to ascertain racially-grounded segregation and the accumulation of disadvantages of the population of African origin and Roma ethnicity does not exist in any statistical data, as it is deemed unconstitutional, inasmuch as it discriminates a portion of the population on the grounds of their skin colour and ethnic belonging. The impossibility of collecting official statistics on this issue may favour the persistence of the status quo and the perpetuation of discrimination, by making it impossible for society to know with any depth all the conditions that generate and nourish inequalities in the country. We therefore deem it pertinent to widen the scientific gathering of information on the resident population, setting in place mechanisms that will guarantee both constitutionally and politically, that such a collection will serve exclusively to counter inequalities and never to legitimate or promote them.

ii) **Opacity of the public institutions in the publication of microdata:** this last item mostly reflects the limitation of data published by some public institutions. INE publishes some bivariate analysis tables on their website and makes available only some sections of the Censuses microdata (rather than the anonymised integral version, as in other countries) upon request and, often, against payment by those who request access to it. SEF makes some of its statistical tables available on its website, but presents few variables and crossings. CML has recently made efforts to make public management more transparent, having joined the “Open Data” initiative of the Open Knowledge Foundation (http://dados.cm-lisboa.pt/). Yet there is still no data available on the city’s immigrants. ACM makes available very relevant collections of data on the website of the Migrations Observatory (Observatório das Migrações)78, some gathered by bodies under its remit (like CICDR, the Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination) others through other sources (INE and SEF). However, it would be useful to include the publication of its own monitoring data, such as for instance the service users in CNAsIs and CLAIs.

From the point of view of the qualitative information gathered, the stress should fall on the pertinence of the interviews, surveys and workshops conducted under the scope of this project. It allowed us to include and examine different perspectives on the issues that most affect the integration of immigrants and ethnic minorities in the city. However, it is also important to note that some of the organisations contacted did not have the opportunity to take part in the study, through any of the means made available. In most cases, the justification offered was lack of time, which is itself suggestive of the current fatigue of some association leaders, caused by cuts to the organisations funding, a reduction in the number of technicians, and the accumulation of volunteer positions with their jobs. We also did not have the opportunity to conduct interviews with immigrants and ethnic groups that do not belong to associations, which would be extremely
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enriching for this study and would enable to validate or complement the institutional and associative viewpoints we gathered. We hope that in subsequent stages of this project this component may be included, namely so as to find solutions to the problems pinpointed by the research in a more inclusive, participatory and democratic way.
8. Conclusions and reflections / Concluding remarks

This Report has sought to sketch a brief profile of the City of Lisbon in relation to the integration of immigrants and immigrant descendants, as well as some remarks on Roma-Portuguese citizens. Some hindrances and exclusion factors are tendentially transversal to all the population residing in the city, and they have been aggravated by the recessive contexts of the last few years. For instance, the rise in unemployment, namely youth unemployment and cuts to social benefits, which only in 2016 seemed to have started showing signs of a reversal, affected a substantial portion of the Portuguese and Lisbon families. There is, however, strong evidence that the impact of some of these factors tends to affect immigrant communities disproportionately.79

Furthermore, there are also issues that only affect immigrants, and especially those in an irregular situation. Recent requisites imposed by SEF for obtaining regularisation are the clearest example of this, and it is one of the problems at the top of the political agenda of immigrants' associations. And there are also patterns of exclusion that combine various factors such as economic destitution, residential segregation or the stigmatisation of certain neighbourhoods, racial/ethnic discrimination or gender discrimination, which means in some cases immigrants and ethnic minorities are faced with an accumulation of disadvantages.

Some ideas on the access and enjoyment of fundamental social rights have been developed, such as the teaching of Portuguese as a foreign language, education and vocational training, health, housing, employment, or protection against discrimination, among other relevant issues. For each of these fields, numerous obstacles to the full integration of immigrants were recognised – and most were pinpointed consensually by the organisations interviewed. Some national or local plans/projects seem to have contributed or are still contributing to the integration of immigrant and ethnic communities in the city, even if there is a shared perception that they are insufficient in the face of the existing levels of exclusion. There are three issues that, as we see it, contribute to this reality:

1) The first consists in the fact that some of these issues transcend the local dimension. For example, the current levels of unemployment spring from a negative macro-economic context in Portugal and Europe, which inevitably limits the possibility of reverting these trends at the local level. Other examples include legislation or legal dispositions within a national frame, which also place constrains on the autonomy of municipal intervention in certain spheres. The clearest example of this is the obstruction to the regularisation of immigrants

79 In terms of unemployment, for example, it shows that its rates are twice or three times as high among Eastern European or PALOP nationals when compared to Portuguese citizens (see Section 5.3.5).
imposed by SEF in 2016, or the Rent Act (Lei das Rendas, 2012). Despite the growing administrative decentralisation and the widening of competences of municipalities over the last few years, there is still a strong dependence on national policies and strategic guidelines.

1) The second is also tied to the nature of the issues, even though not so much in terms of the different scales of governing or distribution of competences, addressed in the previous paragraph. It is linked, rather, to the hypothesis that many of these issues are interconnected, that is, they are complex and non-linear, with manifold mutually-reinforcing relations and feedback between the different facets of integration. For example, racial discrimination cannot be dissociated from spatial segregation, from structural factors such as unemployment and socio-economic inequality, as well as from historical issues, policy choices (national or international), media priorities and cultural stances. Although we have witnessed a shift in the organisational culture of some public institutions, the weight of technocracy, bureaucracy and sectoral vision is still conspicuous in many of these bodies, from which results a reluctance to intervene in the more vulnerable territories following bottom-up (participatory) rationales and in an integrated manner (i.e., with cross-sectoral and interdisciplinary approaches), which in turn contributes to the view that that you are merely “aiding” rather than empowering or mending, rather than solving.

2) The third lies in the growing threats to the financial sustainability of the various organisations that took part in this study. The cuts to direct public funding to the associations recognised by ACM/Portuguese state, the decrease in the number of projects available or the fiercer competition between organisations in applying for funded projects, in some cases with public institutions applying alongside them, the rules and procedures for funding and reimbursement of expenses in some of the programmes/projects (namely European/EU) that in the short or medium term tend to weigh heavily on the organisations, are some among many factors that have contributed to a greater financial fragility of some of the associations we contacted. And this aspect naturally affects their capacity to respond to the needs and demands of the communities they work with.

These are critical questions for the promotion of integration, but they are far from definitive or incurable. The fact that some of these problems are structural, or the product of a wider context, even subject to political and economic dynamics on a European or global scale, does not mean that CML has no capacity to intervene to improve or at the very least mitigate these issues. Indeed, we believe that despite the circumscription of competences and budget constraints of the municipality, there are local instruments already in place that can contribute to the social integration of various vulnerable communities, and others that can be created for that purpose, which takes us to the two following points.
While the CML shows some signs of a shift in its organisational and local governing paradigm, namely through initiatives that, to varying degrees, attempt to promote citizen participation and local partnerships (e.g.: Participatory Budgets, Bip/Zip Programmes, Community Groups, Social Networks, CMIC), other institutions seem still very closed to the community/communities or to the idea of local and community action (e.g.: Health Centres, Social Security, etc.). The competences recently acquired by municipalities may create the necessary political ground for access to certain social rights or public services to be democratised, bringing it closer to citizens and making it socially, economically and culturally fairer. This will only become a reality, as we see it, through the mobilisation and reinforcement of partnerships between the central state and local authorities (municipalities and boroughs) and civil society. This implies a strong ability to articulate governance across the various scales, in which CML may operate as a key axis. It also for a greater participation of citizens to be promoted and for the associative movement (immigrants associations and others) to be involved in the process, a participation which will only cement itself if collective decision-making translates into concrete measures and initiatives, and does not stop at listening their views.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Position/function</th>
<th>Interview Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM – Alto Comissariado para as Migrações</td>
<td>Eduardo Quá</td>
<td>Technician in the ACM Office for International Relations and Human Rights (Gabinete de Relações Internacionais e Direitos Humanos)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associação dos Ucranianos em Portugal</td>
<td>Pavlo Sadokha</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGUINENSO - Associação Guineense de Solidariedade Social</td>
<td>Vânia Cunha</td>
<td>Técnico/Project manager; responsible for “Programa Escolhas” 6ºG (6th Generation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa de Moçambique</td>
<td>Enoque João</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa do Brasil de Lisboa</td>
<td>Cyntia de Paula (A);</td>
<td>Coordinator of the Office for Orientation and Counselling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidariedade Imigrante – Associação para a Defesa dos</td>
<td>Timóteo Macedo</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRNA - Non-Resident Nepali Association</td>
<td>Bhim Kamal</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Position/function</td>
<td>Interview Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCC – Associação Lusofonia Cultura e Cidadania [Association for Lusophone Culture and Citizenship]</td>
<td>Maria João Rodrigues (A); Teresa Pedroso (B)</td>
<td>Project coordinator; Coordinator of the Office for Professional Insertion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association ComuniDária</td>
<td>Magdala Gusmão</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturface - Associação Cultural para o Desenvolvimento [Cultural Association for Development]</td>
<td>Celso Soares</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associação SOS Racismo [SOS Racism]</td>
<td>José Falcão</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR – Conselho Português para os Refugiados [Portuguese Council for Refugees]</td>
<td>Isabel Sales (A); Mónica Farinha (B)</td>
<td>Head of the Centre for Reception of Refugees (CAR - Centro de Acolhimento para Refugiados); Coordinator of the Legal Office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUBE - Clube Intercultural Europeu [European Intercultural Club]</td>
<td>Marta Vaz (A) e Carla Mendonça (B)</td>
<td>Project manager and coordinator of &quot;Programa Escolhas 6ªG&quot; (6th generation); Project technician</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Position/function</td>
<td>Interview Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidade Islâmica de Lisboa [Lisbon Islamic Community]</td>
<td>Mahomed Abed</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obra Católica Portuguesa de Migrações [Portuguese Catholic Work for Migrations]</td>
<td>Eugénia Quaresma</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariado Diocesano de Lisboa da Obra Nacional e Pastoral dos Ciganos [Lisbon Diocesan Secretariat for the Roma National Pastoral]</td>
<td>Fernanda Reis (A); Aida Marrana (B)</td>
<td>President; Representative in CMIC</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instituições Internacionais</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Legislation (see Annex 1)**

**Relevant Policy Documents**


CML (2015c), Plano de Desenvolvimento de Saúde e Qualidade de Vida da Cidade de Lisboa [Development Plan on Health and Living Standards of the City of Lisbon]. Available at: [http://observatorio-lisboa.eapn.pt/ficheiro/Plano-de-Desenvolvimento-de-Sa%C3%A7e-e-Qualidade-de-Vida-da-Cidade-de-Lisboa.pdf](http://observatorio-lisboa.eapn.pt/ficheiro/Plano-de-Desenvolvimento-de-Sa%C3%A7e-e-Qualidade-de-Vida-da-Cidade-de-Lisboa.pdf)


Relevant International Reports


IOM (2011) Migration Profiles: Making the Most of the Process


**Concepts, indicators, classifications (examples)**


**Useful data sources**


Population in the largest city (% of urban population): http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.URB.LCTY.UR.ZS

For integration in European countries, please refer to the [Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX)](https://www.mipex.eu/).

For an overview on decentralisation practices, please refer to the UCLG Country Profile on Decentralisation and Local Governments ([EN](http://uclg.org/sustainability), [FR](http://uclg.org/fr/sustainability)).
10. Annexes

Annex 1: Domestic Legal Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreto-Lei [Decree] 4/2001</td>
<td>Unlike in the earlier extraordinary regularisation processes, which essentially worked as legalisation amnesties for all immigrants settled in the country up to a certain date, this made the existence of a work contract registered at the Ministry of Work a prerequisite for regularisation and limited the validity of the residence permit to a one-year period, renewable until a maximum of five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreto-Lei [Decree] 34/2003</td>
<td>It revoked the regime that governed the granting of residence and imposed, for the first time, a maximum limit of entries in the country for labour migrants, in other words, a more restrictive regulation than the earlier legislation, which however failed to produce the expected results, as demonstrated by the fact that the following year the extraordinary regularisation processes resumed, as well as bilateral agreements with Brazil (e.g. the so-called “Lula Agreement”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei [Law] 23/2007, 4 July</td>
<td>So-called “Lei de Estrangeiros” [Foreigners Law&quot;], which came to replace the various types of long-term visas formerly attributed by one single residence permit visa; it created exceptional mechanisms for the concession of residence permits for the exercise of employed and self-employed professional activity (respectively, n. 2 of Articles 88 and 89).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei Orgânica [Organic Law] 2/2006, 17 April (it changed, for the fourth time, the Nationality Law created in 1981)</td>
<td>It makes the acquisition of nationality easier, particularly for children/grandchildren of immigrants born in Portugal. The main change in comparison with the 1981 Law is the reinforcement of the jus soli right as a criterion for the attribution or acquisition of nationality. The right to the nationality of origin is attributed to those born in Portugal, if at least one of their parents has resided in Portugal legally for over 5 years, with any kind of valid document (rather than necessarily a residence permit), or that they have completed the first stage of education in Portugal (4th grade) (cf. Healy, 2011: 63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolução do Conselho de Ministros [Council of Ministers Resolution] n. 21/2010, 26 March</td>
<td>It establishes the total target contingent of the annual concession of residence permits for the admission of foreign nationals for the exercise of an employed professional activity, laying out a maximum limit of 3,800 residence permits until 31 December of that year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attract highly qualified citizens from non-EU countries. The first point is especially relevant and polemic, since it makes regularisation and tax benefits available for a specific profile of immigrants, with a high capital for investment\(^8\), thus discriminating against others, and because the “Golden Visas” have become a police target, on the suspicion of crimes of corruption and money laundering by some Portuguese politicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Despacho [Order] 7/2016, 21 March, emitted by the National Director of SEF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It changed the norms in place until then as to the entry and residence of foreign nationals in Portugal, restricting the possibility of initiating the process of legalisation to immigrants with a Schengen visa (a single entry visa for EU countries under the Schengen Agreement) and that are able to prove that their entry into the country took place before the expiry date on the visa (up to 3 months), offering proof of that entry to the Portuguese police forces. This order thus makes regularisation impossible for foreign nationals residing in Portugal under the scope of the exceptional tracks set out in Articles 88º-2, 89º-2 of Law 27/2007, of 4 July, i.e., to all foreigners that arrived in Portugal before March 2016 and who do not have regular resident status, since the deadline demanded of them is impossible to meet. To this one should add obstacles in Social Security and Tax Office, who apparently began being instrumentalised by SEF to reject registration by immigrants in an irregular situation. These registrations were what enabled regularisation through Law 27/2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\)Through one of the three following conditions: Acquisition of real estate for a value equal or superior to 500,000€; Transference of capitals worth 1 million Euros or more; The creation of at least ten jobs.
Annex 2: Maps

Figure 1. Map of the Lisbon Metropolitan Area (AML)
Figure 2. Map of Greater Lisbon
Figure 3. Concentration of foreign population from the European Union (EU27), by borough (2011)

Source: Marina Carreiras (2016), based on data from the 2011 Census (INE)
Figure 4. Concentration of foreign population from the PALOPs, by borough (2011)

Source: Marina Carreiras (2016), based on data from the 2011 Census (INE)
Figure 5. Concentration of foreign population from Brazil, by borough (2011)

Source: Marina Carreiras (2016), based on data from the 2011 Census (INE)
Figure 6. Concentration of foreign population from China, by borough (2011)

Source: Marina Carreiras (2016), based on data from the 2011 Census (INE)
Figure 7. Concentration of foreign population from India, by borough (2011)

Source: Marina Carreiras (2016), based on data from the 2011 Census (INE)
Annex 3: Terminology explained

**Foreigner** is a person who does not have the citizenship of the country of current usual residence regardless of the place of birth

"**Foreign-born**" means a person who was born outside of the country of current usual residence regardless of the person's citizenship

"**Economically active**" population comprises all persons who provide the supply of labour, as employed or as unemployed, for the production of goods and services.\(^{82}\)

**Average annual rent for housing per m\(^2\)** are all rentals actually paid by tenants, i.e. the rentals the tenant pays to the landlord regardless of any social benefits the tenant receives from public authorities (including payments which at the tenant's discretion go directly to the landlord). Rentals normally include payment for the use of the land on which the property stands, the dwelling occupied, the fixtures and fittings for heating, plumbing, lighting, etc., and, in the case of a dwelling let furnished, the furniture. Rentals also include payment for the use of a garage to provide parking in connection with the dwelling. The garage does not have to be physically contiguous to the dwelling; nor does it have to be leased from the same landlord.

**Average prices of housing unit**: Average buying price per housing unit sold during the reference year, net of national taxes, for units available for purchase (in Euro or equivalent in Euro). This includes both newly built and old (existing) housing units.

**Disposable household income** (net of any taxes and social contributions paid) includes:

- all income from work (employee wages and self-employment earnings)
- private income from investment and property
- transfers between households
- all social transfers received in cash including old-age pensions


Disposable household income does not include:

- income from private pension plans
- in kind social transfers
- imputed rent
- income in kind, with exception of company car
- own consumption.

**Average area of living accommodation**: m\(^2\) per person and similar variables concerned with **surface areas**: the area refers to the living floor space that is the total area of rooms (rooms have minimum 4 m\(^2\) of area and are min. 2 m high over the major area of the ceiling thus normal bedrooms, dining rooms, living rooms, habitable cellars and attics, servants rooms, kitchens and other separate spaces used or intended for habitation are all rooms; kitchenettes (<4 m\(^2\), <2m wide), corridors, verandas, utility rooms and lobbies do not count as rooms nor do bathrooms and toilets).

**Persons at risk of poverty or social exclusion** corresponds to the sum of persons who are: at risk of poverty or severely materially deprived or living in households with very low work intensity. Persons are only counted once even if they are present in several sub-indicators. At risk-of-poverty are persons with an equivalized disposable income below the risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60% of the national median equivalized disposable income.

**Lone parent private household (with children aged 0 to under 18)**: A one family household with only one adult and at least one child under 18 years old. It should be noted that the adult is not necessarily a biological parent but an adult of the family nucleus.

The definition of ‘**early school leaving**’ (used at EU level) refers to ‘those young people who leave education and training with only lower secondary education or less, and who are no longer in education and training’. In statistical terms, European ESL rates are measured as the percentage of 18-24 year olds with only lower secondary education or less and no longer in education or training (EC 2013). **Early leavers from training and education** refers to persons aged 18 to 24 fulfilling the 2 conditions: 1) the highest level of education or training attained is pre-primary education, primary education or first stage of basic – compulsory – education, lower secondary or second stage of basic education
(this corresponds to the first cycle of secondary education\textsuperscript{83}), or upper secondary education (includes general, technical or vocational education for students who have completed their first cycle of secondary education); 2) they did not received any education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey.

**Students in higher education:** The number of students attending programmes leading to the award of a qualification equivalent to first stage of tertiary education and second stage of tertiary education (programmes leading to the award of an advanced research qualification: e.g. PhD's, etc.).

\textsuperscript{83} In countries with no system break between lower secondary and upper secondary education and where lower secondary education lasts more than three years, only the first three years following primary education are counted as lower secondary education. Lower secondary education may either be “terminal” preparing students for entry directly into working life and or “preparatory” preparing students for upper secondary education (EC 2013, 37-38).