Local-level indicators and estimates of the irregular migrant population

Main Authors: Lucy Leon & Myriam Cherti (COMPAS, University of Oxford)
Contributing Authors: Maristella Cacciapaglia, Paola Bonizzoni and Maurizio Ambrosini (University of Milan), Ruth Heylin (University of Leicester), Shiva Mohan (Toronto Metropolitan University), Katarzyna Rakowska (University of Warsaw), Lalaine Siruno (University of Maastricht)

Reviewers: Albert Kraler (UWK) & Michele Levoy (PICUM)

MIrreM Policy Brief No.2, April 2024

Funded by the European Union

Co-funded by:

UK Research and Innovation

Toronto Metropolitan University

Canada Excellence Research Chair in Migration & Integration

SUMMARY

This policy brief provides a concise summary of information that can help policymakers and other stakeholders grasp the main issues around local-level estimates of irregular migrant populations and make decisions about which factors to prioritise while making these estimates.

Drawing on examples from municipalities across Europe and Canada, we highlight the scarcity of official local-level estimates, how the divergences in terminology feed into the uncertainty around estimates, the challenges in collecting local-level data as well as showcasing promising practices. Whilst local-level estimates are rare, they can be a way towards overcoming some of the limitations of national estimates including data sources that may not be available nationally, such as the numbers of irregular migrants accessing specific local services and can help inform the development of local-level policy and practice. However just as with national estimates, local-level estimates may pose ethical issues in how they are used and for which purpose.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Lucy Leon is a Researcher at the University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS).

Myriam Cherti is a Senior Researcher at the University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) and the Principal Investigator for the City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE).

Maurizio Ambrosini is Professor of Sociology of Migration at the University of Milan, Department of Social and Political Sciences, and chargé d'enseignement at the University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis (France).

Paola Bonizzoni is Professor of Sociology of Migration at the University of Milan, Department of Social and Political Sciences.

Maristella Cacciapaglia is a Researcher at the University of Milan, Department of Social and Political Sciences.

Ruth Heylin is the MIrreM Project Officer at the University of Leicester.

Shiva S. Mohan is a Research Fellow at the Canada Excellence Research Chair in Migration and Integration program at Toronto Metropolitan University.

Katarzyna Rakowska is an Assistant Researcher in the Centre of Migration Research and a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Sociology in University of Warsaw.

Lalaine Siruno is a researcher at the School of Business and Economics, Maastricht University, and the Governance and Public Policy of Innovation Unit, United Nations University (UNU) – MERIT.

TO CITE:

Leon, L., Cherti, M., Bonizzoni, P., Ambrosini, M., Cacciapaglia, M., Heylin, R., Mohan, S., Rakowska, K., Siruno, L. (2024) Local-level data, indicators and estimates of the irregular migrant population. MIrreM Policy Brief No.2. Krems: University for Continuing Education Krems (Danube University Krems). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10853356

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The authors thank the interview respondents and workshop participants who generously shared their time and expertise on this topic. Without these participants, the analysis included in this paper would not have been possible.

The main authors are also grateful to the reviewers Albert Kraler and Michele Levoy for their insightful and constructive feedback, as well as their colleagues Denis Kierans and Carlos Vargas-Silva at COMPAS for the support provided in the development of this policy brief.

1. CHALLENGES IN UNDERSTANDING AND DEFINING IRREGULARITY

The lack of consensus on terms for defining migrant irregularity impacts municipalities' ability to define and measure the size of the local irregular migrant population.

1.1 Definitions and terminology

The MIRREM taxonomy takes a wide approach to defining irregular migrants and other categories of migrants with a precarious legal status. Irregular migrants include people without regular residence status in the country where they reside *and* people whose authorisation to be in the country may be subject to termination through an order to leave and/or an expulsion order because of their activities, were these activities to be detected (e.g., working illegally or breaching specific entry conditions).

However, as the existing MIRREM research has highlighted, there are different understandings of migrant irregularity in different contexts and between different stakeholders and a lack of consensus on terms for defining migrant irregularity (Kraler & Ahrens, 2023; Slootjes et al, 2023) across European states and North America. As a result, this impacts how municipalities understand and define migrant irregularity and, as a consequence, how the issue is addressed at a local level.

The term 'irregular' was not widely used across municipalities - in fact in both UK and Canadian municipalities, 'irregular' was more widely used in reference to irregular entries instead of residents living in the country with an irregular status. Instead, a multiplicity of terminology was used across municipalities:

(1) *'undocumented people'* – this term was often used by UK and Irish municipalities as well as the city of Amsterdam. In Canada, it was primarily only used within academia.
(2) *'precarious/insecure status'* (UK and Canada) to refer to people with short-term temporary status that are seen as being 'at risk' of falling out of status (see for example Baban, Ilcan and Rygiel, 2021)
(3) *'people who are unlawfully present or have no immigration permission'* (UK)
(4) In the Netherlands, there is no direct reference to 'irregular migrants' in legislative documents but instead to *'persons who are illegally (or not lawfully) resident'* or '*undesirable aliens.'*
(5) *'out of status' or 'non-status' migrants* (Canada and Ireland)
(6) *'people with 'no recourse to public funds'* (NRPF). In the UK, the NRPF policy is applied to people 'subject to immigration control', restricting their access to mainstream social security and is applied as a visa condition to people with temporary leave to remain, as well as to irregular migrants by default. As a result, NRPF and irregular migrants can be conflated, despite a significant proportion of people with NRPF having leave to remain in the UK.

According to some municipalities, this range of terminology within and across municipalities has promoted more of a scattered approach to policies supporting irregular migrants from different local government departments, instead of a more joined-up approach. Many of the municipalities focus their work on groups that align with their support and protection duties, such as people seeking sanctuary (asylum-seekers, refugees) and 'migrants with vulnerabilities' due to their age (e.g., children), exploitation (e.g., victims of human trafficking and modern slavery) and those with specific health and support needs. Migrants with an irregular status were among the 'migrants with vulnerabilities' cohort, as long as they were perceived as vulnerable. The prioritisation of certain vulnerable groups highlights the conditionality of support to only certain groups of irregular migrants, deemed more in need or perceived to be more 'deserving' (Ratzmann & Sahraoui, 2021).

1.2 Limitations of local level estimates

With a lack of consensus on terminology and a lack of clear definitions of migrant irregularity, it is challenging for municipalities to effectively collect data to estimate the numbers of irregular migrants at a local level. Even with clear definitions, estimating the number of irregular migrants involves numerous methodological challenges and constraints imposed by limitations of the available data. Consequently, all estimates come with considerable uncertainty and caveats, and they are influenced critically by how and how well these methodological challenges and data limitations have been addressed.

2. KEY FINDINGS

2.1 Methodology

This policy brief draws on learning from cities across the UK, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Canada as well as learning from the C-MISE cities discussed at a joint MIRREM and C-MISE workshop held in Oxford, UK in December 2023.

Drawing on data from desk research and qualitative interviews with 14 stakeholders carried out by researchers at COMPAS, University of Oxford and our partners at the University of Leicester, Maastricht University, University of Milan, Toronto Metropolitan University and the University of Warsaw, our research questions focused on local-level data, estimates and indicators as part of the development of local-level policies around irregular migration.

Working together with the City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE)[1], the interim findings were presented and discussed at a joint C-MISE and MIRREM workshop with representatives from C-MISE cities, MIRREM partners, the UK Home Office and the UK Office for National Statistics.

2.2 Publicly available local-level estimates

Local-level estimates of irregular migrants have been limited because of the same challenges faced in producing national estimates. However, there have been some sporadic attempts by European cities:

(1) Estimates provided by cities to Eurocities in 2010, indicate that undocumented migrants represented between 3% and 6% of the population in Ghent, Genoa and Rotterdam (Gebhardt, 2010).
(2) Gordon et al. (2009) for example, estimated that at the end of 2007, there were 442,000 undocumented people in London, of whom 61,000 were UK-born. More recently, Jolly et al. (2020) adopted a Delphi model to estimate the number and distribution of undocumented children in London, commissioned by the Greater London Authority. The study estimated that

[1] The C-MISE Initiative is a knowledge-exchange programme supporting European cities to share knowledge on best practices and policy responses regarding irregular migrants.

in 2017, there were 397,000 undocumented people in London, including 107,000 children and 26,000 young people. This figure does not include the UK-born children of people who are undocumented and who may also have an insecure or irregular immigration status.

As part of the MIRREM research, one of the main challenges partners encountered during fieldwork was finding key local government stakeholders who were happy to be interviewed on the issue of local level data and estimates for various reasons:

(1) Many local stakeholders felt that they didn't hold sufficient data on the numbers of potential irregular migrants and therefore didn't feel they would be able to contribute.
(2) Some felt it was still an emerging area of work that hadn't been addressed or prioritised within their city and therefore didn't feel able to talk about the issue in any depth.
(3) Local stakeholders also raised that where data was held, it was too politically sensitive to share or discuss due to public discourses around migration governance.

Across the cities we covered as part of this study, London was the only city where a publicly available estimate for the local irregular migrant population had been commissioned at a city-level. Our desk research flagged that two London local authorities had attempted rough estimates for their areas as part of their Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) to provide insights and data on the health and wellbeing needs of the local population (Newham, 2021; Sutton, 2019):

(1) In 2019, the London Borough of Sutton had applied Sigona and Hughes (2012) estimate that 0.9% of the UK's under 18 population may be irregular migrants, equating this to the Sutton population, to estimate that there may be up to 476 children who are irregular migrants in the borough of Sutton.
(2) In 2021, the London Borough of Newham had estimated the number of undocumented children (up to 1,500 – 2,000) in the borough, as well as the number (30,000) of EEA nationals within the borough needing to regularise their status post Brexit to avoid falling into irregularity, however the methodology used for these figures was not articulated.

In both cases, the estimates had focused on undocumented children rather than adults, which could be seen as an indicative of what cities deem relevant to estimate and address within their wider policy work on health, child welfare and poverty.

In the other cities, publicly available estimates had been developed by academic researchers or NGOs, but not commissioned by the cities directly:

City	Publicly Available Estimate	Source
Amsterdam	between 10,000 and 25,000 people	C-MISE, 2021
Greater London	397,000 people	Jolly et al. (2020) University of Wolverhampton, commissioned by the Greater London Authority
The Hague	between 4,000 and 10,000 people	NGO representative, personal communication, 06 May 2021
Milan	43,000 people	Polis Lombordia, 2021
Rotterdam	about 10,000 people	Pauluskerk Rotterdam (published in Open Rotterdam, 2022)
Utrecht	About 5,000 people	Villa Vrede, n.d.

2.2 Current indicators used to collate data

There are a range of indicators used by both municipalities as well as third sector organisations to try to estimate the local irregular migrant population. This included:

(1) The number of people with an irregular status registered through the mandatory administrative registration (Padron) cards in Spanish cities

(2) The number of people registered with the municipal medical card in Ghent, which allows people with an irregular immigration status to see a doctor

(3) The number of service users accessing NGO services for irregular migrants in The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht

(4) The number of homeless adults with restricted eligibility being identified by advice agencies in UK municipalities

(5) The number of destitute migrant individuals or families presenting at social services as they are locked out of social security, due to their immigration status[2].

Other potential indicators that may not be currently recorded and collected systematically include:

(6) The number of people with an irregular immigration status, accessing local emergency healthcare. This could indicate the number of people dependent on emergency health care, as they are too fearful or unable to access primary care or other public services, due to their status. Anonymous statistical data could also be collected and shared by the specialist health services serving undocumented migrants and other persons unable to access mainstream health services

(7) The number of people being referred to local immigration advice services

(8) The numbers of births and deaths in irregularity, registered with Dutch municipal authorities

(9) The number of school registrations of children whose family have an irregular status

2.3 Challenges collecting local-level data

There are numerous challenges, hindering municipalities' ability to gather data on indicators as part of their estimates of the local irregular migrant population. This includes:

(1) **Unclear operational definitions**: with a lack of consensus on terms defining who counts as an irregular migrant, it is more difficult for municipalities to try to produce estimates of the irregular migration population.

(2) **Reliability**: local-level indicators only present a partial picture of the irregular migration as they may only highlight a particular group of people within the wider irregular migrant

[2] The NRPF Network, hosted by Islington Council in Greater London, manage a national database and case management tool for councils to record details of households with no recourse to public funds (NRPF) that are being provided with accommodation and/or financial support by social services. Whilst local data is not published, the NRPF Network publish an annual data report, including both national and regional data on the numbers of people supported and the breakdown by immigration status.

population. In addition, it may feel like a moving target, gathering data on a potentially mobile and transient population moving from city to city depending on work opportunities and social networks.

(3) **Purpose:** municipalities' motivation to collect data on indicators to estimate the size of the irregular migration population can depend on the political leanings, will and priorities of the city administration as well as public narratives around irregular migration:

a. Some municipalities are **keen to collect data to map the level of need and develop service provision and policy responses**. A recent Amnesty International report highlighted that during the COVID pandemic, Amsterdam and Utrecht city councils worked with NGOs to do an inventory of undocumented migrant workers at risk of homelessness and destitution, whilst NGOs in Rotterdam shared that the Rotterdam council did not express any interest in mapping how many people may be in need during the pandemic (de Zeeuw, 2020).

b. For some cities, there is a **conscious decision not to collect data in order to protect migrants, fearing that any estimate could be misrepresented and used to inform hostile policies, incite divisiveness or that data is used by vigilante groups**.

c. For other cities there is **no political will or budget to implement policy or practice supporting irregular migrants** and therefore no motivation to collect data on potential need.

d. **Shifts in policy-makers' interests with a primary focus on wanting data that aligns with, rather than challenges, the prevailing public discourse**: The ISMU Foundation (Foundation for Initiatives and Studies on Multi-ethnicity) undertook a regular survey of both regular and irregular immigrants in the Italian city of Milan from the early 1990s to 2021. The regional government funding for the survey came to an end in 2022, after a steady decrease in recent years, impacting the survey's sample size. Local stakeholders explained that the public narrative around migration has shifted towards security-related issues in recent years: they believed that one of the reasons that the regional government no longer funded the survey was due to the **research findings not aligning with the prevailing public narrative on irregular migration**, in both the size and composition of the irregular migrant population. The survey findings had instead found, on the contrary, that irregular migrant numbers were not significantly increasing and the majority of people were not arriving clandestinely from African countries, but instead the largest group of irregular migrants in Milan consisted of South American visa overstayers, many of whom are employed irregularly in caregiving activities.

(4) **Gaps in data-sharing and disjointed practice** Within municipalities there are often gaps in both the sharing of case files and the sharing of anonymised data (whether micro-level data or aggregated statistics), as well a lack of joined up work across different agencies and within different local government departments. As a result, this can make it difficult to map a comprehensive overview of the size, characteristics and needs of the local irregular migrant population. This may be as there are limited secure and efficient case management systems to record and share data files across departments and agencies. Whilst this is an issue for many less sensitive topics, it becomes even more challenging when the data and topic are perceived to be sensitive, particularly with a lack of clear firewalls and potentially a conflict in different organisations' agendas. This can happen at different levels:

a. **Between national/local government**, where national agencies may hold data that is not then shared with municipalities. This was raised by UK local authorities who felt that aside from positive asylum decisions, the Home Office did not share detailed

regional data, which they could use to map the potential numbers of irregular migrants in their municipalities. In Ireland, the data published following the 2022 Regularisation Scheme for long-term Undocumented migrants is not disaggregated in terms of place of residence, despite data on applicants' place of residence being gathered as part of the application.

b. **Between local statutory agencies,** for example between the police and local government – the local police force in Milan are reported to collect statistical data on irregular migrants, however this is not necessarily/ easily shared with other local institutions. There may also be a lack of case file sharing between different agencies such as social services, health services and education. Whilst this may be linked to the lack of a secure case management system and clear firewalls, as a result it can prevent local services from understanding individuals' trajectories and therefore has implications for the generation of statistical data.

c. Between local statutory agencies and NGOs – NGOs, legal advisers and community organisations may hold rich data on the numbers and characteristics of referrals and service users. However, without clear firewalls and an agreement on what data will be used and for what purpose, third sector organisations may have significant concerns about sensitive data being misrepresented by local government.

(5) **Shift towards universal services:** some municipalities are striving towards taking a more universal approach to service provision, no longer requesting people's immigration status before providing services (Mourão Permoser & Baubock, 2023). This approach is more inclusive as residents may be less fearful about seeking support due to concerns about being identified as having an irregular status and potentially jeopardising their current status or future applications. However, it limits agencies' ability to capture data on who is accessing services and therefore less data on potential indicators of the size and characteristics of the irregular migrant population. Municipalities need to find the right balance between collecting as little data as possible in order to safeguard irregular migrants and ensure inclusivity, whilst ensuring they have sufficient data to plan and provide appropriate services to meet the need.

(6) **Research blind spots:** most research on irregular migrants primarily focuses on major urban cities (Berntsen et al. 2022). There is a need for further research covering rural areas, exploring the irregular migrant population working in agriculture (Leerkes et al., 2004), particularly as people are less likely to be able to access local advice and community organisations if they have a precarious immigration status and may be at an increased risk of falling into irregularity.

2.4 Promising practices in collecting local-level data

In recent years, some municipalities are trying to find ways of using data to develop local policy and practice to meet local residents' needs and as part of their wider agenda on addressing homelessness, destitution and public health. This has led to some **cities commissioning estimates,** such as the Greater London Authority as well as other **municipalities trying to find ways themselves of measuring indicators.**

In the UK, more municipalities have sought to map the level of need of vulnerable migrants, including those with an irregular status, within their local **Joint Strategic Needs Assessments** (JSNA), a resource containing a wide range of local and information **to inform plans and decisions to improve people's health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities**. One East Midlands, the regional network for

the voluntary and community sector (VCSE) in the East Midlands of England, has produced guidance on how to include migrants within the JSNA process.

In London, Islington Council host the NRPF Network, a national network safeguarding the welfare of destitute families, adults and care leavers who are unable to access benefits due to their immigration status. In addition to providing training, guidance and assistance to councils across the UK, the NRPF Network manage **a national database and case management tool for 82 English and Scottish councils to record details of households with no recourse to public funds (NRPF) that are being provided with accommodation and/or financial support by social services.** Whilst not all households receiving support will have an irregular status, the NRPF Network publish an annual data report**, including both national and regional data on the numbers of people supported and the breakdown by immigration status.**

In Scotland, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities have started undertaking an **annual survey of Scottish local authorities** to establish the numbers and characteristics of destitute people with no recourse to public funds seeking support from local government, in order to **inform the Scottish Government's Ending Destitution Together strategy and to develop and agree future funding and delivery models (Scottish Government, 2023)**

The City of Ghent set up an information hub (Infopunt migratie) providing general advice and information on immigration matters to all residents of the city as well as providing a municipal medical card that allows access to a local doctor. **To build people's trust, Infopunt migratie ensures the confidentiality of data shared and collects only minimal details from clients, including nationality, gender and immigration status.** People's names and telephone number are only requested if they need a follow-up (C-MISE, 2019; 2024). The city also set up a **Municipal Steering Committee ('Stedelijke Stuurgroep') on Migrants with Irregular Stay** ('Mensen Zonder Wettig Verblijf') in 2016 with representatives from local government departments, elected members and civil society organisations. The Committee's terms of reference include having an oversight of the number, profile and situation of irregular migrants living in the city (C-MISE, 2019; 2024).

Local population registers such as the Spanish 'padrón municipal' system enables municipalities to gather demographic information about their residents, including an indicator of the number of migrants (Bauder & Gonzalez, 2018). **Barcelona actively encourages and facilitates irregular migrants with registration, enabling people with no fixed address to register with the City Council's Social Services Department to access services** such as education and have evidence of their residence and community ties if they apply to regularise their status. In 2010, more than 16,000 people with no fixed address were registered in Barcelona, 13,400 of whom were non-EU country nationals – many had irregular migration status (C-MISE, 2019; 2024). With a clearer sense of the potential need, municipalities such as Barcelona can plan and develop appropriate services, ensuring school places and vaccination programmes can meet future demands (C-MISE, 2019; 2024).

3. IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

- Data and the development of policy responses should go hand in hand – local-level services should rely on data to measure their efficacy and impact and vice versa, data should inform policy and service development, helping agencies map and plan for the level of need.
- To minimise the misuse of data that could harm vulnerable migrants, municipalities should uphold ethical standards, when measuring and publishing indicators and estimates of the local irregular migrant population (Cyrus, 2023). This should include clarifying the purpose of collecting data, determining what data needs to be collected and developing systems that better allow the sharing and linkage of anonymised data that serves local information needs.
- To support with responsible data collection, municipalities could explore setting up a local population register and drawing on the expertise of cities like Barcelona that allow undocumented migrants to register more easily with the local population register, without requiring a fixed address and which enables all residents to access local services, regardless of their immigration status.
- To enrich the quality of data collected, municipalities could consider developing information sharing partnerships with voluntary and community organisations to collect anonymised statistical data with firewalls in place.
- To develop a more comprehensive overview of the irregular migration population, researchers could widen their scope to also include municipalities in rural and more agricultural areas, instead of primarily focusing on major urban cities (Berntsen et al. 2022). More research is needed in rural areas to explore the irregular migrant population working in agriculture in areas (Leerkes et al., 2004), particularly as people are less likely to be able to access specialist support services providing immigration advice and representation.

4. REFERENCES

Baban, F., Ilcan, S., & Rygiel, K. (2021). The Precarious Lives of Syrians: Migration, Citizenship, and Temporary Protection in Turkey (Vol. 5). McGill-Queen's University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1z7khfp

Bauder, H., & Gonzalez, D. A. (2018). Municipal Responses to 'Illegality': Urban Sanctuary across National Contexts. Social Inclusion, 6(1), 124–134. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1273

Berntsen, L., de Lange, T., & Rijken, C. (2022). *Migranten zonder verblijfsvergunning: Rechten en sociaaleconomische positie in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

C-MISE. (2021). Learning from Amsterdam's experience on irregular migrants and discussing healthcare for migrants during the COVID-19 pandemic: reporting on the C-MISE meeting "in" Amsterdam. https://cmise.web.ox.ac.uk/article/learning-from-amsterdams-experience-on-irregular-migrants-and-discussing-healthcare-for-migr

de Zeeuw, H. (2020). *Geen inkomsten en rechten: het onzichtbare leed in de schaduweconomie*. A. International. https://www.amnesty.nl/wordt-vervolgd/het-onzichtbare-leed-in-de-schaduweconomie

Delvino, N. & Spencer, S. (2019) Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe: Guidance for Municipalities, City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE) COMPAS, Oxford. https://www. compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/CMISE-Guidance-for-Municipalities-Migrants-withIrregular-Status-in-Europe.pdf

Delvino, N., Spencer, S. and Cherti, M. (2024) Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe: Guidance for Municipalities, City Initiative on Migrants with Irregular Status in Europe (C-MISE) COMPAS, Oxford. https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/project/city-initiative-on-irregular-migrants-in-europe-c-mise

Cyrus, N. (2023) Ethical benchmarking for the measurement of irregular migration. MIrreM Policy Brief No.1. Krems: University for Continuing Education Krems (Danube University Krems). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10042022

Gebhardt, D. (2010) Irregular migration and the role of local and regional authorities. In Assessing EU Policy on Irregular Immigration under the Stockholm Programme, eds S. Carrera and M. Merlino. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) https://aei.pitt.edu/15111/1/Carrera__%26_Merlino_on_Assessing_EU_Policy_on_Irregular_Immigration.pdf

Gordon, I., Scanlon, K., Travers, T. and Whitehead, C. (2009) Economic impact on the London and UK economy of an earned regularisation of irregular migrants to the UK. London: LSE https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gla_migrate_files_destination/irregular-migrants-report.pdf

Jolly, A., Thomas, S. and Stanyer, J. (2020) London's children and young people who are not British citizens: A profile. London: Greater London Authority. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.13839.12964

Kraler, A., & Ahrens, J. (2023). Conceptualising migrant irregularity for measurement purposes. MIrreM Working Paper 2/2023 (Version 3). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7868237

Leerkes, A., van San, M., Engbersen, G., Cruijff, M., & van der Heijden, P. (2004). *Wijken voor illegalen. Over ruimtelijke spreiding, huisvesting en leefbaarheid*. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers bv
Mourão Permoser, J. & Baubock, R. (2023). Spheres of sanctuary: introduction to special issue. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. 49. 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12966

Newham Council (2021) Children and Young People's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2021 – 2023 newham.gov.uk/downloads/file/3607/cyp-jsna-august-2021

Open Rotterdam. (2022). Strenger beleid voor ongedocumenteerd in Rotterdam dan in de hoofdstad. Retrieved 07 November 2023 from https://openrotterdam.nl/strenger-beleid-voor-ongedocumenteerd-in-rotterdam-dan-in-de-hoofdstad/

Polis Lombordia (2021) Osservatorio Regionale per l'integrazione e la multietnicità - ORIM Programma di lavoro 2019-2021 Monografia rilevazione campionaria 2021 https://www.ismu.org/osservatorio-regionale-per-lintegrazione-e-la-multietnicita-orim-rilevazione-campionaria-2021/

Ratzmann N, & Sahraoui N. (2021) Conceptualising the Role of Deservingness in Migrants' Access to Social Services. Social Policy and Society. 2021;20(3):440-451. doi:10.1017/S1474746421000117

Scottish Government (2023) Ending Destitution Together - Progress Report - Year Two 2022-2023 https://www.gov.scot/publications/ending-destitution-together-progress-report-year-two-2022-2023/

Sigona, N., & Hughes, V. (2012). No Way Out, No Way In: Irregular migrant children and families in the UK. University of Oxford. https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/publication/pr-2012-undocumented_migrant_children

Slootjes, J., Sohst, R., & Kokkelmans, R. (2023) Mapping Stakeholders' Needs and Usage of Irregular Migration Data. MIrreM Briefing Paper No. D2.1. Brussels: Migration Policy Institute Europe. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7589494

Sutton Council (2019) Children's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment https://moderngov.sutton.gov.uk/documents/s70711/6b%20Submitted%20Final%20Appendix%20B%20-%20Childrens%20Joint%20strategic%20needs%20assessment%20JSNA.pdf

Villa Vrede. (n.d.). Undocumented migrants in Utrecht. Retrieved 07 November 2023 from https://villavrede.nl/en/undocumented/

THE MIRREM PROJECT

MIrreM examines estimates and statistical indicators on the irregular migrant population in Europe as well as related policies, including the regularisation of migrants in irregular situations.

MIrreM analyses policies defining migrant irregularity, stakeholders' data needs and usage, and assesses existing estimates and statistical indicators on irregular migration in the countries under study and at the EU level. Using several coordinated pilots, the project develops new and innovative methods for measuring irregular migration and explores if and how these instruments can be applied in other socio-economic or institutional contexts. Based on a broad mapping of regularisation practices in the EU as well as detailed case studies, MIrreM will develop 'regularisation scenarios' to better understand conditions under which regularisation should be considered as a policy option. Together with expert groups that will be set up on irregular migration data and regularisation, respectively, the project will synthesise findings into a Handbook on data on irregular migration and a Handbook on pathways out of irregularity. The project's research covers 20 countries, including 12 EU countries and the United Kingdom.

More information on the project is available at http://irregularmigration.eu.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

In addition, MIrreM benefit from funding provided by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) under the UK government's Horizon Europe funding guarantee. The Canadian research component of this project is undertaken, in part, thanks to funding from the Canada Excellence Research Chairs Program of the Government of Canada.

COPYRIGHT CLAUSE

This work is licensed by the MIrreM Consortium under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, 2020. For details, see http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/