

Thessaloniki: Profiling of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Third Country Nationals not registered with the Asylum Service

Potential and Obstacles to Local Integration

Thessaloniki, July 2019

Thessaloniki: Profiling of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Third Country Nationals not registered with the Asylum Service

Potential and Obstacles to Local Integration

Profiling Coordinator: **Knut Mæhlumshagen**

Report preparation: **Stamatia Boskou** (Independent consultant) & **Margharita Lundkvist-Houndoumadi** (JIPS)

Research facilitation: **Knut Mæhlumshagen** (Interagency Profiling Coordinator NORCAP/UNHCR), **Kari Fyhn** (JIPS), **Svend-Jonas Schelhorn** (JIPS), **Steve Catling** (NORCAP/UNHCR), and **Meriç Vedia Özgüneş** (Municipality of Thessaloniki/UNHCR), **Dorothea Kokozidou** (Municipality of Thessaloniki/UNHCR), **Anna Stamatiadi** (NRC), **Theodora Gazi** (DRC), **Marina Sotirolou** (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki) and **Vasiliki Bouranta** (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki).

Report editing: **Lisa McMunn**

Report design: **BakOS DESIGN**

Profiling Advisory Committee: Municipality of Thessaloniki, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Alkyone Refugee Day Care Centre, the Arsis Association for the Social Support of Youth, Solidarity Now, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the voluntary association OMNES, the civil society network Help Refugees, INTERSOS, Filoxenia and the Hellenic Red Cross.

Report preparation: February 2019.

Data collection: April – July 2018.

Acknowledgements

This profiling exercise was initiated in order to better understand the challenges around local integration of refugees and asylum seekers in the metropolitan area of Thessaloniki so as to provide more evidence for the policy development and response planning of the Municipality and the humanitarian and civil society community working in Thessaloniki. Additionally, the profiling results are intended to serve as a baseline for the future monitoring of local integration that is to be led by the Municipality.

The completion of this profiling exercise and analysis of the displacement situation in Thessaloniki is a joint achievement of municipal authorities, UN agencies, international and national NGOs as well as civil society organizations. The Municipality of Thessaloniki together with UNHCR provided the important lead in this process. A Profiling Coordinator was identified and Profiling Advisory Committee as well as a Technical Working Group were established comprising: the Municipality of Thessaloniki, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Alkyone Refugee Day Care Centre (Alkyone), the Association for the Social Support of Youth (Arsis), Solidarity Now, the Danish Refugees Council (DRC), the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the voluntary association OMNES, the civil society network Help Refugees, INTERSOS, Filoxenia and the Hellenic Red Cross. The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) provided support throughout the course of the profiling.

All Profiling Advisory Committee members worked on the profiling through their appointed focal persons, who jointly discussed objectives, methodological approaches, decided on indicators, reviewed the data collection tools, supported with enumerators and qualitative data collection facilitators, reviewed preliminary results and final analysis as well as organized the community consultations. This profiling was supported by in-kind and monetary contributions by UNHCR, NRC, NORCAP, DRC, UNICEF, Heinrich Böll Stiftung, JIPS, Alkyone and Solidarity Now.



Technical support by:



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION	9
The Refugee Context in Northern Greece	9
Why a Profiling in Thessaloniki?	11
Profiling Objectives and Analysis Structure.....	13
2. PROFILING METHODOLOGY	14
Target Groups and Geographic Scope.....	14
Collaborative Process to Shape Analysis Approach and Tools.....	15
Qualitative Data Collection	16
Quantitative Data Collection	18
3. REFUGEES & ASYLUM SEEKERS: EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL FOR LOCAL INTEGRATION.....	21
Demographic and Displacement Profile	22
Migration History and Length of Stay in Thessaloniki.....	26
Access to Employment and Livelihood Means.....	26
Access to Housing and Services	32
Future Intentions.....	36
Social Networks in the City	40
4. THIRD COUNTRY NATIONALS NOT REGISTERED WITH THE ASYLUM SERVICE: CHALLENGES IN COPING WITHOUT THE ASYLUM STATUS.....	43
Introduction.....	43
Demographic and Displacement Profile	44
Migration History and Length of Stay in Thessaloniki.....	46
Accommodation and Homelessness	47
Access to Employment and Livelihood Means	48
Access to Services	50
Future Intentions.....	51
Social Networks	52
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	54
ANNEX 1: INDICATORS AND QUESTIONS.....	64
ANNEX 2: ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVITY	76

Executive summary

WHY A DISPLACEMENT PROFILING IN THESSALONIKI

The closure of the so-called “Balkan route” and the EU- Turkey Statement in March 2016 changed Greece from a ‘transit’ country to a country hosting a growing population of refugees and asylum seekers. To address the needs of this growing population staying on the Greek mainland, the Greek Government established Open Reception Facilities (ORFs) in Northern and Central Greece. In the beginning of 2016, UNHCR through its partners established urban accommodation schemes to host asylum seekers eligible for relocation as part of the European solidarity measures. The program evolved to focus on the most vulnerable asylum seekers for whom accommodation in the ORFs was unsuitable. The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) set up a similar accommodation program in late 2016 also focusing on the most vulnerable.

Arrivals at the Greek-Turkish land border increased in late 2017 and as a result a higher number of people started arriving directly to Thessaloniki, without having presented themselves to the authorities at the border. Hence, they were not registered by the Greek authorities and as a consequence lacked access to a dignified shelter, or other forms of basic assistance available to asylum seekers and refugees.

The Municipality of Thessaloniki and the humanitarian community jointly decided to conduct a profiling exercise of the refugees and asylum seekers hosted in Thessaloniki as well as Third Country Nationals not registered with the Asylum Service in Thessaloniki. The objective was to explore the extent to which refugees and asylum seekers were moving towards local integration. This was done by looking at their outlook for the future as well as the obstacles and possibilities towards greater economic and socio-cultural integration in Greece. The analysis of persons with no asylum service documentation focused on the key challenges faced by those groups, such as lack of a regularized status and homelessness. The collected data would form

a baseline for future integration monitoring and would additionally be a useful tool for the implementation of integration activities as foreseen in national and local strategies for integration.

PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

To lead the exercise, a Profiling Advisory Group was established in October 2017 and a profiling coordinator was hired to manage the project. The Joint IDP Profiling Service supported the exercise throughout. The Advisory Group was composed of representatives of the Municipality of Thessaloniki, assigned by the appointed city member council for migrants and refugees, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Alkyone Refugee Day Care Centre, the Arsis Association for the Social Support of Youth, Solidarity Now, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the voluntary association OMNES, the civil society network Help Refugees, INTERSOS, Filoxenia and the Hellenic Red Cross. The group met throughout the course of the exercise to shape and agree on key elements such as objectives, methodology approach, indicators, questionnaire, interpretation of preliminary findings, and recommendations.

The profiling exercise included the following two target groups:

- ➔ **Refugees and asylum seekers** who arrived in Thessaloniki after January 2015. This target group included persons with asylum seeker preregistration cards, asylum seeker full registration cards, decisions on granted status (refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection), residence permits or asylum applications under administrative appeal.
- ➔ **Third country nationals, not registered with the Asylum Service** which included persons with police notes, or persons whose documentation issued by the Greek State had expired, or persons who had not been issued documentation by the Greek State.

The profiling was based on a household survey combined with qualitative data collection and community engagement activities. A sample-

based household survey of the refugees and Asylum seekers covered in total 641 households, which were stratified in 3 strata: i. those in the urban accommodation scheme, who had been provided with apartments; ii. those self-accommodated in Thessaloniki, i.e. who were either renting an apartment by themselves, or were hosted by friends, relatives or volunteers; and iii, those who were fully registered residents of the Open Reception Facilities (ORF) in Diavata. For the target group of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service, a non-probability sampling strategy was applied, which involved a mix of snowballing and convenience sampling approaches, due to the absence of any available registry. This target group included people residing unofficially in the ORFs, hosted by individuals in Thessaloniki, or living in a situation of homelessness.

KEY FINDINGS

Refugees & asylum seekers

❶ **Basic demographics:** The refugees and asylum seekers in the accommodation scheme were comprised by 43% women, 60% below 18 years of age and 13% single member households. In the Diavata ORF, a very similar profile was found with 44% women, 60% below 18 years of age and 5% single member households. Amongst the self-accommodated refugees and asylum seekers, the demographic profile is different: only 21% are women, 14% are below 18 years of age, and more than half are single member households. The differences in the demographic profiles must be kept in mind when interpreting the below results.

❷ **Length of stay in Thessaloniki and future intentions:** The great majority of refugees and asylum seekers in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata had been in Thessaloniki less than one year, at the time of the study. The majority of the households in the accommodation scheme (60%) reported that they intended to stay in Thessaloniki for a longer term and one of the main conditions for being able to locally integrate was finding employment. Amongst the households in Diavata, less than half intended to stay in

Thessaloniki (45%) and more than a third (38%) intended to move to another EU country. For those intending to stay, being able to locally integrate was very much linked to finding a different accommodation solution. Finally, the households having found their own accommodation, were on the average for a longer time in Thessaloniki, as almost half of them had lived in the city for more than one year. This group also included the biggest proportion reporting that they intended to stay in Thessaloniki for a longer term (76%). For them, the main condition for local integration was access to employment and getting a recognized legal status.

❸ **Economic integration:** Economic inactivity is very high amongst women, where 73% are not working and not looking for work, while that is the case for only 24% of the male working aged population. The reported employment is very low among the working aged population in the accommodation scheme (5%) and in the Diavata ORF (4%), while it is considerably higher amongst the self-accommodated persons (34%). The main obstacles to access to employment across all strata were linked to unavailability of jobs in Greece and the insufficient knowledge of the Greek language.

When compared to the households in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata, the self-accommodated households showed a greater capacity for self-reliance and had more often some salary income as a secondary source of income. That was in addition to the cash assistance, which was the main source of income across all accommodation strata. However, at the same time, self-accommodated households reported often not being able to cover foreseen monthly expenses, such as rent and utilities, experiencing unforeseen expenses more often, and they tended to make more use of the free humanitarian services. Additionally, it is important to note that the demographic characteristics of the group in self-accommodation differed compared to the other two groups, as approximately half was comprised of single males.

④ Socio-cultural integration:

Housing: Tenure security was higher among the self-accommodated households, where 75% rented their own apartment, and the vast majority of them (81%) had a contract. Furthermore, more than half expected to be able to remain in the same accommodation for longer than six months. The households in the accommodation scheme and the ORF reported great insecurity around the expected length of stay in their current accommodation, with 75% reporting 'not knowing' how long they could stay. Security of housing tenure was reported in the community engagement sessions held with refugees as very important for a sense of safety, which would allow families to focus on longer term planning.

Access to basic services: Access to emergency health provision is free for everyone, including asylum seekers and refugees. Almost all households in need of health care had visited a primary or emergency health facility. Education is a fundamental human right for all children and compulsory in Greece for all children 5-15 years. The attendance rate of children in primary school was quite high (78%) and the parents did not report any significant problems pertaining to their children's attendance. Possession of a personal health insurance number (AMKA) and a tax number (AFM) are prerequisites for having full access to the Greek social service system. The great majority across the accommodation strata had access to both AMKA and AFM.

Social networks: Refugees and asylum seekers in the ORF in Diavata, the majority of whom were in Thessaloniki for less than a year, reported having much less access to support networks compared to the households in the accommodation scheme. The self-accommodated households, who had been the longest in Thessaloniki, appeared to a greater extent to have networks to rely on when in need, particularly in Thessaloniki. Interactions between the refugee population and the local community were generally reported as positive in nature.

Persons not registered with the Asylum Service

- ① **Basic demographics:** The surveyed population not registered with the Asylum Service comprised of twice as many men, compared to women. The population was noticeably young, with 82% being younger than 35 years. 94% of the households were single member households. 63% of the surveyed population had arrived to Thessaloniki within one month preceding the data collection.
- ② **Future intentions:** Approximately half of the persons not registered with the Asylum Service that were surveyed indicated an intention to stay in Thessaloniki (48%) and less than one third of the households (30%) indicated an intention to move on to another EU country. Of the 336 individuals surveyed, 75% stated that they intended to apply for asylum in Greece.
- ③ **Homelessness:** The vast majority (84%) of the respondents not registered with the Asylum Service that had arrived within the month preceding the data collection were in a situation of homelessness. Amongst those that had been in Thessaloniki between one and six months, almost equal proportions were residing unregistered in the Open Reception Facility in Diavata or were still living in a situation of homelessness in Thessaloniki. The respondents found in a homeless situation were primarily single member households (88%).
- ④ **Livelihood means:** 41% of the households of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service reported that they had no income. 28% were using their own savings, while 18% were receiving remittances from family and friends abroad. Engaging in negative coping mechanisms, such as sex work, was highlighted during the data collection informally to the enumerators.
- ⑤ **Access to services:** A majority of the households of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service reported having been in need of healthcare and most of them (55 out of 61 households) had managed to visit a health care facility, mainly an NGO clinic. The lack of documentation, proving that the persons resided legally in Greece, hindered the access of those persons to municipal services and other services such as access to education.

1.

Introduction



THE REFUGEE CONTEXT IN NORTHERN GREECE

2015 saw the beginning of record flows of persons arriving by sea to Europe with the intention of seeking asylum. The majority of people were coming from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan.¹ The main points of entry into Europe were through Southern Italy and the Greek Islands of the North-Eastern Aegean Sea. According to UNHCR, in 2015 alone 856,723 persons arrived to Greece by sea,² many of whom later transited onward to other locations in Europe. In early 2016 attempts were made to stem the flow of arrivals through the closure of the “Balkan route” in March 8th, and the subsequent introduction of the European Union (EU) – Turkey Statement on March 20th.³ This resulted in a major shift in the context. In a short period of time Greece changed from a short- term transit country for people “en route” to other destinations in Northern Europe and beyond, to a country hosting a growing population of refugees and asylum seekers who would be remaining in Greece for the foreseeable future. The nature of the response began to change to cater to the needs of a largely stationery population.

The aforementioned closure of the “Balkan route” between Greece and Northern Macedonia resulted in approximately 10,000 people being stopped on the Greek side of the border around the village of Eidomeni. Informal settlements were established that lacked adequate basic services. Conditions

were poor, and due to the large numbers of people the situation quickly deteriorated further. To address the needs of this population and to decongest the border area, the Greek Government established thirty five⁴ Open Reception Facilities (ORFs) in Northern and Central Greece. Due to the urgency of the situation, a number of sites were selected despite the fact that they were considered unsuitable for long-term housing (warehouses etc.). These locations were classified as temporary sites, with a view to closing them as soon as alternative accommodation options could be made available.

At this time, the Greek Asylum Service was also facing challenges due to the fact that the large numbers remaining in Greece now needed to register for asylum within a short period of time. This resulted in increased backlogs in accessing asylum, and by extension backlogs in accessing requisite documentation. In order to address this issue a large-scale pre-registration exercise was carried out with the support of UNHCR. The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that all persons had the opportunity to express their will to seek asylum and obtain the corresponding documentation.

In tandem, the relocation scheme designed to move certain eligible candidates to other European countries to seek asylum began to scale up.

¹ <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/46970>

² <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean/location/5179>

³ The EU-Turkey Statement is a statement of cooperation between European states and the Turkish government. It seeks to control the crossing of refugees and migrants from Turkey to the Greek Islands, and was initially intended to curb the large numbers of people traveling illegally to Europe. “1) All new irregular migrants crossing from Turkey into Greek islands as from 20 March 2016 will be returned to Turkey... 2) For every Syrian being returned to Turkey from Greek islands, another Syrian will be resettled from Turkey to the EU taking into account the UN Vulnerability Criteria.”

⁴ Lagadikia, Nea Kavala, Giannitsa, Veroia, Alexandria, Vagiochori, Sinatex, Vasilika, Serres, Drama, Kavala, Halkero, Petra Olympou, Nireas, Frakaport, SOFTEX, Dion Avete, Derveni, Oraiokastros, Ktima Iraklis, Kipselohori, Koutsohero, Roka, Trikala, Volos, Katsikas, Faneromeni, Tsepelovo, Konitsa, Agia Eleni, Doliana, Filipiada, Herso, Karamanlis, Diavata.

Challenges followed in the coming months with delays in relocation and family reunification procedures meaning that the onward movement of persons in the ORFs was slowed. Works to upgrade and winterize sites were also delayed. These factors resulted in persons continuing to live in substandard conditions, in areas that were intended for short term stays. This became increasingly problematic as winter of 2016 advanced.

In parallel, UNHCR and its partners gradually established urban accommodation schemes. The purpose was to provide additional space for refugees and asylum seekers, with a focus on the most vulnerable, for whom accommodation in the ORFs was unsuitable. Initially the majority of spaces were allocated to vulnerable relocation candidates, but as the demographic in the country, and the needs changed, this later shifted to include those seeking asylum in Greece. Other NGOs set up parallel schemes providing shelter to asylum seekers.

In the following months arrivals to the islands continued at a steady albeit reduced pace, and regular movements of persons onward to the mainland were carried out by the Greek Authorities in coordination with UNHCR. Persons were only transferred to the mainland when they were exempted from the border asylum procedures or, for Syrians particularly, their application was considered admissible to be examined in Greece, according to the legal provisions introduced for the implementation of the EU -Turkey Statement. At the same time, a number of ORFs on the mainland that had been designated as temporary sites began to shut down, putting increasing pressure on available space.

The influx of refugees via the Eastern Mediterranean route increased significantly in the second half of 2017. Approximately 26,000 people arrived in Greece by land and sea during

this period.⁵ An increase in arrivals via Evros at the Greek-Turkish land border was noted in 2017 as a whole. 5,677 arrivals were recorded that year, while Turkey reported intercepting a further 28,400 attempting to cross via the land route⁶.

Some persons stopped at the Reception and Identification Centre (RIC) in Filakio, Evros. There, some of them were registered by the government and then allocated to ORFs further inland. Contrary to the island transfers no official transportation was provided for the people registered in Fylakio. An increasing trend was noted in persons of concern arriving directly to Thessaloniki, without stopping at the border to present themselves to the authorities. This new trend was attributed to a number of factors, but primarily because smugglers were transporting people directly to Thessaloniki city rather than to the reception facility at Fylakio. For the purpose of this report the term spontaneous arrival⁷ will be used when discussing this group.

As persons were spontaneously arriving in sites outside of official transfers (from the islands or RIC Fylakio), they were not officially registered as residing there by the Greek authorities. This left them without access to a dignified shelter, or other forms of basic assistance available to persons registered in an accommodation programme or an ORF. They were also not eligible for the cash assistance grant provided on a monthly basis to all asylum seekers in Greece as they did not meet one of the eligibility criteria, i.e. being registered in a site or providing a residential address. As the numbers of persons in this precarious situation increased their situation became increasingly problematic. Some found informal or temporary accommodation arrangements in urban centres, some went to live unofficially in the ORFs, others found places in squats or slept on the street of Thessaloniki and Athens, and others continued their onward journey outside of Greece.

⁵ Desperate Journeys, January-July 2018, p.8, UNHCR. <http://www.unhcr.org/desperatejourneys/>.

⁶ Desperate Journeys, January 2017-March 2018, UNHCR <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/63039>

⁷ Spontaneous arrivals can be defined as persons who arrived to Thessaloniki without being part of an official transfer organised by the Greek Authorities. These are persons who arrived to Greece via the Evros border travelling directly to Thessaloniki and the surrounding area without stopping at the RIC facility at Filakio or persons who were released from the RIC facility in Evros without being included in an official transfer to an ORF. The majority of these persons hold no documentation at all or they hold a valid or expired Police note. The Police Note is an administrative document given by the Police after the registration of the person in a Police station. By holding this paper, the person has the right to legally stay in Greece for a period of time after the date of issuance. The duration of Police Notes varies they can be issued for a minimum period of 30 days and for a maximum period of 6 months.

Arrivals via the land border continued in 2018 and in April 2018 the land arrivals surpassed the ones on the islands⁸. The increased arrivals via Evros and the shortage of space at the ORFs and in the urban accommodation programmes continued. In April 2018 there was a sudden influx of new arrivals, who began to gather in larger numbers at points in the city centre. They were later redirected to two ORFs (Lagadikia & Diavata) where they awaited registration, sleeping outdoors in tents and public buildings. While efforts to redirect these persons to locations where they can access basic assistance continue, at the time of writing the problem persists and arrivals both via the islands and the land border continue.

At this time the majority of refugees and asylum seekers in Thessaloniki Metropolitan area reside in apartments rather than in ORFs. There is only one site connected with Thessaloniki's public bus routes, all other sites are located far away from the city. While information is available on asylum seekers and refugees residing in urban accommodation schemes and open accommodation sites, much less is known about those who are self-accommodated, the ones who reside unofficially in open accommodation sites and others who arrived spontaneously.

As increasing numbers of persons are granted asylum in Greece, there is a need to shift focus toward the longer-term needs of this growing population. During the interviews (2018), the government was in the process of defining the timeframe concerning how long beneficiaries of international protection are eligible to continue to receive assistance after being granted their status. However, as of March 2019, the discontinuation of assistance provision has been officially decided, with the ministerial decision 6382/2019 (Government Gazette B' 853/12.3.2019), and it is 6 months after the delivery of the positive Refugee Status Determination decision. While some initiatives to promote integration and self-reliance are underway, a number of obstacles remain particularly in the area of access to employment.

WHY A PROFILING IN THESSALONIKI?


In October 2016 the Thessaloniki Urban Working Group (UWG) was established to enhance coordination of humanitarian actors and address challenges related to working with the displaced population in Thessaloniki. The UWG is co-chaired by the Municipality of Thessaloniki and UNHCR, other members include a wide range of urban responders including neighboring municipalities, NGOs, civil society and ad hoc attendance by line ministries.

In March 2017 an UWG strategy development process was initiated. Lack of data about the urban refugee population residing in the greater area of Thessaloniki was highlighted as a critical concern. In addition, the Municipality of Thessaloniki was engaged in finalizing its Integrated Action Plan for the Integration of Refugees and Migrants, where monitoring of integration vis-à-vis a baseline as well as robust data on which to base planning and programming on was deemed essential. As a result of this, the Municipality of Thessaloniki formally requested UNHCR's support to initiate a comprehensive urban profiling exercise. Upon the joint request by the Municipality of Thessaloniki and UNHCR, the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) supported the exercise throughout the process, both through engagement in an advisory capacity and offering technical support.

To lead the exercise, a Profiling Advisory Group was established in October 2017. It was composed of representatives of the Municipality of Thessaloniki, Alkyone, ARSIS, Solidarity Now, INTERSOS, Help Refugees, Omnes, UNHCR, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The purpose of the Advisory Group was to advise and direct the profiling activities, to approve the profiling objectives, to provide input to findings (preliminary and final), and to endorse the profiling report.

⁸ UNHCR Fact Sheet for Greece, May 2018. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/64032.pdf>

THE PROFILING PROCESS AND HIGHLIGHTS



In addition, a Profiling Technical Group was also set up. It was made up of focal persons appointed by the Advisory Group. Its purpose was to plan the profiling activities, and to provide input to all technical profiling documents (e.g. indicators, questionnaires, analysis plans, etc.).

To ensure a successful outcome from the profiling exercise, extensive consultations with all relevant stakeholders on overarching as well as technical issues was essential. Meetings of both the Advisory and the Technical Groups took place at various stages in the profiling process to facilitate this. This included a joint workshop to define the profiling indicators, as well as a joint workshop to interpret preliminary profiling results and direct the analysis.

PROFILING OBJECTIVES AND ANALYSIS STRUCTURE

The profiling exercise aims to provide the Municipality of Thessaloniki, and other relevant actors with the requisite information to allow them to design advocacy initiatives, policy, service provision, and integration programmes, that are better tailored to meet the needs of persons affected by displacement, in the Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki.

The specific objectives agreed upon were as follows:

- ➔ To produce a demographic profile of the refugees, asylum seekers and spontaneous arrivals disaggregated by sex, age and other relevant diversity criteria;
- ➔ To analyze the capacities, vulnerabilities and coping mechanisms of the target populations;
- ➔ To assess the degree of integration of the target populations, with a focus on access to services;
- ➔ To produce a set of indicators for measuring the degree of integration.⁹

Persons affected by displacement residing in the area of Thessaloniki cannot be viewed as a monolithic group. This is due to a number of important factors that vary significantly among different sub groups. These factors include legal status, documentation, ability to access assistance and accessibility of population.

As a result of this, for the purpose of this report, the target population was separated into two categories that are analyzed separately:

- ① asylum seekers and refugees, analysed in chapter 3;
- ② third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service, including police note holders as well as persons with expired, or no documentation for their residence in Greece, analyzed in chapter 4.

Different sampling approaches were designed for these two groups, as explained in further detail in the methodology chapter. This means that a comparative analysis of the data between the two groups is not possible.

The first category, asylum seekers and refugees is further broken down into three sub categories based on accommodation type as follows:

- ① ESTIA¹⁰ accommodation scheme;
- ② Open Reception Facility (Diavata); and
- ③ Self – Accommodated.¹¹ A comparative analysis is made between refugees and asylum seekers in the accommodation schemes, the ORF in Diavata, and the self-accommodated.

⁹ The selection of core indicators to measure integration while using the profiling results as a baseline, will be done upon the completion of the profiling process by the Municipality of Thessaloniki and the Profiling Advisory Group, in coordination with other efforts of developing indicators at the European level (CoE, OECD) as well as national level (such as a similar initiative of the Municipality of Athens).

¹⁰ The Emergency Support to Integration & Accommodation (ESTIA) scheme provides urban accommodation to refugees and asylum seekers in apartments. It is run by UNHCR in coordination with 12 partner organizations throughout Northern and Central Greece.

¹¹ This is defined as those who are either renting an apartment through their own means, either through a formal lease or informal subletting, or being hosted by friend or relatives. (More details on the definition of the population groups included in the study are provided in the next chapter on Methodology).

2.

Profiling Methodology



TARGET GROUPS AND GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

As laid out in Chapter 1, the profiling exercise included the following two target groups:

➔ **Refugees and asylum seekers** who arrived to Thessaloniki after January 2015.¹² This target group includes persons with asylum seeker pre-registration card, asylum seeker full registration card, decision paper on granted asylum, residence card permit or asylum application under administrative appeal. The groups were divided into three subgroups (also referred to as 'strata') defined by their accommodation situation. Strata one is made up of those in the urban accommodation scheme who have been provided with apartments through the ESTIA scheme. Strata two is made up of the self-accommodated households in Thessaloniki, which are defined as those that are either renting an apartment by themselves, or being hosted by friend, relatives or volunteers. Strata three is made up of residents registered in the Open Reception Facilities in Diavata.

➔ **Third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service** includes persons with police notes, or persons whose documentation issued by the Greek State has expired, or persons who have not been issued documentation by

the Greek State. The study included persons residing unofficially in the ORFs, persons who are hosted by individuals in Thessaloniki as well as persons living in a situation of homelessness.¹³

Refugees and asylum seekers without a valid home address were not included in the study. This is due to the fact that information on them is not available through the databases to which the profiling team could gain access. Lack of available data on this population meant that it was not possible to draw a sample. Furthermore, refugees and asylum seekers of Turkish nationality have not been included in the survey because access to their exact addresses was not given due to protection concerns. Therefore, focus group discussions were conducted with the Turkish population.

The geographic scope of the profiling includes the six boroughs of the Thessaloniki Municipality and the surrounding Municipalities of: Kalamaria, Neapolis-Sikeon, Pavlou Mela, Kordeliou-Evosmos, Ampelokipon-Menemenis, Delta, Thermenis and Oreokastro. Residents of the open reception facility of Diavata¹⁴ were also included in the exercise. The reason for selecting this ORF was its proximity to the city of Thessaloniki and the regular use of city services by its residents.

¹² The refugees and asylum seekers, who arrived before 2015, are a small group in comparison with those that arrived in 2015 and later. This pre-2015 group had a notably different experience due to the nature of reception and response at that time. As a result the asylum seekers arriving before 2015 are considered to be in a very different situation and have not been included in this study.

¹³ The usage of the term homeless is based on the definition established through Law 4052/2012 Art. 29: '(1) Homeless persons are recognized as a vulnerable social group that receives social protection. Homeless persons are defined as all persons legally residing in the country, who lack access to safe and adequate accommodation, owned, rented or freely released, and which would meet the technical requirements and basic amenities for water and electricity; (2) The homeless population include those living on the street or in shelters and those who are hosted, due to necessity, in institutions or other forms of institutional care.' For the purposes of this study, persons who at the time of the data collection had not yet legalized their status are also included in the category of 'homeless'. Additionally, the institutional shelters were excluded, due to the fact that this option was not available to the target group.

¹⁴ The profiling team originally identified two ORFs, Lagadikia and Diavata as meeting the criteria of proximity to the city and residents making use of city services. However, due to complications in gaining access to Lagadikia in the timeframe allowed for the data collection it was decided that all data collection for this sub group would be carried out in Diavata.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS TO SHAPE ANALYSIS APPROACH AND TOOLS

A number of meetings were held in the Profiling Technical Group to discuss approaches to analyzing local integration. It was agreed to look at integration as:

- ➔ a **multifaceted concept** comprising the following four dimensions: legal integration, economic integration, socio-cultural integration and political/civic integration.¹⁵
- ➔ a **gradual process** moving from limited integration (e.g. economically dependent, socio-culturally excluded, politically passive) towards greater integration (e.g. self-reliant, socio-culturally included, engaged in the community) along each the above-mentioned four dimensions. The analysis would thus focus on capturing the extent to which persons are integrated along the different dimensions.
- ➔ as a process that includes **many actors**:¹⁶ the displaced population, the hosting population, the authorities, the civil society, and the humanitarian/development sector. An understanding of the role of all these actors is ideally required to properly analyse the process of integration. This study contributes primarily with data on the displaced population and should be complemented with an analysis of the role of the other actors.
- ➔ a process that is **defined by the future intentions of the persons as well as their demographic characteristics** (e.g. sex, age, capacities and skills).

¹⁵ See also The Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU, adopted by the Justice and Home Affairs Council in November 2004: <https://bit.ly/2KPfVvm>

¹⁶ According to UNHCR 2005 EXCOM Conclusions on Local Integration: 'Noting that local integration in the refugee context is a dynamic and multifaceted two-way process, which requires efforts by all parties concerned, including a preparedness on the part of refugees to adapt to the host society without having to forego their own cultural identity, and a corresponding readiness on the part of host communities and public institutions to welcome refugees and to meet the needs of a diverse population,' See: <https://bit.ly/2QynKO7>

BOX 1:

DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL DOCUMENTS

Asylum seeker pre-registration card:

The card asylum seekers are provided with, after their preregistration as such. It contains the date of the full registration appointment.

Asylum seekers full registration card:

The card asylum seekers are provided with, after they have completed their full registration. It usually contains the date of the interview appointment.

Decision granting international protection status (refugee or subsidiary protection):

The decision of the Asylum Service (first instance) that grants the applicant with the International Protection Status (refugee or subsidiary protection status)

Residence permit card:

Recognized refugees are provided with a residence permit card a few months after they receive the decision on granted asylum.


Asylum application under administrative appeal:

In case the application is rejected by the Asylum Service or instead of the requested refugee status, subsidiary protection status is granted, the applicant has the right to appeal to an Independent Appeals Committee (second instance).

Police note:

It is a document issued by the Police to third country nationals that enter Greece and allows them to stay in the country for a specific period of time, either ascertaining that return to the country of origin is not possible, or providing a deadline during which the person has to leave Greece. The duration of stay granted in a police note varies based on a number of factors and ranges between thirty days and six months.

ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROFILING IN THESSALONIKI



This analysis framework draws on the Durable Solutions Analysis Guide which operationalizes the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs. For more see: <http://inform-durablesolutions-idp.org>

The Profiling Technical Working Group worked on the development of indicators to address the four dimensions of local integration. A joint one-day workshop was held, where all profiling partners reviewed and prioritized indicators. This became the foundation of the profiling questionnaire (see Annex 1 for the developed indicator and question list). The household survey was conducted between the months of April and July 2018 with mobile devices. For the group of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service a shorter list of indicators and questions was prioritized, acknowledging that certain topics were less relevant given the much shorter length of stay in Thessaloniki.

A mixed methods approach was used in the profiling exercise, where both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were combined, depending on the information sought. The approach included key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and a household survey. The different methods used throughout the process are described in detail below.

QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION

Qualitative data in the form of focus group discussions (FGDs), and mixed group discussions was collected at several stages during the profiling exercise for different purposes. Specifically:

- ➔ Four group discussions with refugees and asylum seekers were carried out during the design phase of the profiling, in order to better understand, how to approach the concept of local integration and how to best shape the indicators and data collection tools (see Box 2).
- ➔ Four focus group discussions were carried out with of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service residing in the ORF in Diavata, in the vicinity of Thessaloniki; two focus groups with Arabic speakers and two focus groups with Farsi speakers, divided according to sex. The identified FGD participants had been living in Thessaloniki as homeless or informally accommodated for a longer period of time, before moving from the centre to reside informally in Diavata. These FGDs aimed at supplementing the survey results, which primarily captured third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service having been in Thessaloniki for less than one month.¹⁷

¹⁷ It seems likely that this was due to the aforementioned influx of spontaneous arrivals in the month of April 2018 (see Chapter 1 for more details), which was also the month of data collection for this group.

BOX 2:

INTERACTIVE APPROACHES INFORMING THE LOCAL INTEGRATION ANALYSIS



The FGDs informed the understanding of local integration and the way the survey tool was designed in the following ways:

- i. Given the relatively short length of time that the targeted population had been living in Greece (many less than 6 months), FGD participants prioritized consistently access to work, housing and documentation as key to local integration. It was therefore decided that while keeping the holistic approach to the analysis of integration (including cultural and civic integration), the data collection tool would focus particularly on access to livelihoods, documentation and housing.
- ii. Each focus group highlighted a somewhat different set of key integration elements, depending on the legal status and housing situation of the participants. This highlighted the need to analyze integration in the light of the documentation status and housing situation of the persons, and therefore the sample was also stratified by legal status and housing situation. The results of these consultations were presented at the joint analysis workshop with all profiling partners, to ensure that all decisions regarding interpretation and analysis of data retained the perspective of affected populations.

One of the approaches used included an interactive session, where participants were asked to prioritise a number of elements of local integration that were illustrated on cards.

The cards depicted among other things: language skills, employment, documentation, relations to local population, access to administrative services, access to health and education.

BOX 3:

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & VALIDATION OF PROFILING RESULTS

A number of consultations with refugees and asylum seekers were held during the preliminary analysis of the profiling results. The aim was two-fold: to share preliminary results with the surveyed groups and to discuss and validate the findings.

A total of three consultation sessions were carried out: one in Arabic, one in Urdu and one in Farsi. All sessions included both men and women. The team of facilitators that was identified was made up of persons with the relevant language skills and who had also worked as enumerators during the profiling survey. The latter meant they had a good understanding of the situation of refugees and asylum seekers living in Thessaloniki. Additionally, they were familiar with the data collection tool and how the surveys were carried out.

During each consultation, preliminary profiling results were presented on posters through data visualizations and key statements, translated into the relevant languages. These posters formed the basis for the joint discussion and interpretation. In addition to validating results, the participants also brainstormed on potential solutions and provided recommendations on how the final profiling results should be shared with the refugee and asylum seeker communities.

The results of these consultations were presented at the joint analysis workshop with all profiling partners, to ensure that all decisions regarding interpretation and analysis of data retained the perspective of affected populations.

- ➡ Group discussions with enumerators that had worked on the survey were carried out during the analysis phase. This was done in order to validate and inform the interpretation of the preliminary survey results.
- ➡ Finally, community consultations with refugees and asylum seekers were held, with the two-fold objectives of sharing preliminary profiling results with the surveyed communities and simultaneously discuss and contextualize the results (see box 3).

QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION

Different sampling approaches were developed for the target group of refugees and asylum seekers, and for the target group of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service. The sampling approaches and their limitations are described below.

Sampling approach for refugees and asylum seekers: description & limitations

In total, the survey of refugees and asylum seekers covered 1,808 individuals comprising 641 households. The sample was stratified by accommodation type into three strata:

- ➊ Those in the urban accommodation scheme who have been provided with apartments through the ESTIA scheme.
- ➋ Those self-accommodated in Thessaloniki, i.e. are either renting an apartment by themselves, or being hosted by friends, relatives or volunteers.
- ➌ Those who were fully registered residents of the Open Reception Facilities (ORF) in Diavata.

Table 1: Population and sample size per strata, household and individual level

Strata	Population		Sample	
	Households	Persons	Households	Persons
Open Reception Facility	148	565	148	565
Self-accommodated	482	592	161	248
Accommodation scheme	1,280	2,910	332	995
Total	1,910	4,067	641	1,808

The sampling frame for refugees and asylum seekers was UNHCR's ProGres database, while for the ORF in Diavata, a site population list provided by the camp manager was used as a basis to generate a sample.

A simple random sample of households was initially drawn for the accommodation scheme strata and the self-accommodated strata shortly before the data collection was due to begin. During data collection, reaching a majority of the sampled households was challenging due to the listed phone numbers being outdated, as persons of concern often change their pre-paid SIM cards. Unannounced home visits were not an option given time and resource constraints. It was therefore decided to aim for full coverage of both these strata, expecting that a high proportion of the persons in the ProGres database for these strata would not be reachable by phone. To assess potential bias introduced by this approach, the demographic profile of the surveyed persons was compared to that of the whole population of refugees and asylum seekers in the UNHCR ProGres database. The age and sex figures of the population were compared to the survey figures. The sample distributions resemble the population distributions quite closely on the basis of these demographic characteristics.¹⁸ As such, the overall impression is that there is little skew in the survey data for these two strata. It is therefore assumed

that the survey results are representative and can be applied to the population as a whole (see Annex 2 for the representativity analysis).

For the strata of the Open Reception Facility (ORF) in Diavata, the most update site registration list was obtained from the Reception and Identification Service (RIS) that manages the site. The enumerators managed to get in touch with at least one representative of each of the registered households living in the site at the time of the data collection. No one declined the request for an interview. It was not relevant to compare the surveyed population to the UNHCR database list to assess representativity, given that the population in the site had changed significantly since the list for that strata had been assembled by the camp manager in the site. Since a full count of the site population was achieved, the results are considered to be representative for the population that lived in Diavata at the time the survey was conducted (June 2018).

It should be noted that the population in the strata of the ORF in Diavata is very small in comparison to the other strata. For some variables, the number of observations is very low, which makes the analysis of these results less certain. Such cases are indicated in the analysis.

¹⁸ It was not a goal to obtain data that is representative by nationality. The population and survey figures were nevertheless compared. In both the accommodated and self-accommodated strata the survey participants are distributed across the nationalities in proportions that roughly resemble the population, with some exceptions. In the 'accommodation scheme strata', the sample is the most "off" in the case of Syrians, who are underrepresented. Syrians are the largest refugee- and asylum seeker group in Thessaloniki, and one would need another 55 Syrians in the sample to make the proportion of Syrians in the sample equal to the proportion in the population. In the self- accommodated sample, the sample is the most "off" in the case of Pakistanis, who are also underrepresented. As it was not a goal to obtain data that would be representative in terms of nationality, any implications this may have for the analysis have not been explored.

Table 2: Number of persons in the population, number of surveyed persons, and coverage, by strata

Strata	Population (N)	Sample (N)	Coverage (%)
Open Reception Facility	565	565	100
Self-accommodated	592	248	41.2
Accommodated	2,910	995	34.2
Total	4,070	1,808	–

The response rates differ across the three strata, as illustrated in the 'coverage' column in the table below. To adjust this, post-stratification weights were calculated and applied in tables where the respondents of all three strata are considered together, i.e. where the variable of interest is not broken down by strata.

Sampling of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service: description & limitations

The unified registry for persons with police notes (EURODAC II) could not be accessed for the purpose of the profiling study. Although organizations that provide assistance to police note holders hold information about this population group, including UNHCR which provides cash assistance, there is no exhaustive list. Similarly there is no unified registry for undocumented persons. However, through comparing aggregated information from multiple service providers, a population figure of 200 households was estimated as a rough baseline.

In the absence of a registry, it was not possible to construct a list from which a random sample could be drawn. Thus, a non-probability sampling strategy was applied, which included convenience sampling approaches¹⁹. With non-probability approaches it is not possible to establish how well the sample represents the population unless all members of a given target group have been interviewed.

The enumeration team interviewed 451 persons making up 227 households under the category of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service. This number of households interviewed was slightly higher than the number originally foreseen, a possible explanation for this being the aforementioned influx of arrivals to Thessaloniki the same month. The survey results support this theory, as more than half of the survey respondents from this target group had been in Thessaloniki for less than a month at the time of the interview. The high number of recent arrivals made the estimate of the total population more uncertain. In addition, many of the persons who were approached, declined to be interviewed. As a result, it is difficult to assess how representative the interviewees were of the target group.

¹⁹ Convenience sampling is a type of non-probability sampling method, where the sample is taken from a group of people easy to contact or to reach, e.g. by snowballing techniques where respondents identify other respondents known to them.

3.

Refugees & Asylum Seekers: Exploring the Potential for Local Integration

Sample

DESCRIPTION & REPRESENTATIVITY

The sample of asylum seekers and refugees included a total of **1,808 individuals** comprising **641 households**. All of those surveyed resided in the Municipality of Thessaloniki and the surrounding Municipalities, including the Open Reception Facility (ORF) in Diavata.

The surveyed households were divided into three groups according to where and how they were accommodated. This was due to the fact that their accommodation was deemed to be a defining factor for other key issues pertaining to their living conditions. The three strata include:

- Refugees and asylum seekers residing in the ESTIA²⁰ accommodation scheme (332 households, 995 individuals);
- Refugees and asylum seekers officially residing in the ORF in Diavata (148 households, 565 individuals);
- Refugees and asylum seekers who have secured accommodation through renting or being hosted by others. This group are referred to as self-accommodated for the purposes of this report (161 households, 248 individuals).

The analysis of the situation of refugees and asylum seekers focuses on the differences and similarities between these three groups

The sample of households in the accommodation scheme, and those who are self-accommodated, is assumed to be representative of the total population in these strata in the Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki (see Methodology chapter for more on the representativity analysis). The results from the ORF in Diavata are representative of the site population at the time of the survey, as the data collection covered the full population on the site. Weights have been applied to the three strata to allow for an analysis of the total refugee and asylum seeker sample, when thematically relevant, or when the observations by strata are too few to allow for separate analysis.

For a detailed description of the sample refer to the Methodology chapter above.

²⁰ The Emergency Support to Integration & Accommodation (ESTIA) scheme provides urban accommodation to refugees and asylum seekers in apartments. It is run by UNHCR in coordination with 12 partner organisations throughout Northern and Central Greece.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND DISPLACEMENT PROFILE

Accommodation situations

The study covered the asylum seekers and refugees in the broader Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki. This includes the six boroughs of the Municipality of Thessaloniki, as well as the surrounding Municipalities of: Kalamaria, Neapolis-Sikeon, Pavlou Mela, Kordeliou-Evosmos, Ampelokipon-Menemenis, Delta, Thermenis and Oreokastro. In addition, the Open Reception Facility (ORF) of Diavata was included, given its proximity of the city of Thessaloniki and the regular use of city services by the residents.

At the time of sampling, the ESTIA accommodation scheme hosted a total of 1,280 households (4067 individuals) with refugee or asylum seeker status in the Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki. According to the database from which the sample was drawn, there were 482 households (592 individuals)²¹ who were self-accommodated in the Metropolitan area of Thessaloniki. The ORF in Diavata had a population of 148 registered households (565 individuals) at the time of the study.²²

Under the accommodation scheme, apartments furnished with basic equipment are provided to refugees and asylum seekers by humanitarian actors based on vulnerability.²³ The residents do not pay rent, utility costs or any related expenses, but need to cover the costs for any additional furniture, or household appliances. All households receive a standard monthly cash grant which varies according to family size. Asylum seekers

and refugees in the accommodation scheme live primarily in individual apartments, while some reside in community buildings.²⁴ The accommodation is scattered throughout the greater area of Thessaloniki.

The self-accommodated group was primarily made up of households that are renting their own apartment and therefore have to cover any housing related expenses themselves. This applied to 76% of the self-accommodated households that participated in the survey. The remaining 24% were being hosted for free by family, friends, volunteers, or faith-based organizations.

The third group of refugees and asylum seekers who were living in the Diavata ORF were staying in containers as a household, or in some cases, as an exceptional measure, sharing a container with another household.²⁵ Basic services including health, education, shelter, basic non-food items and internet are provided by the different organizations working inside the site. Registered residents in the site also receive the standard monthly cash grant. This group was not expected to cover additional housing related expenses such as utility bills.

Sex, age and household size

The basic demographic characteristics in term of sex and age²⁶ differed significantly between the households in the accommodation scheme and the ORF on one hand, and the self-accommodated households on the other. Women made up 43% and 44% of the individuals in the accommodation scheme and the ORF respectively, while in self-accommodation only 21% were women.

²¹ UNHCR ProGres data as of May 2018.

²² The total number of the persons residing unregistered in the ORF was not known. Many of them have been included in the group of 'persons with no asylum service documentation' analyzed 'third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service' analyzed in the subsequent chapter.


²³ According to Article 14, §8 of the Law on the structure and function of the Asylum Service, the following categories are defined as vulnerable: (a) unaccompanied minors, (b) persons with disability or suffer from incurable or serious illness, c) the elderly, d) women in pregnancy or in the postpartum, e) single parent families with minor children, f) victims of torture, rape or sexual violence or exploitation, persons with post-traumatic stress disorder, particularly survivors and victims of shipwrecks; and (g) victims of human trafficking.

²⁴ These are blocks of apartments rented by humanitarian organizations to accommodate asylum seekers and refugees.

²⁵ MoMP policy is to accommodate one family per container. It is only in exceptional cases due to the need to urgently accommodate new arrivals that more than one family will live in the same container.

²⁶ The presented data on sex and age in the accommodation scheme and self-accommodation derive from UNHCR's ProGres database (ProGres) as of May 2018, while the sex and age data for the ORF derive from the profiling survey, as the data collection included a full count of the site.

Figure 1: Age distribution of refugees and asylum seekers by accommodation strata. (Age data on the population in the accommodation scheme and self-accommodation derive from UNHCR's ProGres database while the age data on the ORF in Diavata derive from the profiling survey/count.)




The age distribution also differed between the three groups, indicating more similarities between the groups in the accommodation scheme and the ORF, compared to the self-accommodated population. 60% of the population in the accommodation scheme and 52% in the ORF were younger than 18 years of age, while that was only the case for 14% of the self-accommodated group. Across all groups the proportion of persons above 55 years of age was very low (between 2-3%).

The percentage of single person households was highest among the self-accommodated (51% of all

households). As single men are less likely to meet the vulnerability criteria that are required to be admitted to the accommodation scheme, they are more likely to try to find their own solutions for accommodation. However, one must also bear in mind that the accommodation solutions found by single men may be very temporary and informal without the backing of an NGO or UNHCR to ensure minimum standards are met. In the accommodation scheme and the ORF in Diavata there was also more diversity in the household sizes. These households were primarily made up of families with children, averaging 4-7 members.

Figure 2: Household sizes across accommodation strata



Nationalities and legal status

According to UNHCR's ProGres database, the main nationalities hosted in the accommodation scheme are Syrians (46%), Iraqis (25%) and to a lesser extent Afghans (9%). Most persons sampled from the accommodation scheme for the profiling survey had fully registered with the Greek Asylum Office (ASO) (65%), whereas the recognized refugees comprised 33%. Only a very small number of persons were found whose asylum applications had been rejected at first instance²⁷ or at second instance and had appealed²⁸ in the competent administrative court (13 persons in total).

In Diavata the majority of the registered population was from Syria (41%), Afghanistan (26%) and Iraq (21%). According to the profiling survey, 64% of the individuals had been fully registered with the Greek Asylum Office, 25% had been granted asylum in Greece while 10% had pre-registered their asylum claim.²⁹

The main nationalities of the self-accommodated population differed significantly from the above. According to UNHCR's database, 44% were from Pakistan and only 20% were from Syria. The remaining 36% were distributed across a larger number of nationalities. According to the profiling survey, most self-accommodated persons were fully registered with the Greek Asylum Office (61%) and 25% were recognized refugees.

Literacy, education and health

Basic education, literacy and being in good health are important factors for being able to find work and provide for oneself and one's family. These factors are considered here in order to give an

overview of the situation and basic capacities of the refugee and asylum seeker population by accommodation strata.

Literacy³⁰ levels were found to be lower in the ORF in Diavata and amongst the self-accommodated (68%), than among the individuals in the accommodation scheme (76%). There was no significant difference noted in literacy levels between men and women across the strata. It was observed that literacy rates were highest among the Afghan (82%) and Iraqi (80%) population surveyed, and somewhat lower among Syrian (68%) and Pakistani (55%) respondents.

Table 3: Literacy among individuals 12 years and above among the main nationalities represented (N = total number of persons aged 12 years and above)

Afghan (N=170)	82%
Iraqi (N=259)	80%
Pakistani (N=115)	55%
Syrian (N=430)	68%

In total, across all accommodation types, 15% of the individuals above 18 years of age reported having no formal education. Self-accommodated individuals appeared to have completed higher levels of education in their home countries, with a combined 70% having completed secondary level education or a university degree.³¹ In the accommodation scheme and in Diavata the equivalent proportion was 52% and 51% respectively.

²⁷ Those whose asylum claim has been rejected in first instance may be in the process of appealing that rejection or taking a decision on whether or not to pursue an appeal.


²⁸ Those under administrative appeal have an asylum claim that has been rejected in second instance (they have exhausted the appeal option). They are pursuing an appeal on the grounds that there was an issue with the legal process itself, rather than claiming that elements in the merits of the claim itself had been overlooked.

²⁹ Persons who have declared their desire to seek asylum at the ASO and are waiting for the availability of an appointment in order to fully register their claim.

³⁰ Literacy is defined as the reported ability to read and write in one's mother tongue among all persons above 12 years of age.

³¹ The data show a discrepancy between the reported literacy of the self-accommodated refugees and asylum seekers and their reported highest level of completed education. While 32% report being illiterate, only 12% report having no formal education. This would indicate that persons having completed primary education still report being illiterate in their mother tongue. This should be explored further. A potential explanation could be that these persons have completed education in other countries and thus not in their mother tongue.

Figure 3: Highest education completed in country of origin by all persons above 18 years of age (N = total population above 18 years in each strata)



When looking at the highest education level completed in the country of origin amongst the survey respondents and comparing this across their length of stay in Thessaloniki,³² no particular difference was observed. The education levels of asylum seekers that had arrived to Thessaloniki over the past 2-3 years, seem to be roughly similar.


The survey respondents were asked if they, or anyone else in their family above 5 years of age, suffered from any serious health condition, including mental health conditions or disabilities that prevented them from carrying out usual daily tasks. Such a health condition would imply the need for care, and for the adult population it would prevent or impede their ability to work. 21% of the total population, reported such health conditions, with no particular difference between the accommodation strata or between men and women. When looking at the main nationalities represented, the proportion of households with someone suffering of such health conditions ranged between 19-27%.

Table 4: Proportion of households with at least one member suffering from serious health condition, including mental health condition, or disability that prevented them from doing usual daily tasks' (N = total number of households by nationality)

Afghan (N = 254)	19%
Iranian (N = 95)	16%
Iraqi (N = 420)	22%
Pakistani (N = 122)	27%
Syrian (N = 700)	20%

³² Length of stay in Thessaloniki was only asked to the survey respondents specifically and cannot be assumed to apply to the rest of their household, therefore this analysis only pertains to the survey respondents.

Figure 4: Highest education level completed by survey respondents in country of origin by length of stay in Thessaloniki (N = total number of respondents by length of stay)



MIGRATION AND LENGTH OF STAY IN THESSALONIKI

The majority of respondents in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata had been in Thessaloniki less than one year, at the time of the study (79% and 78% respectively). That proportion was lower among the self-accommodated refugees and asylum seekers, as about half (49%) had been in Thessaloniki longer than one year.

Households arriving during 2017, and now residing in the accommodation scheme and the ORF in Diavata, reported entering Greece mainly via the Greek islands. However, among households arriving during January to June 2018, a change in the travel pattern was observed, as 72% had reached Greece via the Evros land border.

Refugees and asylum seekers in self-accommodation having arrived during 2017 entered Greece through the islands and from the Evros land border in similar proportions (46% and 44% respectively). Also among these households did the trend change during the first half of 2018, where a majority (69%) entered Greece over the Evros land border.


ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT AND LIVELIHOOD MEANS

Employment is defined as any activities a person undertook for remuneration, for example working for wages or benefit in-kind, running a business (e.g. selling on the street), or working in the agricultural sector, for at least one hour during the four weeks preceding the survey. According to Greek law the right to employment varies depending on the legal status of the individual. Asylum seekers' right to employment is restricted,³³ whereas recognized refugees have the same rights as a Greek national. The study aimed to identify formal employment as well as informal employment among the working age population, between the ages of 15 and 67. It should be noted that due to the small number of employed persons, the analysis of the employed population is not done by accommodation strata but for the whole refugee and asylum seeker population.

It should also be noted that it is expected that some respondents may not have been willing to report their employment, if this was informal or illegal for fear of potential repercussions.

³³ Persons obtaining the asylum seeker status are allowed access to the labour market but can only work as employees and are not allowed to set up their own business.

Figure 5: Length of stay in Thessaloniki of survey respondents (N = survey respondents only, as their length of stay may not be the same as that of their family members).



This section explores both the persons that managed to find employment and looks at their employment conditions, as well as the unemployed and economically inactive persons and the obstacles they face in accessing work. Finally, the chapter reviews the degree of economic resilience and sustainability of the refugee and asylum seeker households.

EMPLOYMENT DEFINITIONS:

All employment statistics are only relevant for the working age population, which is defined as individuals between 15 and 67 years of age.

Employed person:

someone who has worked at least one hour during the four weeks preceding the survey. Employment is defined as any activities a person undertook for remuneration, for example working for wages or benefit in-kind, running a business (e.g. selling on the street), or working in the agricultural sector.

Unemployed person:

someone who has not worked during the four weeks preceding the survey and is actively looking for work. Unemployed persons are considered together with the employed persons to be economically active, as they are available to the labour market.

Economically inactive person:

someone who is not looking for work and is thus unavailable to the labour market.

The working refugees and asylum seekers

A total of 9% of asylum seekers and refugees of working age reported having worked one hour at a minimum, in the four weeks preceding the survey. The employment rate was much smaller among women (2%) compared to that among men (13%). Of the working population, 44% were from Pakistan and 19% from Syria.


While the percentage of persons employed among refugees and asylum seekers in Diavata and in the accommodation scheme were almost identically low at 4% and 5% respectively, the employed proportion among the self-accommodated was remarkably higher at 33%. Among the employed persons, 43% worked full-time and 41% worked occasionally.³⁴ The vast majority of the working population (78%) reported to have had work experience prior to their arrival in Greece.

A high prevalence of under-employment was apparent, as 70% of the asylum seekers and refugees who had been working were actively looking for more work. The two main reported obstacles to finding more work were linked to lack of available jobs in Greece, due to the financial crisis, and insufficient knowledge of the Greek language. It was also noted that many of those who had found employment were underutilizing their existing qualifications, which indicates as second form of under-employment: the great majority (70%) of persons working in elementary occupations, consisting of simple tasks, had completed secondary level education or higher education (including university degrees).

The unemployed refugees and asylum seekers

Almost half of the working aged refugees and asylum seekers are looking for work (48%) and thus defined in this analysis as unemployed. One fifth of the working aged women were actively looking for work, while 73% of men fell into this category. This indicated that a much higher percentage of men than women are actively looking for work.

Figure 6: Employment status across the accommodation strata (N = working aged persons, 15-67 years of age)



³⁴ Occasional work refers to irregular intervals between the hours or days of work.

86% of the unemployed persons did have work prior to their displacement, and therefore had working experience. The main obstacles reported to finding a job were the same as indicated earlier among those seeking additional work, namely: lack of availability of employment opportunities in Greece coupled with inability to communicate in Greek to an adequate level. Lack of requisite documentation and issues related to individual's legal status were also mentioned but to a lesser extent.³⁵ Emphasis was put on the importance of learning the Greek language in several of the focus groups conducted with refugees and asylum seekers, as illustrated below:

“*I am an expert, I have a bachelor degree in electronic engineering, I want to have my own business and I need accommodation and assistance until I learn the language and can be more familiar with the situation in Greece. After that, I will find my own solutions, I will find my own way for living.*”

Adult man, asylum seeker

“*Personally, I love Greece, they have a rich culture and civilisation. And I don't have any money at all to try leaving Greece. If I find my own job I will leave the camp so that somebody else can take my place. I used to be a professional driver for all vehicles' categories. The main issue for all of us is the lack of knowledge of the Greek language.*”

Adult man, asylum seeker, Diavata ORF

At the same time, being able to learn the language was also linked by some focus group participants with the general living conditions and the 'peace of mind' as formulated by some persons. More specifically one participant summarized the discussion indicating that: "in my opinion, first of all, money is very important. If I don't have to worry about money I will have more mental

capacity to learn the language. If I don't have any concerns or stress I can learn the language more easily”.

The reported obstacles in obtaining formal employment and the strong desire to supplement the monthly cash grant³⁶ which is considered to be insufficient, had forced some persons into illegal income-generating activities. Consultations with asylum seekers and refugees revealed that income generating options were available through a number of illegal activities including smuggling, selling cigarettes on the street or dealing drugs. The community consultation participants had all heard about those activities by word of mouth from fellow community members. The extent to which the employment rate captured by the profiling reflected the informal labour market and employment that involved illegal activity was not clear. Consultations with NGO representatives revealed that refugees and asylum seekers hesitated to admit that they work. Those consulted believe that this reluctance is not only due to potential involvement in illegal activity, but also for fear of facing a reduction in their monthly cash assistance.


The economically inactive asylum seekers and refugees

A substantial proportion of refugees and asylum seekers (43%) reported not having worked and not looking for work. This group is defined as *economically inactive*. Similarly to the employed and unemployed groups, higher proportions of economically inactive persons were found in the accommodation scheme (45%) and in Diavata (55%), while only 20% were found to be economically inactive amongst self-accommodated working aged persons. The higher prevalence of economic inactivity among persons in the accommodation scheme and the ORF, might partly be linked to the fact that the accommodation scheme project and the mainland sites host the most vulnerable persons, who

³⁵ The latter finding on the main obstacles to access the job market is in line with information on access to labour market published in a briefing paper in 2017: *Transitioning to a government-run refugee and migrant response in Greece*, Joint Agency Briefing Paper, December 2017.

³⁶ The cash grant provided is the Minimum Expenditure Basket required to cover basic needs. The total amount a family can receive is on par with what a vulnerable Greek family would receive via the national Social Solidarity Income.

Figure 7: Reported reasons for not looking for work by sex (N = working age population by sex, 15-67 years)



need support and assistance. Furthermore, the population in the accommodation scheme and the ORF have some of their expenses covered (rent and utilities) and are therefore in a less urgent need of additional income beyond the cash assistance. In addition, as indicated earlier, the population in the ORF in Diavata, and in the accommodation scheme, has comparatively lower education levels (approximately 50% have completed secondary level education or a university degree) than the persons that are self-accommodated (where 70% have completed secondary level education or a university degree). The employment is higher (by more than 10 points) among the self-accommodated persons who have been in Thessaloniki for more than one year (44%) compared to those who have been in Thessaloniki less than one year (31%).

The percentage of economically inactive working aged women is much higher than that of men (73% and 24% respectively). Half of the economically inactive women reported household

related responsibilities as the reason. The reported reasons for inactivity amongst men are more varied with health being the main reason.


Economic welfare

All households were asked to prioritize their main two sources of income. Cash assistance³⁷ provided by UNHCR is the primary source of income for asylum seekers and refugees across all groups, 98% of the households in the accommodation scheme, 86 % of the households in the ORF in Diavata and 87% of the self-accommodated households.

A majority (68%) of the households in the accommodation scheme and in Diavata reported having no secondary source of income, while only 29% of the self-accommodated households reported having no secondary source of income. One third of the self-accommodated households indicated income from employment as their secondary source of income, which corresponds to the similar proportion of persons who reported

³⁷ The amount of cash assistance has been standardized by the Cash Working Group in agreement with the Greek Government. It is based on family size and the type of assistance provided to asylum seekers and refugees (it refers to catering services provided in some sites). It is set below the amount given to vulnerable Greek families by the social welfare system.

Figure 8: Most important second source of income by households – first source of income is the Cash Assistance Programme provided by UNHCR.



being employed. Remittances were listed as the secondary source of income for 17% of the households in the accommodation scheme and in Diavata, and 25% of the self-accommodated households. When broken down by nationality, remittances are reported as a key income source amongst mainly Pakistani households (37%), followed by Iraqi (21%), Syrian (14%) and Afghan (11%) households.

The economic resilience of the self-accommodated household was also approached by looking at the reported challenges linked to covering the monthly rent and utility costs. More than two thirds of the self-accommodated households (73%), who were renting their own apartment or were hosted with rent, were not always able to cover rent or utility bills during the 6 months preceding the survey. Furthermore, 66% of the self-accommodated households reported not being able to face unexpected expenses,³⁸ such as those linked to health or travel, during the same period. Despite the free accommodation (including rent and utilities) and the access to cash assistance,

half of the households in the accommodation scheme and the ORF in Diavata were also not able to cover similar unexpected expenses.

The municipality and some NGOs offer free services such as food, clothing or overnight shelter to persons who are in need. The self-accommodated households have used these services more than the other two groups. Despite the receipt of monthly cash assistance and free housing in the cases of asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme and the open accommodation site, participants in the focus group discussions mentioned struggling to cover the monthly expenses of the family with the assistance received.

³⁸ Defined as an amount of approximately 100 Euro.

ACCESS TO HOUSING AND SERVICES

Mobility and tenure insecurity

Security of housing tenure is very important for a sense of safety and to allow families to focus on longer term planning. Security of tenure refers to both the actual tenure of housing, in the form of e.g. rental contracts, as well as the perceived security of tenure, which refers to how long persons expected to be able to stay in their housing and whether they fear eviction. In the focus group discussions with refugees and asylum seekers, access to housing was consistently highlighted as one of the very key components and first steps to integration.

75% of the self-accommodated households were renting their own apartment,³⁹ with the vast majority of them (81%) reporting having a written rental contract. In addition, more than half of the self-accommodated households (53% out of 134 who replied to this question) expected to stay longer than 6 months in their current accommodation, whereas the rest either indicated a shorter period of time or were unsure. In most cases, the existence of a rental contract, did seem to influence positively the expectation of being able to remain in their current accommodation for more than 6 months.

The perceived tenure security is much lower for the asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme and the ORF in Diavata. In both cases at least 75% of the households stated that they were unsure how long they would be

able to stay in their current accommodation. There are a number of conditions associated with continued eligibility to live in the accommodation scheme. While no official government communication had been issued on a cut-off date for recognized refugees, during the community consultations, participants shared rumors that recognized refugees would be asked to leave the accommodation scheme six months after their recognition. Although it should be noted that persons, entering an ESTIA accommodation, receive and sign the acknowledgement of terms and conditions of accommodation, which clearly refer to 3 + 3 months (after recognition) with possibility of extension. The measure had not been implemented until March 2019. Furthermore, there has been a lack of certainty at different points in time regarding the duration of funding for the ORFs, which beneficiaries of the scheme have been aware of. These two factors were reported to have caused insecurity among the population surveyed.

Refugees and asylum seekers reported a relatively low degree of mobility⁴⁰ since arrival in Thessaloniki. In the ORF in Diavata, 82% of the registered residents had come directly to the site and had not lived elsewhere in Thessaloniki prior to that. Among the households residing in the accommodation scheme, the proportion having arrived directly to their allocated apartment was 68%. This is not surprising as the

Table 5: Number of moves since arrival in Thessaloniki of refugee and asylum seeker households (HHs)

	Accommodation scheme (N = 327 HHs)	Diavata ORF (N=147)	Self-accommodation (N = 157 HHs)
Came directly here	68%	82%	43%
Moved once	28%	15%	38%
Moved 2 times	4%	3%	14%
Moved more than 3 times	1%	1%	5%

³⁹ This includes cases where the respondents report being hosted while contributing to the rent.

⁴⁰ Degree of mobility is defined by the number of times that households have moved house prior to taking up residence in their current location.

majority of asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme were transferred there based on referrals from the RICs or ORFs. As expected, the mobility is somewhat higher among the self-accommodated, where a combined 52% have moved either once or twice prior to taking up residence in their location at the time of surveying.

Access to health

Access to public hospitals for emergency health provision is free for everyone including asylum seekers and refugees. Individuals need to have a social security number (AMKA) to receive medication or other health services free of or for a nominal charge.

Almost all households (97% across all groups) visited a primary or emergency health facility, when someone in their family was in need of health care. Two thirds of these households went to a public hospital to receive treatment, while the remaining visited a NGO health facility, i.e. Medecins du Monde (MDM) or PRAXIS. The few households (16 households) who did not visit a doctor although they had needed to do so, did not specify the reasons for this decision. In debrief discussions with the survey enumerators, the lack of female doctors was reported by female respondents to the survey as a factor that may have deterred some individuals in accessing health services. Very few households (2 in total) reported discrimination or refusal by medical staff to provide treatment.

The refugees and asylum seekers who participated in the group discussions reported that despite the high numbers of visits to the hospitals, the treatment received was unsatisfactory. Issues reported included long waiting times, and difficulties in communicating with hospital staff due to lack of available interpretation. Nevertheless, focus group participants also recognized that Greek patients faced similar challenges pertaining to the treatment quality.

Access to education

Asylum seeker and refugee children are subject to compulsory education in the same way as Greek children. They can enroll in school even if they have inadequate documentation and no deportation measures have been taken against their family. This means that they can enroll even if they haven't completed yet their asylum procedures, as long as they have a valid form of ID. Just like the Greek students, they are allowed to attend classes, after they submit a medical certification and a medical history of vaccination that has to entail though only three basic vaccines.

The asylum seeker and refugee children who stay in the accommodation scheme and those who are self-accommodated can attend regular classes in the public school that they have been assigned to, based on their address. Children in the Open Reception Facilities attend afternoon classes in public schools outside the ORFs, while the Ministry of Education (MoE) also runs formal kindergartens in the ORFs for children 4-5 years old.

Out of 366 children between the ages of 6 to 14 years, 81% were reported to be attending school on a regular basis, while among the 125 children between the ages of 15 to 18, only 48% were reported to be attending school. No real difference in the attendance rates between boys and girls was noted. However, in analyzing the results by accommodation type, it was noted that out of 279 children in the accommodation scheme that were between 6 and 14 years, 84% were attending school,⁴¹ while out of the 59 children of the same age in Diavata, that proportion was at 75%, and among the 29 children of same age in self-accommodation, 17 children attended school.

The vast majority of survey respondents, with children attending school, did not report that their children faced any significant challenges at school. Only a small number (25) of respondents mentioned that their children faced difficulties following the curriculum due to difficulties with the Greek language and in very few cases due to facing discrimination from teachers or classmates.

⁴¹ This reported school attendance rate of children between 6 and 14 years in the accommodation scheme is somewhat lower than the 90% attendance rate reported by the UNHCR-funded accommodation project nationwide.

For the 153 children who did not attend school (30% of all school aged children), the reported reasons vary. Households in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata whose children are not attending school, referred to lack of the requisite papers as a reason as well as other unspecified reasons. During debriefs, survey enumerators mentioned additional obstacles that refugee parents had shared with them. In some cases children affected by displacement had been asked to join classes with local children who were younger than them which made them uncomfortable. This was due to gaps in their education resulting from time on the move prior to their arrival in Greece. Some parents had also reported not finding it relevant to enroll their children to school in Greece as the families did not plan to stay there long term.

Self-accommodated respondents with children who were not attending school mentioned lack of requisite papers as the primary reason. Support in enrollment of children in public schools is provided through NGOs in the accommodation scheme and through Ministry of Education representatives in the ORFs. In both cases support in vaccinating and enrollment processes is provided. As self-accommodated parents do not have access to that kind of support, it is more difficult for them to identify the school their children should attend, especially in cases where the school that is supposed to enroll the children has no capacity to do so.

The attendance rate in kindergartens was low across children in all three accommodation strata. Only 5 children out of 183 children eligible for pre-school were reported to be attending.

Access to basic social services

Possession of a personal social insurance number (AMKA) and a tax number (AFM) are prerequisites for having full access to the Greek social service system. The AMKA as well as other administrative papers are usually obtained through a Citizens' Service Centre (KEP), these can be found at various points around the city of Thessaloniki and in the surrounding municipalities.

The vast majority of asylum seekers and refugees surveyed had visited a KEP, in most cases this was to get a birth certificate for a new baby, or an AMKA number. 87% of the asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme had visited a KEP, and 54% of them indicated that they received assistance from a NGO in doing so. 78% of the residents in the ORF had visited a KEP, the vast majority of them reported the need for assistance from an NGO to access these services. Interestingly, although self-accommodated persons did not receive assistance from an NGO to access a KEP, they nevertheless were successful in obtaining key documents for their inclusion in the Greek social service system. It was observed that of the 83% of self-accommodated who had been to a KEP, 72% managed without any external assistance.

A high percentage of asylum seekers and refugees have obtained an AFM; 74% in the accommodation scheme, 70% in the ORF in Diavata and 78% of the self-accommodated. Less persons, hold an unemployment card issued by the Labour Employment office (OAED). Among the three groups, the higher percentage of unemployment card holders was in Diavata (44%). The proportion of OAED card holders is particularly high in this ORF as application for these cards was facilitated by an NGO working in the site.⁴² The legal status of individuals, e.g. being fully registered with the Asylum Service or being a residence permit holder, does not seem to be a contributing factor on the likelihood of possessing an unemployment card. By having an unemployment card asylum seekers and refugees can use the public transport for

⁴² As with all results from the ORF in Diavata, this is not representative of other ORFs.

free, among other services.⁴³ However, refugee and asylum seeker participants in focus group discussions mentioned that the lack of an official residence was an obstacle for applying for an unemployment card, and in some cases the unemployment office refused to renew expired cards.

A joint petition report submitted to the Greek authorities regarding the difficulties of asylum seekers and refugees in obtaining AMKA and AFM,⁴⁴ as well as recent initiatives by relevant Ministries,⁴⁵ have contributed significantly to improved access. This in turn has led to higher numbers of asylum seekers and refugees having managed to obtain AMKA and AFM.

Access to municipal social services

The Municipality of Thessaloniki, in coordination with other organizations, has developed services⁴⁶ to improve the quality of life for Thessaloniki's inhabitants, and to address social problems and challenges, primarily for vulnerable groups. Overall

the awareness of municipal services, such as the Social Grocery/Food kitchen, welfare benefits, health clinics, social pharmacies and nurseries, is rather low among the refugees and asylum seekers across all three accommodation categories. However, the residents in the ORF in Diavata report a somewhat lower awareness of such services. This low awareness of the municipal services was also highlighted by almost all the participants in the consultations held with the refugees and asylum seekers.

Respondents were asked if they knew of the Centre for Integration of migrants (KEM) or the Community Centre ('Kentra koinotitas').⁴⁷ Among 660 respondents 19% had heard of one of these two Centres. Of this group a majority (85%) had also visited one of these facilities. No one in the ORF in Diavata had heard of these Centres, and very few had heard of them among the self-accommodated. The vast majority of those who were aware of or who had visited these facilities were residing in the accommodation scheme.

Table 6: Proportion of respondents by accommodation strata being aware of the below listed municipal services (N = total number of respondents)

	Accommodation scheme (N = 334)	Diavata ORF (N = 152)	Self-accommodated (N = 164)
Social grocery or food kitchen or food and basic assistance	9%	4%	15%
Welfare benefits such as social solidarity income (KEA) or disability benefits	4%	0%	7%
Municipal health clinics	16%	11%	14%
Social pharmacy	13%	8%	12%
Nurseries/infant centers	3%	4%	4%

⁴³ Since August 2017 all unemployed persons with valid unemployment card can use the city bus for free, following an announcement by the city bus company of Thessaloniki (OASTH). Passengers who use this benefit are obliged to carry with them their ID card, unemployment card and a receipt of the renewal of the card.

⁴⁴ Joint report of 25 organizations for cases of violations of asylum seekers' rights, August 2017. <https://bit.ly/2rkk9Vx>

⁴⁵ Ministries of Labor, Social Security and Social Solidarity, Migration Policy, and Health

⁴⁶ For the purpose of this survey, asylum seekers and refugees were asked about their awareness of the following municipality services: i) shelter for abuse women, ii) shelter for asylum seekers (Arsis) or REACT (UNHCR), iii) municipal social pharmacy, iv) municipal health clinics, v) social solidarity income (KEA) or disability benefits, vi) social grocery or food and basic assistance, and vii) overnight homeless shelter or open day shelter for the homeless.

⁴⁷ Kentra Koinotitas (KKs) is a municipal structure and functions as 'one stop shop' offering a variety of services such as reception, information, support, cooperation with services and structures (referrals etc.) and services aiming to social inclusion. KEMs offer services specifically to refugees and migrants such as information service, counseling support for integration issues, cooperation and referral to other structures and services. There are currently two KEMs functioning in the wider area of Thessaloniki: one in the city of Thessaloniki and the other on in Evosmos-Kordelio. The rest of the municipalities in Thessaloniki have KKs.

FUTURE INTENTIONS

This chapter focuses on the future intentions of asylum seekers and refugees, particularly where they would like to be based in the future and factors that may influence that decision. The profiling survey approached this topic from two different angles, by asking respondents:

- ➔ Where do you and your family intend to live in one year from now? What is the main reason for this intention?
- ➔ What would be the most important thing that needs to be in place, in order for you to stay longer term in Thessaloniki?

When looking at considerations about future residence and the conditions that would facilitate staying longer in Thessaloniki, it is important to note that all households were asked both questions. This means that households may intend to move on from Thessaloniki, while still considering remaining longer term in Thessaloniki if certain conditions were in place.

Intentions for future residence

Amongst the households in the accommodation scheme and the self-accommodated the majority stated that they intended to remain in Thessaloniki longer term (60% and 76% respectively). Among the households in Diavata, only 45% stated that they intended to stay in Thessaloniki, while 38% intend to move to another EU country.

The trend of preferring to stay in Thessaloniki was most prevalent amongst the self-accommodated households, making up three quarters of the population. It is important to note that of the households who wished to stay on the majority stated that would prefer to do so in a different accommodation to that in which they were currently residing. This applies across all accommodation strata, but particularly among the households in Diavata as they currently reside in containers.

The main reasons for intending to remain in Thessaloniki are more diverse than the reported reasons for wishing to move on to somewhere else. The prioritized reason for intending to leave Thessaloniki is to be with family and friends (58% amongst the HHs intending to leave

Figure 9: Household intentions for future residence by accommodation strata





Figure 10: Reported main reason for intending to stay in Thessaloniki or leave (Total N is weighted and does not include the HHs that reported not knowing/not having decided where they intend to stay longer term)



reported this) and finding better employment opportunities (19%). The reasons for intending to stay in Thessaloniki are distributed between safety (28%) – meaning that Thessaloniki offers safety compared to their place of origin – employment opportunities offered in the city (19%), access to education (10%), and presence of friends and family (9%). The prioritization of factors that contribute to a decision to remain in Thessaloniki are similar across the three accommodation strata with minor variations. Households in the accommodation scheme and in Diavata put more emphasis on access to education as a priority. This may be explained by the fact that this group has a larger percentage of parents with children of school going age.


Exploring what characterizes the households, who prefer to stay in the same area or to move on, helps to better understand the factors that influence these preferences. The preference to remain or to move on was analyzed taking into account nationality, employment status, length of time in Thessaloniki to date, participation in Greek language courses and access to administrative services. The results are laid out below.

Although the intention to stay was reported by the majority of respondents across all nationalities surveyed, this was more prevalent among Pakistani and Iraqi households than among Syrian and Iranian households.

Table 7: Future intentions by nationality of respondents (only the main nationalities are shown)

	Afghan (N = 81 HHs)	Iranian (N = 41 HHs)	Iraqi (N = 96 HHs)	Pakistani (N = 101 HHs)	Syrian (N = 163 HHs)
Stay in Thessaloniki	64%	51%	75%	85%	56%
Leave Thessaloniki	36%	49%	25%	15%	44%
Total %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 11: Intention to stay in Thessaloniki or leave by length of stay in Thessaloniki (HHs)



Amongst the respondents who reported their household's intention to remain in Thessaloniki, 17% had worked at least an hour in the four weeks preceding the study, while amongst those who reported their intention to leave Thessaloniki, only 9% had worked during the same period. The majority of the respondents indicating a preference to stay were, as mentioned earlier, self-accommodated, which also is the group with the highest levels of employment.

Responses do not show that intention to remain long term is more prevalent among those who have been in the city for longest. Therefore, it appears that the intention to remain in Thessaloniki is not linked to the length of stay in the city to date.

Ability to speak Greek facilitates communication with the local community and impacts positively on the possibility of finding employment. It is observed that amongst the respondents who attend Greek language courses, 80% intended to stay in Thessaloniki, while only 60% intended to stay amongst the respondents who did not attend courses.


Access to social and administrative services such as AMKA and AFM, are observed in similarly high proportions amongst both the households that intend to stay in Thessaloniki, and those who do not. This is positive, as accessing such services are prerequisites for asylum seekers and refugees for accessing the Greek social system, regardless of expected length of stay in Greece and Thessaloniki.

Prioritised conditions for local integration

All households covered by the study, were asked if they would consider staying longer term in Thessaloniki, if certain conditions were in place. This question was posed to households regardless of their stated intentions, as mentioned above. Exploring the factors considered to make a decision to stay in Thessaloniki longer term more feasible, can help us understand, which conditions are prioritized by the refugees and asylum seekers, when it comes to local integration.

Finding employment is the condition prioritized by most households across all types of accommodation – particularly among those in the accommodation scheme (52%). This finding was presented and discussed during consultations with asylum seekers and refugees, where it was agreed that employment is an important condition to make staying in Thessaloniki and become self-reliant more feasible. However, concerns regarding the economic situation in Greece and the lack of available jobs even for Greek nationals was mentioned. The participating refugees and asylum seekers indicated that they did not expect to be able to find work in Thessaloniki.

Figure 12: Important conditions for staying longer term in Thessaloniki by accommodation situation
(N = the number of households that would consider staying in Thessaloniki)



“We just had a miserable life. My kids lost 2 years of school. Human beings need a house and a job. So, if we have these things we don’t want to leave the country. I want to have my own job. In our country we didn’t have any financial problems. The only reason for us to be here is our safety.”

Adult man, refugee or asylum seeker, resident in Diavata ORF

“If we find jobs, we would love to stay in Greece forever. No European country is as good as Greece. We have the right to live in Greece, but now we do not really live. That is, our friends who are living in Central Europe have superior living conditions. Here you have abandoned us in a house, and have said that this is a house, go live in it!”

Adult man, asylum seeker, resident in the accommodation scheme

A recognized legal status that formalized their position in Greece was considered an important factor among the self-accommodated households (32%), and to a lesser extent the households in the accommodation scheme (14%). Access to accommodation, meaning having one’s own place to stay, is the second most prioritized condition for staying longer term in Thessaloniki amongst households in Diavata (29%). Being relocated to an apartment is important to continue staying in Thessaloniki for this group, as they currently reside in containers that they often sometimes share with other families.

A smaller proportion of households across all accommodation types did not wish to consider staying longer term in Thessaloniki, regardless of potential alterations to their current circumstances. 14% of the households in the accommodation scheme, 19% of the households in Diavata, and only 5% of the self-accommodated households were not willing to consider staying in Thessaloniki under any conditions. None of the respondents who stated this, had been employed in the weeks preceding the study.

SOCIAL NETWORKS IN THE CITY

The social networks that asylum seekers and refugees had built in Thessaloniki will be explored by looking at their relations with the local Greek community, and with other families and individuals affected by displacement. The mechanisms that they had in place to cope with emergencies, and their general sense of safety in the city will also be considered. Since experiences on these topics may vary between household members, questions around community interactions and participation as well as perceptions of safety, were addressed directly to each respondent of the survey and not asked at a household's level.⁴⁸

Interactions with Greeks and other refugees

Interactions between the refugee population and the local community were generally reported as positive in nature. Asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme, as well as the self-accommodated, reported interacting positively at least once per week with their neighbours or local shop owners. However, among the respondents in Diavata, 27% reported hardly ever or never interacting with the local community. The distance of the site from the town of Diavata, and the existence of a number of the essential services on site, could explain the less frequent interactions with the local population.


Fewer asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme and among the self-accommodated reported having no interaction

with the host community (18% and 17% respectively). Respondents from this group who reported only seldom or never interacting with the local community were asked about the main reason for this. More than half of the respondents who reported interacting seldom or never with local neighbours, indicated language as a barrier to interaction (58%), while a combined 32% indicated social isolation from their Greek neighbours as a reason (i.e. 'not knowing anyone in the neighbourhood' and 'neighbours are unfriendly').

All refugees and asylum seeker households were asked if their children played with local children. They reported that interaction is limited; only 36% of the households with children in Diavata reported that their children played with children of Greek nationality from the area, while this proportion increased to 45% among self-accommodated households with children and increased further to 52% among households with children in the accommodation scheme.

Respondents were also asked if they interacted with other members of the refugee and asylum seeker community. Incidences of such interaction were very high in Diavata, this is understandable given the high concentration of refugees and asylum seekers in one location. However, it was found to be significantly lower among those residing in the city of Thessaloniki. Approximately half of the respondents in the accommodation scheme interacted with other refugees and asylum seekers on a daily basis, while only 37% of the self-accommodated respondents did so.

Figure 13: Main reason reported for having none or seldom contact with Greek neighbours as reported by the respondents across the accommodation strata (N = 125 HHs)



⁴⁸ Therefore the total N for many of the below figure/Tables will represent the total number of respondents – while this will coincide with the number of households covered, the information collected is at the individual level and can thus also be disaggregated by demographics characteristics as relevant.

Coping strategies

The way that households react in situations of need and whom they approach for help are indications of the availability of social safety nets and support networks. Respondents were asked if a sudden and unforeseen need for a larger sum of money (e.g. 200 EUR) had arisen in the six months preceding the study, and if so how this need was addressed. Such an incident of need was reported by a large proportion of the self-accommodated respondents (57%), while a lower proportion (38%) was found among the households in the accommodation scheme as well as in Diavata. This indicates greater irregularity or unpredictability of expenses amongst the self-accommodated.


The ways households addressed this need differed by accommodation type. Even though such incidents had mainly occurred among the self-accommodated households, comparatively less of these households reported 'having no one to go to' (10%), 56% asked neighbours, friends and relatives in Thessaloniki for support, while 24% asked relatives abroad. This indicates availability of support networks that can be approached when in need.

Many more households in Diavata having had such a need for economic support, reported that they had no one to go to (46%); while households in the accommodation scheme were to a greater extent able to cover this need through their own means (24%).

Sense of safety

Almost one out in five asylum seeker and refugee respondents reported experiencing verbal or physical harassment⁴⁹ in Thessaloniki within the 6 months preceding the study. The percentage of persons who reported the incident to the police varied significantly among the different groups. 42% of asylum seekers and refugees in Diavata reported it to the police, while 25% of the self-accommodated asylum seekers and refugees did so, only 16% of persons in the accommodation scheme reported this to the police. The constant presence of the Police on site facilitated reporting of any incident of harassment by the residents in Diavata. In addition, the participants of the focus group discussions with asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme reported that the cost of filling a lawsuit against the perpetrator (80 Euros) was seen as a deterrent in reporting to the Police.

Figure 14: Ways of addressing a sudden need for a bigger amount of money (e.g. 200 EUR) amongst the households that reported having had such a need during the 6 months preceding the study (N = HHs having had the need for a bigger amount of money)



⁴⁹ Harassment includes for example: verbal insults, insulting behaviour, threats, physical violence and damage to property.

Fewer respondents reported having been verbally or physically harassed by the police or local authorities. The self-accommodated reported having experienced the highest percentage of such incidents at 9%. Only 5% of residents of the ORF and 3% of residents in the accommodation scheme reported similar incidents.

Despite the incidents of verbal and physical harassment, the sense of safety within the asylum seeker and refugee population remains high. During the focus group discussions many participants reported that they had not experienced violence or felt threatened during their stay in Greece and felt that they could move freely. The security situation was perceived as being comparatively better to that in their country of origin.

“*My daughter goes out at 9:00 p.m. sometimes when it is completely dark outside but there is nothing to fear. It is normal to go out at night here, but in our country it wasn't safe.*”

Adult woman, asylum seeker, resident in accommodation scheme

“*Even though I am an adult, back in our country it wasn't safe walking out during the night. Here it is normal.*”

Adult man, asylum seeker, resident in accommodation scheme

4.

Third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service: challenges in coping without the asylum status

Sample

DESCRIPTION & LIMITATIONS

The sample of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service was made up of **212 households comprising 441 individuals** distributed throughout the Municipality of Thessaloniki as well as the Open Reception Facility (ORF) in Diavata. The sample was made up of 361 persons, who, according to their statements, were holding police notes, 63 persons were holding no documentation and 17 persons were holding expired documentation.⁵⁰

The sample covers different accommodation situations: 222 persons were living in a situation of homelessness (living on the street, in unfinished or abandoned buildings, or in a homeless shelter), while 161 persons were living as unregistered residents in the ORF at Diavata, and 27 were living in rented accommodation in Thessaloniki.

Since no sampling frame existed for this group, a non-probability sampling approach was chosen. Thus, the representativity of this sample cannot be assessed. Given the limited size of this sample, some topics cannot be explored in as much detail.

For a detailed description of the sample refer to the methodology chapter.

INTRODUCTION

Limited information is available on the population in Thessaloniki classified for the purposes of this report as 'third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service'. This is primarily due to the fact that they fall outside the regular reception mechanism, and as such systematic data collection is not carried out upon arrival. This chapter explores the living conditions and future intentions of the third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service. The majority of the sample is made up of police note holders (82%), while the remainder are persons with no documentation or

expired documentation regarding their residence in Greece.

Despite the differences in legal status between persons holding a valid police note and persons with expired, or no documentation, it was decided to analyze these persons as one group. This is due to the fact that they face a number of common challenges in accessing services, most notably accommodation, cash assistance and employment due to the fact that they are not classified as asylum seekers or refugees. However, when possible and relevant, a comparison between these two groups will be made.

⁵⁰ No documents were asked to be shown by the individuals in the sample, thus the information is according to their verbal communication.

BOX 4:

SPONTANEOUS ARRIVALS – AN OVERVIEW

The land arrivals from Evros border saw a significant increase in 2017 (an increase of almost 50% compared to 2016 arrivals). This trend continued in 2018 with the total number of arrivals through Evros at almost 7,200 for the period from January to May 2018. As the only reception and identification centre (RIC) located at Fylakio lacked the capacity to accommodate such a big number of new arrivals, the Greek authorities placed a significant number of people, including children, in inappropriate police detention facilities in the area until there were spaces for them in Fylakio, with some of them remaining in detention in these facilities for almost three months.

The increased number of arrivals resulted in a delay in their timely identification, registration and issuance of basic documentation. The reports of poor conditions and overcrowding in Fylakio, the nature of the smuggling route, and the lack of information about the existence of a reception facility close to the border in Evros led many new arrivals directly to Thessaloniki, rather than presenting themselves to the authorities immediately upon crossing the border. These persons did not arrive to Thessaloniki through an official transfer organized by the Greek authorities. This fact in combination with the decrease in available spaces in ORFs, meant that the Greek Authorities were no longer willing to grant access to the majority of such cases to ORFs upon arrival. This resulted in their being left in an extremely precarious situation, without access to accommodation or other forms of basic assistance, including the monthly cash grant, issued to persons registered in an accommodation programme, self-accommodated with a proof of address, or ORF. In addition to this, groups of persons (almost 3,000 persons) were released from Filakio by the Greek authorities in April 2018 without completing the full registration process thereby ensuring their issuance of basic documentation and being allocated through an official transfer procedure to an Open Reception Facility. Reasons for this decision included lack of adequate services in Fylakio to cope with the numbers of arrivals, including interpretation, medical and psycho-social assistance.

A sudden influx of spontaneous arrivals of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service occurred in Thessaloniki at the same time that the data collection for the profiling was taking place (see Box 4 on more information about the spontaneous arrivals). As a result, a big proportion of the sample (63% or 134 households) was made up of the newly arrived population. Where relevant, comparisons will be drawn between the new arrivals and those that have been in Thessaloniki for a longer period of time.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND DISPLACEMENT PROFILE

Nationalities and legal status

The majority of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service surveyed originated from Syria (34%), Iraq (28%) and to a lesser extent Pakistan (10%) and Afghanistan (8%). The majority of the sample was made up of police note holders (82%), while the remaining were persons with no documentation (14%) and expired documentation (4%).

When asked about intention to seek asylum in Greece, of the 336 individuals surveyed, 75% stated that they intended to do so, while 4% had not yet decided. The proportion of persons who intend to apply is higher among the police note holders than the undocumented and those with expired documentation. Among the 21% who stated that they did not intend to apply, the vast majority (64%) preferred to move to another EU country and only 13% believed that they do not fulfill the criteria to apply for asylum in Greece.

Table 8: Number and proportions of surveyed persons intending to apply for asylum in Greece by legal status

None or expired documentation	Police note holders
47 (62%)	204 (78%)

Sex, age and household size

The group of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service surveyed contained twice as many men as women. The total population surveyed were noticeably younger than the refugee and asylum seeker category with almost 82% being under the age of 35. The age distribution was similar between men and women.

The vast majority of persons with expired, or no documentation were single member households (94%). Among police note holders, half the population was made up of single member households, while the remainder was mainly distributed between three and four member households. There is a clear trend that police note holders were more often families, whereas persons with irregular status were single member households. It was reported by NGOs representatives that, single men were often afraid to go to the police station to renew their police note as they might be detained for a lengthy period, while families with children tended to be released after 1-2 days in detention. In some cases, Police Note holders have reported going to the Police Station to renew expired police notes and being refused a renewal. According to reports reasons for refusal were not made clear to them. In addition, the misperception that police note holders are excluded from basic services also

contributes to police refusing to renew documents, due to the fact that they may not see the value in doing so.

Literacy, education and health

The literacy rate,⁵¹ among respondents was somewhat lower for women (64%) than for men (74%). 16% of the women also reported not having any formal education, while that percentage was lower for men (9%). The same proportion among women and men (56%) had completed either primary or lower secondary education, and 9% of the group surveyed have a university degree, which was equally distributed between men and women.

The survey respondents were asked if they, or anyone else in their family, suffered from a serious health condition, including mental health conditions or disabilities that prevented them from carrying out their usual daily tasks. 21% of the total population reported such a health condition, with the proportion being slightly higher among the women (25% for women against 18% for men). More than half of these persons were in a situation of homelessness.⁵²

Table 9: Size of households (HHs) by legal status

	Expired, or no documentation (N = 72 HHs)	Police note holders (N = 145 HHs)
1 member HHs	94%	50%
2 member HHs	3%	8%
3 member HHs	1%	14%
4 member HHs	0%	15%
5+ member HHs	1%	12%

⁵¹ Defined as the reported ability to read and write amongst all persons above 12 years of age.

⁵² The usage of the term homeless is based on the definition established through Law 4052/2012 Art. 29: '(1) Homeless persons are recognized as a vulnerable social group, that receives social protection. Homeless persons are defined as all persons legally residing in the country, who lack access to safe and adequate accommodation, owned, rented or freely released, and which would meet the technical requirements and basic amenities for water and electricity; (2) The homeless population include those living on the street or in shelters and those who are hosted, due to necessity, in institutions or other forms of institutional care.' For the purposes of this study, persons who at the time of the data collection had not yet legalized their status are also included in the category of 'homeless'. Additionally, the institutional shelters were excluded, due to the fact that this option was not available to the target group.

MIGRATION HISTORY AND LENGTH OF STAY IN THESSALONIKI

The majority of the survey respondents (63%) had been in Thessaloniki less than one month at the time of interview, while almost all remaining respondents (32%) had been in Thessaloniki between one and six months. Only 5% of the respondents had been in Thessaloniki for longer than six months. The vast majority (84%) of the respondents that had arrived within the preceding month were in a situation of homelessness, whereas amongst those that had been in Thessaloniki between one and six months, almost equal proportions were residing unregistered in an ORF and were living in a situation of homelessness in the city.

“My husband and I entered from Evros, we walked for 10km, then we took a bus from a village and we reached Thessaloniki at 05.00 a.m. We spent 5 days in a hotel here that we paid for with our own money. After the hotel, we went to the police station where we stayed for 1 night. We learned about this camp from an organization”.

Adult woman, unregistered resident in the ORF in Diavata


Regardless of the year of arrival in Greece, the vast majority of households surveyed reported having arrived via the Evros border (93%). In the focus

group discussions held with third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service residing unregistered in the Diavata ORF, participants recount the way of entering Greece and finding a place to stay:

“We reached a village in Evros, I don’t know the name. We went with the smuggler until an abandoned and burnt out train station, where we spent one night. Then, a Greek journalist came and took us to the police station for some hours. After that we stayed at the Detention Center for 3 days. This place was like a psychiatric facility. They processed our papers, and then we took a bus to Thessaloniki. Outside the bus station there is a place like a garage where we stayed for 2 nights. We didn’t know how to get to the camp (ORF). One journalist told us to come here, we didn’t know him. At first, we didn’t believe him and were afraid to come. But, we asked some Greeks if there is truly a camp here. We bought tickets and we took a bus half way to the camp and walked the rest of the way. We brought our own tents and have been living in the tents.”

Adult woman, unregistered resident in the ORF in Diavata

Figure 15: Accommodation situation according to length of stay in Thessaloniki (N = the number of respondents by length of stay)



“...We were 45 people in the van. We couldn't see anything from inside the car, sometimes they were knocking on the car walls to keep us quiet whenever we were passing by a police check point. They left us in a place on Egnatia highway where there was a signpost saying that we were 30km away from Thessaloniki. They gave us the number of the police in order to call them. We called the police, and they came in 15 minutes. They told us not to walk on the highway and told us to go on the sideway, where we waited for 2 hours for other policemen to arrive by police bus. They took us to the police station where we spent 3 days. The police informed us which bus to take to come to Camp Diavata. We are 5 people in my family and we live in the warehouse building.”

Adult man, unregistered resident in the ORF in Diavata

ACCOMMODATION AND HOMELESSNESS


The majority of surveyed individuals with expired, or no documentation (75%) were in a situation of homelessness, primarily living on the streets and to a lesser extent in abandoned buildings. Very few from this group were residing in apartments that they had rented (11 persons or 14%).

The surveyed police note holders were almost equally distributed between living in a situation of homelessness (45%) and residing informally in Diavata (42%), where they either had found shelter in containers that they were unofficially occupying, or they were hosted by other families, or sleeping in tents or public spaces in the ORF.

Among the households that were experiencing homelessness, including police note holders and households with expired, or no documentation, 28% (41 out of 146 households) had tried unsuccessfully to access an ORF.

As reported in focus groups with young male third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service in Thessaloniki, living on the street was one of their main challenges: “Because we have to stay outside, there is always a risk for example of

Figure 16: Accommodation situation of surveyed population (persons) by legal status



theft... there are fights... it is too cold one falls ill in the cold”.

The majority of persons that had arrived during the month preceding the study (84%), were found in a situation of homelessness. Of the group that had been residing between one and six months in Thessaloniki, 45% had managed to access the ORF in Diavata, albeit unofficially, while a similar proportion (43%) were still experiencing homelessness. More than half of the households that were not experiencing homelessness at the time that they were surveyed, reported having been in a situation of homelessness since their arrival in Thessaloniki. This pattern is also reflected in the discussions with unofficial residents in the Diavata ORF. Third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service first spent some time in Thessaloniki, on the street or hosted by a friend before moving to the site to live as unregistered residents.

“I came directly to Thessaloniki, I never went to Athens. From friends I found out about the camps. They didn't let me enter Volvi camp, and so I spent 10 days at a hotel. When our money ran out, we were hosted with rent by friends for 40 days and then in May I came to Diavata.”

Adult man, unregistered resident in Diavata ORF

“I came to Thessaloniki at the end of March, I spent 1 month in a hotel and after that I rented an apartment from someone who had gotten an apartment from a local NGO. After 15 days, the NGO found out and sent me away. I was never homeless because I was in Germany before and knew that camps existed for refugees, so I found out where the camp is and in May I entered the Diavata Camp.”

Adult man, unregistered resident in Diavata ORF

Participants, in focus group discussions held in Diavata with unregistered residents, reported feeling insecure in their current accommodation. However, their dire financial situation was the main obstacle to renting a safer place, while lack of legal papers was also reported as a significant obstacle. All survey participants experiencing homelessness reported the same two obstacles to finding a housing solution: lack of money as the primary obstacle and secondly lack of 'legal papers'.

“When we will find a job and then we will try to rent an apartment for our family.”

Adult woman, unregistered resident in Diavata ORF

“We are waiting for our cash assistance card and after that we will rent an apartment.”

Adult woman, unregistered resident in Diavata ORF

ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT AND LIVELIHOOD MEANS

EMPLOYMENT DEFINITIONS:

All employment statistics are only relevant for the working age population, which is defined as individuals between 15 and 67 years of age.

Employed person:

someone who has worked at least one hour during the four weeks preceding the survey. Employment is defined as any activities a person undertook for remuneration, for example working for wages or benefit in-kind, running a business (e.g. selling on the street), or working in the agricultural sector.

Unemployed person:

someone who has not worked during the four weeks preceding the survey and is actively looking for work. Unemployed persons are considered together with the employed persons to be economically active, as they are available to the labour market.

Economically inactive person:

someone who is not looking for work and is thus unavailable to the labour market.

Employment

Police note holders and persons with expired, or no documentation do not have the right to work legally in Greece. However, the survey questionnaire aimed to identify any informal activities that working aged persons undertook despite the lack of requisite documentation. Work refers to any activity a person undertook for remuneration, for example working for wages or benefit in-kind, running a business (e.g. selling on the street), or working in the agricultural sector.

In total only 7 out of 164 persons of working age reported having worked during the four weeks prior to the survey. They were all Pakistani single men. Five of them had expired, or no documentation and the remaining two were police note holders. All of them had actively tried to increase their hours of work, as they had only worked occasionally.

Almost half of the third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service surveyed were unemployed, meaning that they were actively looking for a job. Their legal status and the lack of relevant papers was the main obstacle they faced in their search for employment (64%), while the insufficient knowledge of the Greek language was also reported as significant obstacle. The lack of Greek language skills was also highlighted in the focus groups held with third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service in the ORF in Diavata, who were residing there unofficially. Women as well as men reported that they were not able to find work without being able to speak Greek, despite having work experience from their countries of origin. Learning Greek was reported by some of the female FGD participants and male youth as a challenge because the courses offered re-started often from the beginning to accommodate for new students, thus not allowing them to progress much further.

During the survey interviews, some respondents reported that due to the difficulties in finding work, they engaged in sex work for material compensation.

The proportion of respondents of working age who were actively looking for work differed significantly between men and women. Among women, the majority (83%) were economically inactive, meaning they were not employed or looking for work. The main reported reason for this was family responsibilities. Among the working aged men, the majority (64%) were actively looking for work.

Livelihood means

As the vast majority of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service had no access to employment, the study examined how the households met their basic needs. All households were asked to prioritise their main two sources of income.

41% of the households reported that they had no income. 28% were using their own savings, while 18% were receiving remittances from family and friends abroad. This was also confirmed during the focus groups discussions. Only a very small percentage of persons (2%) were receiving cash assistance through the Cash Assistance Programme.⁵³ The vast majority (85%) reported that they did not have any secondary source of income.

When looking at the three main nationalities represented in the surveyed group, it is observed that among Iraqi households (34 households in total), half were relying primarily on savings. Among Pakistani households (49 households in total), 40% were relying on remittances; and among the Syrian households (43 households in total) 44% were relying mainly on savings.

Given the accommodation situation of the population, the majority had no monthly rent or utility bills to pay. 37% of the surveyed households resided in the Open Reception Facility in Diavata, as they were unofficially referred there.

Table 10: Economically active and inactive population by sex
(N = the working aged population, 15-57 years of age)

	Female		Male	
	%	N	%	N
Worked occasionally	0%	0	7%	7
Not looking for work/ economically inactive	83%	49	30%	31
Looking for work	17%	10	64%	67
Total	100%	59	100%	105

⁵³ Police note holders, at the time of the survey, were eligible to receive cash assistance, however they needed to be able to present a valid residential address in order to receive it.

Table 11: Primary and secondary source of income for the households (HH) during the 6 months preceding the survey

	Main source of income (N = 212 HHs)	Secondary source of income (N = 212 HHs)
No income	41%	85%
Savings	28%	3%
Remittances	18%	5%
Cash Assistance Programme	2%	0%
Salary/ wages	3%	3%
Using loans	1%	1%
Begging	1%	0%
Other	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Table 12: Usage of free clothing and food services amongst households (HHs) during the month preceding the survey (same households may have accessed both types of services)

	Residents in apartments (N = 16 HHs)	Homeless situation (N = 146 HHs)	Open Reception Facility (ORF) /unregistered (N = 40 HHs)
Used free clothes offered by NGOs	2 HHs	43 HHs/ 29%	13 HHs
Used free food provided by Municipality or NGOs	5 HHs	88 HHs/ 60%	31 HHs

Half of the surveyed households were living in a situation of homelessness in the city, whether living in abandoned buildings, on the street, or in a homeless shelter. While only 6% (16 households) were living in an apartment either rented or hosted by others.

The basic services of free food and clothing, offered by the Municipality and different NGOs, were primarily used by the persons experiencing homelessness. 39% had accessed free food and 19% had accessed free clothing. It was reported by local NGO representatives that many of the homeless persons had lost personal items, such as clothes and sleeping bags due to police raids. The households residing unofficially in the ORF in Diavata were receiving food through catering and some additional supplies on a daily basis.

ACCESS TO SERVICES

Access to health care

Access to public hospitals for emergency health provision is free for everyone, including police note holders, or persons with expired, or no documentation. Households that had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month at the time of the survey were asked if any of their members had been in need of health care at any time during the six months preceding the study, or since they arrived to the city. A majority of the households reported having been in need of health care (61 out of 95 household, 64% of respondents) and most of them (55 out of 61 households) had managed to visit a health care facility. More than half of the households in need of health care had visited an NGO clinic (31 out of 55 households), either in the centre of Thessaloniki or in the ORF, while the remaining households visited a public hospital.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Only 2 households reported having visited a private health facility.

Access to education

Education is compulsory for all children aged 5-15 residing in Greece regardless of nationality, even if they lack the relevant documentation.⁵⁵ Questions regarding school attendance were restricted to third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service who had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month. The sample included a total of 77 children between 6 and 17 years of age. Only 36 children between 6 and 17 years of age had been in Thessaloniki for more than a month, and among these only 2 were reported to be attending school. Respondents whose children were of school going age (4-17 years old), but did not attend school, mostly indicated the lack of requisite documentation for school enrolment as the primary obstacle.

Table 13: School attendance of children in households that had been in Thessaloniki more than one month at time of data collection (N = all children excluding new arrivals)

	6-12 years	13-17 years
Arrived less than one month ago / not asked this question	33	8
Do not attend school	19	15
Attend school	2	0
Total of children (N)	54	23

Access to basic social services

Persons with expired, or no documentation do not have the right to access basic social services, given that they are considered by law to be residing in the country illegally. The exception to this is the right to emergency medical treatment in hospital. Police note holders can visit a KEP to receive a birth certificate for children who have been born since their arrival in Greece, which had been done by few of the police note holders interviewed.

⁵⁵ A valid ID document (e.g. asylum seeker's card) issued by the Greek state and a vaccination card are needed for the enrolment of children in school.

FUTURE INTENTIONS

This chapter focuses on the future intentions of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service surveyed, particularly where they would like to be based in the future, and factors that may influence that decision. The profiling survey approached this topic from two different angles, by asking respondents:

- ➔ Where do you and your family intend to live in one year from now? What is the main reason for this intention?
- ➔ What would be the most important thing that needs to be in place, in order for you to stay longer term in Thessaloniki?

Intentions for future residence

Approximately half of the surveyed third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service indicated an intention to stay in Thessaloniki (48%) and less than one third of the households (30%) indicated an intention to move on to another EU country. No great difference in intentions was found between households holding police notes and households with expired, or no documentation, indicating that this difference in legal status did not influence the decision to stay or leave.

One fifth of the households intending to stay in Thessaloniki indicated employment opportunities as the main reason influencing their decision to stay. Nevertheless, only very few persons amongst these households (3 persons in total), reported having worked during the four weeks preceding the survey. This indicates that it is not an existing job that keeps them in the city, but rather the intention to find one. One quarter of households intending to remain in Thessaloniki indicated safety as the main reason for this decision. This could be interpreted as an improved security situation compared to that in their place of origin, and during the journey to Greece.

The households, intending to move to another EU country stated that the desire to be with family and friends was the primary motivation (38%), or the prospect of better employment opportunities (18%).

Table 14: Intentions for future residence among third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service (HHs)

	%	N – HHs
Stay in Thessaloniki	48%	101
Elsewhere in Greece	8%	16
Another EU country	30%	63
Return to country of origin	1%	2
Don't know/ have not yet decided	14%	30
Total – HHs	100%	212

Prioritized conditions for local integration

The survey respondents were asked, if they would consider staying long term in Thessaloniki and under which conditions. 15% stated that they would not consider staying long term (31 out of 212 households), the majority of these households had indicated an intention to move on to another EU country.

Of the remaining respondents that were willing to consider staying long term in Thessaloniki, 39% (181 households) reported access to accommodation as the most important factor for being able to remain long term. Access to employment and a recognized legal status were each indicated by approximately a quarter of the households. This result is supported by the findings from the focus group discussions, where participants stated that access to employment was a deciding factor, but that regularization of their legal status was a prerequisite to begin rebuilding their lives including finding employment.

These priorities were also clearly reflected in the focus group activity with young male third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service in Thessaloniki, where a young Pakistani man summarized the group's view:

“First of all, we need an ID card so that we may have legal status. We must learn the language. If we live here, we'll learn the language. If we learn the language, we will become aware of rules etc. If we get the education, we will be able to find a place to live etc.”

Table 15: Prioritized factors for being able to stay long term in Thessaloniki among third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service (HHs)

	%	N – HHs
Access to accommodation	38%	71
Find employment	25%	46
Regularization of legal status	22%	40
Other	13%	24
Total – HHs	100%	181

SOCIAL NETWORKS

Community interactions

Frequency of interactions with local Greek neighbours was explored amongst survey respondents that had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month at the time of the study. It was assumed that this question would have less relevance for those who had been there for a shorter period, as they would have been less likely to build such local connections. Among the 95 respondents who had been in Thessaloniki for longer than one month, 34 reported interacting on a daily or weekly basis with the local neighbours, 17 reported such interactions several times per month, but not every week, and 44 indicated that they seldom or never interacted with local people. Half of the respondents who reported never interacting with the local community indicated language as a barrier for interaction.

Interactions with other non-Greek/displaced persons were reported to be very frequent and the vast majority of respondents reported daily interactions. This was the case whether respondents were residing in the ORF in Diavata or elsewhere in Thessaloniki.

However, despite the daily interactions with other non-Greek persons, limited safety nets appear to be available to respondents within the city. Households that had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month, were asked if they had been faced with situation where they had a sudden unforeseen financial need, and how they had dealt

with this situation.⁵⁶ Approximately half (43 out of a total of 95 households) reported having been in sudden need for financial support. Most of these households either had no one to go to for support, or relied on support from family abroad. In focus group discussions with third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service in Diavata, participants mentioned that material support was common among the community on the site, and that this had helped them cover basic needs.

“If there was no support from each other, we would die. We are 4 months here. No cash card, no asylum service papers.”

(Adult woman, unregistered resident in the ORF in Diavata)

“I give my milk to the kids of a neighbor. Now that I know that person (another FGD participant) also needs, I will also give to her milk.”

(Adult woman, unregistered resident in the ORF in Diavata)

Sense of safety

14% of the surveyed respondents (29 out of the 212 respondents), including those who had been in Thessaloniki less than one month, reported having experienced verbal or physical harassment. A quarter of these individuals had reported these incidents to the police.⁵⁷ 9% of respondents indicated that they had been verbally or physically harassed by the police or other local authorities. Through the focus group discussions in Diavata, participants expressed feeling unsafe in the ORF, particularly women. This was attributed to regular outbreaks of fighting, often between different ethnic groups. Discussions with the survey enumerators also revealed that a main source of insecurity reported by third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service came from their insecure living conditions due to sleeping in the streets or in informal tented areas.

⁵⁶ Households that had been in Thessaloniki for less than one month were not asked these questions.

⁵⁷ Only 17 of the respondents were female while the remaining 195 were male. Unfortunately, this makes a sex disaggregation of this indicator less relevant.

5.

Conclusions and recommendations

REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS

Aim of analysis

The analysis aimed to explore the extent to which refugees and asylum seekers in the metropolitan area of Thessaloniki are moving towards local integration. This was done by looking at their preferences for the future as well as the obstacles and possibilities along the way towards greater economic and socio-cultural integration. The final report forms a baseline for future integration monitoring and will be a useful tool for the implementation of integration activities as foreseen in national and local strategies for integration.

Given the diverse accommodation situations of refugees and asylum seekers, the analysis was based on a comparison between three accommodation strata, comprising:

- 1 Households residing in the **ESTIA accommodation scheme**, where rent and utility costs are covered;
- 2 **'Self-accommodated'** households, that are either renting an apartment by their own means, and therefore have to cover any housing related expenses themselves, or are being hosted for free by family and friends (the latter applied to 24% of the self-accommodated group);
- 3 In addition a third category was included, namely households residing in the **Open Reception Facility (ORF) of Diavata**, given its proximity to the city of Thessaloniki and the regular use of city services by the residents. On

the site households were staying in containers and basic services including health, education, non-food items and internet were provided by the different organizations working inside the site.

The recommendations presented in the report aim at national and municipal authorities, as well as the humanitarian actors present in the metropolitan area of Thessaloniki. These recommendations take into account the National Strategy on Integration by the Ministry of Migration Policy and have been developed in accordance with the guidelines presented in the strategy. In addition, the below recommendations also include suggestions brought forward by asylum seekers and refugees during community consultations on the profiling results.⁵⁸

FUTURE INTENTIONS AND LOCAL INTEGRATION

The great majority of refugees and asylum seekers in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata had been in Thessaloniki less than one year, at the time of the study (79% and 78% respectively). The majority of the households in the accommodation scheme (60%) reported that they intended to stay in Thessaloniki in the long term, and one of the main conditions for being able to integrate locally is finding employment. Amongst the households in Diavata, less than half intended to stay in Thessaloniki (45%) and more than a third (38%) intended to move to another EU country. For those intending to stay, being able to

⁵⁸ Asylum seekers and refugees were invited to three community consultations in August 2018 in the Municipality of Thessaloniki where the preliminary results of the profiling were presented and discussed (see Box 3 for more background on the consultations). The consultations included men and women, from different countries and with different professional backgrounds. As part of the discussion, the facilitators asked the asylum seekers and refugees to share their recommendations for addressing some of the challenges identified by the profiling.

integrate locally was very much linked to finding a different accommodation solution.

The households having found their own accommodation were on average living longer in Thessaloniki, as almost half of them had lived in the city for more than one year compared to other groups who have been living in their majority in their accommodation for less than one year. This group of refugees and asylum seekers also included the biggest group reporting that they intended to stay in Thessaloniki longer term (76%). For them the main condition for local integration was access to employment and getting the status of international protection.

Accessing employment as a key condition for local integration was also highlighted and confirmed during community consultations with asylum seekers and refugees; while it was also acknowledged by the participants that due to the economic situation in Greece, the lack of jobs is a challenge for Greek nationals as well.

When looking at intentions by nationality of the refugees and asylum seekers, across the different accommodation types, it is observed that Iraqi and Pakistani nationals represented the largest proportions of households intending to stay.

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION AND SELF-RELIANCE

Self-reliance

Economic inactivity is very high amongst women, where 73% are not working and not looking for work, while that is the case for only 24% of the male working-age population between the ages of 15 and 67. The reported employment is very low among the working aged population in the accommodation scheme (5%) and in the Diavata ORF (4%), while it is considerably higher amongst the self-accommodated persons (34%).

The self-accommodated households show a greater capacity for self-reliance and have more often some salary income as a secondary source of income (in addition to cash assistance, which is the main source of income across all

accommodation strata), when compared to the households in the accommodation scheme and in the ORF in Diavata. As indicated, the employment rate is considerably higher compared to the other strata, and furthermore, 76% of the self-accommodated households were renting their accommodation and covering housing related costs by themselves.

However, at the same time, self-accommodated households reported often not being able to cover foreseen monthly expenses, such as rent and utilities, they experienced unforeseen expenses more often, and they tended to make more use of the free humanitarian services.

More than two thirds of the self-accommodated households (73%), who were renting an apartment by their own means, were not always able to cover rent or utility bills during the 6 months preceding the survey. The free services, such as food, clothing or the day center for homeless offered by the Municipality and NGOs, were used more by the self-accommodated households compared to the refugees and asylum-seekers in the accommodation scheme. The greater irregularity or unpredictability of expenses was observed amongst the self-accommodated, as more than half (57%) reported having had a sudden need for a larger amount of money over the 6 months preceding the study, compared to the equivalent proportion among households in the accommodation scheme as well as in Diavata (38% in both).

It is important to note the different demographic characteristics of the groups, as that contextualizes the above conclusions:

The refugees and asylum seekers in the accommodation scheme were comprised by 43% women, 60% of which were below 18 years of age and 13% single member households. In the Diavata ORF, a very similar profile was found with 44% women, 60% of which were below 18 years of age and 5% single member households. However, amongst the self-accommodated refugees and asylum seekers only 21% are women, 14% of which are below 18 years of age, and more than half are single member households.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCED SELF-RELIANCE:

To national authorities and humanitarian actors:

- ➔ It is necessary to ensure that humanitarian assistance and reception programmes including first reception programmes, are holistic and promote self-reliance from the outset (e.g. accommodation and cash programmes should have clear linkages to integration related interventions) which inter alia address the specific needs of vulnerable groups.
- ➔ Given that economic self-reliance is less among those in accommodation and ORF, promotion of self-reliance and autonomous living for those in these accommodation modalities should be prioritized. Inter alia, asylum seekers and refugees should be assisted through provision of administrative services (finding appropriate, secure and safe housing solutions, for example a Help Desk in municipal community centers to offer relevant administrative services etc.)⁵⁹ to access means for housing and accommodation which both promotes affordable and autonomous living conditions.
- ➔ However, considering that most Asylum Seekers and refugees in the accommodation programmes are highly vulnerable, programmes which address the needs of vulnerable groups during first reception, should continue after being granted international protection.
- ➔ Future studies should explore a) whether it is the fact that households, which are self-accommodated, are more self-reliant, which enables them to find own accommodation solutions, or whether being self-accommodated pushes them to become more self-reliant; b) who and why people are self-accommodated in the first place: choice or by force – choice indicating proactive/drive for self-reliance.

- ➔ More emphasis should be put on understanding how self-accommodated find apartments in order to provide input to the design of future programmes by the Greek state.

Employability & obstacles to employment:

The main obstacles to finding work were reported as lack of employment opportunities in Greece coupled with inability to communicate in Greek at an adequate level. However, out of the total labour force, less than half (44%) are attending Greek language courses. Furthermore, the great majority (86%) of the unemployed population across all three groups reported that they had work experience prior to their displacement. In terms of educational background, only 9% of the labour force (i.e. persons of working age who are either working or looking for work) had no formal education, whereas 43% had primary or lower secondary education, 23% had higher secondary education and 14% university degree.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT:

To national authorities:

- ➔ In line with the National Integration Strategy there is an urgent need for official Greek language courses to be implemented nationwide, from the point of arrival, which will provide systematic quality language training, with an integrated component that subsidizes the costs for national certification of language acquisition, focusing on persons with intention to stay in Greece.
- ➔ Barriers to access the programmes of Information on Vocational Education and Training (VET), Life-long Learning, other programmes of OAED and other opportunities, should be addressed. Relevant information which can assist in individuals' pathways to employment, should be made available in multiple languages to asylum seekers and refugees.

⁵⁹ See recommendations regarding social and affordable housing

- ➔ Facilitated access for asylum seekers and refugees to national employability, traineeship and apprenticeship programmes provided by the Organization for the Employment of Workforce-Organismos Apasholisis Ergatikou Dinamikou (OAED) through provision of systematized Greek language courses tailored to the needs of the current labour market
- ➔ Design specific and targeted employability programmes for asylum seekers and refugees, including the build-in of methodology for activation of vulnerable people, where relevant, and ensure coordination of private and public stakeholders especially in sectors where there is a labour shortage, such as agriculture.

To all stakeholders:

- ➔ Access to Greek language courses should be provided from the outset and both to asylum seekers and refugees targeting persons with intention to stay in Greece.
- ➔ Based on the survey results, the vast majority of women were not looking for work, due to family responsibilities. The recommendation, brought forward by female participants during community consultations, is that child-care should be available during language courses, to enable parents' attendance.
- ➔ Linkages should be created between income opportunities and language courses, to allow for Greek language learning, parallel to or through work experience. This recommendation was brought forward during community consultations, where it was highlighted that this approach allows refugees and asylum seekers to access the labor market, while learning Greek.
- ➔ In relation to the above, assist individuals in improving their language skills through facilitating their participation in OAED programmes of OAED for internships, apprenticeship etc. and explore possibilities

of internships through corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes in the private sector.

- ➔ Regular, systematized collection of data by relevant actors should be in place for those who are self-accommodated and/or homeless (on profiles, education etc.) as is the case for organized accommodation. Moreover, the data that is currently being collected in organized accommodation should be further widened to include additional key information (such as professional and occupational skills) which have direct relevance to designing, implementing integration programmes and monitoring integration.
- ➔ Support individuals in developing entrepreneurial activities, including supporting social solidarity economy activities.

To European institutions:

- ➔ Revision of existing legal framework regarding recognition of academic qualifications (national level) and professional skills at the EU level in order to allow for better coordination at the EU level.

SOCIOCULTURAL INTEGRATION

Housing tenure security

Tenure security was higher among the self-accommodated households, while households in the accommodation scheme and the ORF reported great insecurity around the expected length of stay⁶⁰ in their current accommodation:

75% of the self-accommodated households were renting an apartment by their own means, with the vast majority of them (81%) reporting having a written rental contract. In addition, more than half of the self-accommodated households expected to stay longer than 6 months in their current accommodation, whereas the rest either indicated a shorter period or were unsure. The perceived tenure security was much lower for the asylum

⁶⁰ To note that since the period where this observation was made as a result of the data collected, the Ministerial Decision published in the Official Gazette of 12 March 2019, II, No. 853 clarifies the conditions under which and the duration of stay in the accommodation programme.

seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme and the ORF in Diavata. In both cases at least 75% of the households stated that they were unsure how long they would be able to stay in their current accommodation.

Security of housing tenure contributes to a sense of safety and allows families to focus on long term planning. Security of tenure refers to both the actual tenure of housing, in the form of e.g. rental contracts, as well as the perceived security of tenure, which refers to how long persons expected to be able to stay in their housing and whether they fear eviction. In the focus group discussions with refugees and asylum seekers, access to housing was consistently highlighted as one of the key components and first steps to integration.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED HOUSING TENURE SECURITY:

To national and local authorities:

- ➔ Create a favorable environment for access to housing which includes promoting and supporting social/affordable housing programmes (in line with the National Strategy for Integration), developing innovative responses to housing needs, supporting affordable housing action plans at national and municipal levels, which takes into consideration a housing-first approach⁶¹ that can cover particularly vulnerable groups for the benefit of both local and asylum seeker/refugee populations.
- ➔ Coordination between private and public stakeholders to ensure that an affordable housing stock is developed at local level.
- ➔ Enhance the capacity of the Municipality homeless shelter, in particular increasing capacity of the shelter to host an increased

number of beneficiaries. Facilitate access to basic services and also to the shelter through increasing the capacity of the Day Center for Homeless, in particular through provision of cultural mediation services.

- ➔ Linked to the above, widen the scope of the homeless re-integration programme implemented by the Municipality so that it can assist a larger number of beneficiaries to also effectively include asylum seekers and refugees in a situation of homelessness.
- ➔ Remove barriers of access to social benefits⁶² in general for refugees, and in particular barriers to receive rental subsidies.⁶³ In particular foresee revision of legislation of prerequisites that asylum seekers and refugees cannot comply with due to the nature of their status and residence.
- ➔ Include, in possible future cash for rent programmes, facilitation services to meaningfully support asylum seekers and refugees in seeking affordable and secure housing.

To all stakeholders:

- ➔ Improve accessibility to available housing for asylum seekers and refugees through stakeholder consultations and dissemination of information to local communities, landlords, real estate agents with a view to prevent exclusion from the rental market due to lack of information and discrimination among others.
- ➔ Ensure that asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation programme are aware of their eligible length of stay, when they access the programme.

⁶¹ Housing first is an approach that takes into consideration housing as a human rights and as such does not consider housing as an end goal but as a starting point. The housing first approach was conceived for particularly vulnerable, marginalized and excluded groups (e.g. homeless), aiming to provide increased agency to these groups through providing them with increased choice and control. For more information on the housing first approach see www.housingfirsteurope.eu

⁶² At times it is not possible for asylum seekers and refugees to satisfy all the prerequisites necessary for accessing benefits. For instance for the Social Solidarity Income beneficiaries of international protection have difficulties due to (among others), in practice inability to prove permanent residence in a free of charge provided residence, obstacles in opening a bank account among others and for most benefits due to the absence of an explicit reference to 'beneficiaries of international protection'.

⁶³ Referring to the prerequisite of a 5 year residence.

Access to services (education, health and administrative services):

Access to emergency health provision is free for everyone including asylum seekers and refugees.

Almost all households in need of health care had visited a primary or emergency health facility, and in the vast majority of cases that was in a public hospital.

Education is a fundamental human right for all children and compulsory in Greece for all children aged 5-15 years. The attendance rate of children in primary school was quite high (81%) and the parents did not report any significant problems pertaining to their children's attendance. Attendance in secondary education was low and only 48% of the children attended high school or senior high school (lyceum). Having to attend classes with children from the host community who are younger than them was reported as the main reason for this low attendance at the time of the survey.

Possession of a personal health insurance number (AMKA) and a tax number (AFM) as well as a bank account number are prerequisites for having full access to the Greek social service system. The great majority across the accommodation strata had access to both AMKA and AFM: 87% of refugees and asylum seekers across the accommodation strata had an AMKA number, and 74% of the respondents had an AFM number. This is a result of the support provided by the accommodation partners and other actors including municipal authorities, who supported refugees in acquiring these numbers. However, very few refugees and asylum seekers had bank accounts in particular due to banks not opening accounts for beneficiaries of international protection (specifically, 2% of the households in the accommodation scheme, none amongst the households in the Diavata ORF and 16% of the self-accommodated households reported having a bank account).

Awareness of municipal social services though is low among the asylum seekers and refugees in all three accommodation categories.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED ACCESS TO SERVICES:

To national authorities:

- ➔ Provision of information (print and online) about municipal services and conditions of access to the latter in multiple languages targeting both asylum seekers and refugees as well as those providing services to them
- ➔ According to the report the self-accommodated seem to have a relatively lower percentage of registration at schools due to lack of documents required for the latter. It may be assumed that this is due to the lack of information on prerequisite documentation for school registration such as vaccinations as well as possibly lack of information on the school to which they can be registered based on the address of residence. Hence, authorities should actively conduct outreach, especially to the self-accommodated population, so that barriers of access to education can be systematically reported, key information provided to families and so that families can be assisted to access educational institutions in a timely manner.
- ➔ Provision of cultural mediation, horizontally in key municipal and other state services such as hospitals, parents-teachers' meetings, Kentra Koinotitas (Municipal Community centers), tax office, registry etc.
- ➔ Intercultural training of the competent staff of state and municipal authorities.
- ➔ The Bank of Greece and the relevant authorities should speedily resolve the issue of the difficulty that asylum seekers and refugees face in creating a bank account

To all stakeholders:

- ➔ It is recommended that information on services offered by the Municipality and the humanitarian/civil society is disseminated through: information leaflets in the community centres, via social workers, WhatsApp groups or SMS texts, or/and appointed focal persons in the community.

This recommendation was brought forward during the community consultations, where participants confirmed the profiling findings, pointing to a low awareness of municipal services being offered.

- ➔ Continue to provide awareness raising amongst the refugee population regarding the Greek administration and relevant basic procedures (rights,⁶⁴ obligations⁶⁵) in particular paying attention that the information effectively reaches all communities regardless of their accommodation modality and regardless of where they access services.
- ➔ Continuation and expansion of the system of reception classes, with a focus on developing programmes for the group 15+, such as intensive language courses and vocational trainings.
- ➔ Utilization of life-long learning structures in addition to formal educational ones, such as second chance high schools for young adults.
- ➔ Strengthening the collaboration of NGOs with municipal social services and authorities, including systematic referrals of those individuals who do not speak Greek and do not have the possibility to carry out applications without assistance.

Social and family safety nets & networks:

Refugees and asylum seekers in the ORF in Diavata, the majority of whom had been in Thessaloniki for less than a year, reported having much less access to safety nets and support networks compared to the households in the accommodation scheme.⁶⁶ The self-accommodated households, which had been residing longest in Thessaloniki, appeared to a greater extent to have networks to rely on, when in need, and particularly in Thessaloniki. Specifically, 46% of households in the ORF reported

that, when in need of economic support, they had 'no one to go to', while that was only reported by 29% of the households in the accommodation scheme and only 10% among the self-accommodated households. The majority of self-accommodated households (56%) relied on their networks in Thessaloniki or relatives abroad (24%). The reasons for self-accommodated households having more access to social safety nets remains to be further explored in future research. It is worth highlighting the higher proportion of self-accommodated households having networks within Thessaloniki, compared to that among the households in the accommodation scheme (24%). Among the households in the accommodation scheme, almost one fourth reported being able to cover the costs themselves, while that was only the case among 12% and 11% of the households in the ORF and self-accommodation respectively.

Interactions between the refugee population and the local community were generally reported as positive in nature.

Asylum seekers and refugees in the accommodation scheme, as well as the self-accommodated, reported interacting positively at least once per week with their neighbours or local shop owners. However, among the respondents in Diavata, 27% reported hardly ever or never interacting with the local community. The insular nature of camps, and the existence of a number of the essential services on site, could explain the less frequent interactions with the local population. Of the households reporting no interaction with the Greek population, more than half indicated language as a barrier to interaction, while one third indicated social isolation from their Greek neighbours as a reason.

⁶⁴ Such as access to education, social and welfare benefits, rights to access the labour market among others.

⁶⁵ Such as tax declarations, documentation required and pre-requisites for enjoying certain rights among others.

⁶⁶ The survey took place during a period that Diavata site was receiving a large number of spontaneous arrivals on a daily basis, a situation that created a high sense of insecurity there.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON STRONGER COMMUNITY COHESION:

To national authorities:

- ➔ The allocation of open accommodation sites should take into consideration the degree of access of asylum seekers and refugees to basic services (e.g. hospitals, schools, asylum service). For the existing sites, linkages with services outside the camp should be further enhanced.
- ➔ Promote activities that bring refugees and local community together to help them establish personal relationships.
- ➔ Support community-based protection initiatives that promote the development of social networks, i.e. peer-to-peer support, establishment of associations, and ensure that community-based protection initiatives and processes are included in Local Action Plans of Municipalities and in the design of programmes supporting integration.
- ➔ Enhance social cohesion by including local population in planning and implementation of integration activities and put into service SEM as the operational arm for the design and implementation of social cohesion activities.
- ➔ The services being provided in the urban areas should continue, in a more systematic fashion, to address, in addition to asylum seekers and refugees, the local population where relevant.

THIRD COUNTRY NATIONALS WHO ARE NOT REGISTERED WITH THE ASYLUM SERVICE

Aim of analysis

This profiling exercise also aimed to shed some light on the situation of the population in Thessaloniki classified as third country nationals who have not approached the Asylum Service. This also includes spontaneous arrivals directly to Thessaloniki through the land borders, or

persons that arrive without being part of an official transfer organized by the Greek Authorities. The majority of the persons in this category hold no documentation at all, or they hold a valid or expired police note. The majority of the sample studied was made up of police note holders (82%), while the remainder were persons with no documentation or expired documentation regarding their residence in Greece. A sudden influx of spontaneous arrivals occurred in Thessaloniki at the same time that the data collection for the profiling was taking place, and as a result, a big proportion of the sample (63% or 134 households) was made up of the newly arrived population.

Given the limited capacity of the Regional Asylum Office of Thessaloniki and the local Aliens' Directorate of the Police, new arrivals through the land borders found it significantly challenging to have their willingness to apply for asylum in Greece registered by the Asylum Service. This registration is a basic prerequisite for someone to benefit from all the services that are currently provided to asylum seekers, such as shelter, among others. Hence, the lack of meaningful access to Asylum creates significant protection concerns for those who wish to apply for asylum. The time it takes for an individual to be registered as an asylum seeker in Thessaloniki is a key concern, which extends and maintains the homelessness situation of non-registered asylum seekers.

Basic demographics

This surveyed population was comprised by twice as many men as compared to women. The population was noticeably young, with 82% being younger than 35 years of age. 94% of the households were single member households. 63% of the surveyed population had arrived to Thessaloniki within one month preceding the data collection.

Future intentions

Approximately half of the persons who were not registered at the Asylum Office indicated an intention to stay in Thessaloniki (48%) and less than one third of the households (30%) indicated an intention to move on to another EU country. No great difference in intentions was found between

households holding police notes and households with expired, or no documentation, indicating that this difference in legal status did not influence the decision to stay or leave. Of the 336 individuals surveyed, 75% stated that they intended to apply for asylum in Greece.

Homelessness

The vast majority (84%) of the respondents not registered with the Asylum Service, who had arrived within the month preceding the data collection, were living in a situation of homelessness. Amongst those, who had been residing in Thessaloniki between one and six months, almost half were residing unregistered in the Open Reception Facility⁶⁷ in Diavata and half were still living in a situation of homelessness in Thessaloniki. The respondents found in a homeless situation were primarily single member households (88%).

The focus groups discussions held in Diavata with unregistered residents, as well as the survey results, point the dire financial situation being the main obstacle to renting a place, while lack of legal papers was also reported as a significant obstacle.

Livelihood means

41% of the households of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service reported that they had no income. 28% were using their own savings, while 18% were receiving remittances from family and friends abroad. During the survey interviews, some respondents reported that, due to the difficulties in finding work, they engaged in sex work for material compensation. The basic services of free food and clothing, offered by the Municipality and different NGOs, were primarily used by the persons experiencing homelessness.

Approximately half of the surveyed households that had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month reported having been in sudden need for financial support. Most of these households either

had no one to go to for support, or relied on support from family abroad.

Access to services

A majority of the households of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service reported having been in need of health care and most of them (55 out of 61 households) had managed to visit a health care facility. More than half of them had visited an NGO clinic, either in the centre of Thessaloniki or in the ORF, while the remaining households visited a public hospital.

Among the 36 children of third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service that had been in Thessaloniki for more than one month, only 2 were reported to be attending school. The primary obstacle to enrolling children in school was reported to be the lack of requisite documentation.

To tackle the difficulty for the third country nationals not registered with the Asylum Service to access the Asylum Service, in addition to Skype, those expressing the will to request asylum were referred from Reception and Identification Service (RIS)/Site Management Support (SMS) and KEM⁶⁸ (KEM refers only vulnerabilities and Dublin family reunification from urban settings) to the Regional Asylum Office (RAO) of Thessaloniki. These persons are asylum seekers, having expressed their willingness for asylum in front of an Authority. Nevertheless, they do not receive a willingness number, thus they are not in the online system. In 2018, the waiting period for asylum registration varied between 1-7 months, depending on vulnerability, eligibility for family reunification under Dublin regulation (prioritized), language, number of family members, trends of arrivals, date of police-note expiration, etc.

KEM's referrals was established as a way for the municipality of Thessaloniki to identify the people that are in a homelessness situation in the area of

⁶⁷ For the purposes of the analysis, this group has been considered as 'homeless'

⁶⁸ Center for Integration of Migrants (KEM) are structures established at Municipal level and are annexes to Municipal Community Centers (Kentra Koinotitas). The establishment of a national network of municipality community centres (Kentra Kinotitas) is foreseen in Article 4 of Law 4368/2016 under the political supervision of the Ministry of Labour (MoL). In areas with high concentrations of migrants, municipalities can apply for additional resources to staff an annex to the community centres. This annex is known as KEM (Center for Integration of Migrants).

Thessaloniki and are willing to regularize their legal status in Greece.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

To national authorities:

- ➔ Provision of appropriate information on access to asylum, upon arrest for illegal entry to Greece by the police.
- ➔ Establishment of an interpretation department in the organigram of the Police (interpreters for all police work, not only the Aliens' Directorate of the Police).
- ➔ For newly arriving asylum seekers (arrests for illegal entry in Greece outside of the islands "hotspots"), release from detention - at least for vulnerable asylum seekers and those coming from countries for which UNHCR has issued a non-return advisory, upon the uploading of the willingness and without waiting until the registration by the Asylum Service.
- ➔ For those who are irregularly entering or staying and do not apply for asylum, and who are coming from countries for which UNHCR has issued a non-return advisory, issuance of non-return police notes.
- ➔ Enhancement of Regional Asylum Office's registration capacity, for fast registration of the pending case-load, faster registration of asylum seekers in detention, more rapid registration of persons with expired police notes, especially the ones in a situation of homelessness (at risk of detention). Enhancement of the RAO's administrative capacity, for renewal of trifold, delivery of decisions, issuance of residence permits, processing of applications, etc.

- ➔ Enhancement of the RAO's capacity to conduct Refugee Status Determination (RSD) interviews within a reasonable timeframe (given that, if all pending registrations are conducted, with the current RAO's interview capacity, the interviews will be scheduled after many years),⁶⁹ which among others, also negatively affects employability prospects for asylum seekers.
- ➔ Improve the accessibility of the asylum service in terms of location coupled with infrastructure.
- ➔ The RAO and municipality structures should continue their collaboration on referrals of vulnerable asylum seekers and Dublin Family Reunification cases for Asylum registration.

To national authorities for improving access to the police:

- ➔ Provision of regular training to the police on asylum, intercultural competences, and on how to provide information on asylum procedures.
- ➔ Improve basic reception capacity with the provision of interpreters, and ensuring efficient, clear and understandable information to asylum seekers and refugees.

⁶⁹ There is a high degree of variability regarding when interviews will be scheduled depending on the nationality of the person among others, with some nationalities having interviews scheduled after 2 years currently. This is primarily linked to the lack of interpreters in some languages and/or the high number of applications from a particular nationality.

Annex 1

Indicators and questions

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY			Responding populations
	Questions	Answer options		
Module A				
A1	Name of interviewer	Insert/pick code/name		/
A2	Introduction of survey	<p>Good morning/afternoon, my name is_____ you may know me from xxx, I am here not representing them or to provide any service. I am here conducting a study together with other organizations and the Municipality of Thessaloniki.</p> <p>The study is about the living conditions of refugees and migrants in Thessaloniki and surrounding areas and I would like to ask you a few questions.</p> <p>This survey is not related to any government assistance program, nor will it provide any form of assistance.</p> <p>However, your participation is important, as it will improve the understanding of the situation of refugees and migrants so that future assistance programme becomes better. You are not obliged to participate, and you are free not to answer some of the questions, or to stop the interview at any moment.</p> <p>The information from this interview is anonymous and confidential, which means that it cannot be linked back to you. It will be used in an analysis about specific challenges of refugees and migrants in Thessaloniki.</p> <p>The interview should from 30 minutes to 1 hour. Do you have any questions?</p>		/
A3	Consent: Would you allow us to do an interview with you? [If no consent is given, fill out remaining questions in module A via observation and then close and save the form. If you are not at the location of the respondent's residence and you can't fill out through observation, pick the answering option: 'not possible to obtain this info'].	1. Yes 2. No		/
A4	Location of residence: [Fill out through observation if you are at the respondents residence, or ask if you are interviewing in a different location than the residence]	1. Thessaloniki/ Borough A 2. Thessaloniki/ Borough B 3. Thessaloniki/Borough C 4. Thessaloniki/Borough D 5. Thessaloniki/Borough E 6. Thessaloniki/Triandia 7. Kalamarias 8. Neapolis-Sikeon 9. Paulou Mela	10. Kordeliou-Euosmou 11. Ampelokipon-Menemenis 12. Delta 13. Thermis 14. Oreokastrou 15. Pylaia Chortiati 16. Camp Lagadikia 17. Camp Diavata 18. Not possible to obtain info	/
A5	Accommodation type of respondent [Fill out through observation if you are at the respondents residence, or ask if you are interviewing in a different location than the residence]	1. Camp containers 2. Apartment/flat 3. House 4. Unfinished/abandoned building	5. Homeless Shelter 6. On the street/No housing 7. Other 8. Not possible to obtain info	/
A6	Target population	1. Refugees/asylum seekers 2. Irregular migrants	3. Not possible to obtain info	/

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
HH MODULE B: Migration history, family unity & mobility			
B1	First, I would like to ask some questions about your arrival here to Thessaloniki and your housing situation. When did your family leave your country of origin?	insert/pick year	All
B2	Are there members of your close family with whom you came to Greece that have left within the past year to go to another country and have not returned?	1. yes 2. no	All
B3	Is your family in a family re-unification process?	1. yes 2. no	Only refugees
B4	How long have you been in Greece? [if less than 1 month, indicate '0']	Insert months	All
B5	From where did you enter Greece?	1. island 2. Evros 3. Other	All
B6	How long have you been in Thessaloniki? [if less than 1 month, please indicate '0']	Insert months	All
B7	In how many places have you stayed in the past 6 months in Thessaloniki? (or since you arrived if less than 6 months) A move means that you take all your things with you. [for homeless: in how many different places have you spent the night?]	insert number of places	All
HH MODULE C: Housing			
C1	What is the main tenure status of this dwelling?	1. Provided for free as part of accommodation scheme (former NRC, UNHCR, DRC, Intersos) 2. Rented 3. Hosted with rent 4. Hosted for free by friends/family 5. Hosted for free by volunteers 6. Provided dwelling for free (by NGOs, Church etc.) 7. Other	All – not camp, not homeless
C1_2	Are you officially registered in this site? [if question not understood, ask if person is approved by the MoMP/ army and if s/he is receiving assistance]	1. yes 2. no	Only camp population
C2_1	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki, did you or anyone from your family have to sleep any night on the street or in a homeless shelter?	1. Yes 2. No	All – not homeless
C2_2	[if yes] What was the longest period that you or anyone else from your family had to spend on the street or in a homeless shelter?	insert number of days	Not new arrivals
C3	[if homeless] In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki did you have a period longer than 2 weeks where you were not homeless?	1. Yes 2. No	Only homeless

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
C4_1	[if homeless] I would like to ask you about the two most important obstacles for finding a place to stay [short term shelters do not count as a 'place to stay' in this respect] [If homeless] What is the main obstacle for finding a place to stay?	1. Not looking for a place/ not interested in finding a place 2. Lack of legal documentation/required papers (e.g. only have a police note) 3. Lack of money 4. Unwillingness of flat owners to rent out to migrants/ refugees 5. Do not know how to search for a place 6. Other	Only homeless
C4_2	[if homeless] What is the second most important obstacle for finding a place to stay? [short term shelters do not count as a 'place to stay' in this respect]	1. Lack of legal documentation/required papers (e.g. only have a police note) 2. Lack of money 3. Unwillingness of flat owners to rent out to migrants/ refugees 4. Do not know how to search for a place 5. Other	Only homeless
C4_3	[if homeless] Have you/your family tried to access a site in the past 6 months?	1. yes 2. no	Only homeless
C5	[If dwelling is rented] Does someone in the family have a written rental contract?	1. Yes 2. No	Self-accommodated (refugees & spontaneous arrivals)
C6	[If dwelling is rented] how much rent do you pay each month to stay in this dwelling? [if persons doesn't want to disclose, enter 999]	Amount in EUR/month	Self-accommodated (refugees & spontaneous arrivals)
C7	How long do you expect that you can stay in this housing?	1. Less than one month 2. Between one and 3 months 3. Between 3 and 6 months 4. More than 6 months 5. Forever 6. Don't know	All – not homeless
ROSTER D: Basic demographics			
D0	Observation: Is [Name] responding on his/her own behalf?	1. yes 2. no	All
D1	Is [Name] male or female? [Observation when you fill out the loop on the respondent]	1. Male 2. Female	All
D2	When was [Name] born?	Insert year 999 = don't know	All
D3	What is [Name's] marital status? Do not read list	1. Never married 2. Married 3. Widowed 4. Separated 5. Divorced 7. Co-habiting with my partner	All Age 12+
D4	What is [Name's] nationality (as written in the trifold)? Do not read list.	1. Syrian 2. Afghan 3. Algerian 4. Bangladeshi 5. Chinese 6. DR Congolese 7. Egyptian 8. Eritrean 9. Ethiopian 10. Iranian 11. Iraqi 12. Lebanese 13. Libyan 14. Moroccan 15. Nigerian 16. Pakistani 17. Palestinian 18. Somali 19. South Sudanese 20. Stateless 21. Sudanese 22. Tunisian 23. Turkish 24. Yemeni 25. Other 26. No documented nationality	All

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
D5	What is [Name's] mother tongue? Do not read list.	1. Amharic 2. Arabic 3. Bengali 4. Chinese 5. Dari 6. English 7. Farsi 8. French 9. German 10. Greek 11. Italian 12. Kurmanji 13. Lingala 14. Nepali 15. Pashtu 16. Portugese 17. Punjabi 18. Russian 19. Somali 20. Sorani 21. Spanish 22. Swahili 23. Tigrinya 24. Turkish 25. Urdu 26. Other	All
D6	Does [Name] have a secondary language, in which s/he can speak well?	1. yes 2. no	All Age 5+
D7	Which language is that?	1. Amharic 2. Arabic 3. Bengali 4. Chinese 5. Dari 6. English 7. Farsi 8. French 9. German 10. Greek 11. Italian 12. Kurmanji 13. Lingala 14. Nepali 15. Pashtu 16. Portugese 17. Punjabi 18. Russian 19. Somali 20. Sorani 21. Spanish 22. Swahili 23. Tigrinya 24. Turkish 25. Urdu 26. Other	All
D8	Can [Name] read and write in their mother tongue?	1. can read and write 2. can read only 3. cannot read nor write	All Age 12+
D8_2	Can [Name] read and write in their secondary language?	1. yes 2. no	All
D9	What is the highest level of education ever completed by [Name]? Do not read list.	1. No formal education 2. Primary (grade 1-6) 3. Lower secondary (7-9) 4. Vocational education/ technical institute 5. University (undergraduate) 6. University (postgraduate) 7. University (Phd)	All Age 12+
D10	Did [Name] because of displacement/migration miss any years of school?	1. Yes 2. No 3. don't know	Age 6-21
D11	[if yes] how many school years did [Name] miss?	insert number	Age 6-21
D12	Does [Name] have any serious health condition (including mental health condition) or disability that prevents him/her from doing usual daily tasks?	1. yes 2. no	All/ Age 5+
ROSTER E: Education			
E1	Which kind of documentation does [Name] have? [We only ask about Greek documentation, not passport from other country] Do not read list.	1. Police note (valid) 2. Asylum seekers card pre-registration 3. Asylum seekers card full registration 4. Decision paper on granted asylum 5. Decision paper on rejected asylum 6. Decision paper on second instance rejection 7. Asylum application indet administrative appeal 8. Residence permit card 9. No documentation 10. Expired documentation	All

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY			
	Questions	Answer options		Responding populations
E2_1	Is [Name] planning to apply for asylum in Greece?	1. Yes 2. No	3. Dont know	All
E2_2	[if not planning to apply] Why is [Name] not planning to apply for asylum in Greece?	1. I don't believe that I fit the criteria 2. I don't want to apply 3. I would prefer to move to another country	4. Long waiting time at the asylum service 5. Lack of access to basic assistance /accommodation 6. Other	All
E3	What is the main reason for [Name] not yet having a legal documentation in Greece? Do not read list.	1. Have not had the time yet to apply for such documentation (asylum) 2. Language barriers/ documents and procedures only in Greek 3. Limited access to skype 4. No knowledge of the procedures	5. Limited capacity of the asylum service 6. No access to legal support 7. Fear of arrest/approaching the police 8. Not willing 9. Other	All
E4	Does [Name] have an AMKA number? AMKA is the social security number in Greece	1. Yes 2. No	3. Don't know	All
ROSTER F: Education				
F1	Does [Name] attend pre-school (vrefikos stathmos & pronipio)?	1. Yes 2. No		Age 0-3 Not new arrivals
F2	Does [Name] attend school?	1. yes, 4 days a week or more 2. yes, less than 4 days a week	3. no	Age 5-18 Not new arrivals
F3	[if yes] What school level does [Name] attend? Do not read list.	1. Kindergarten (Nipiagogio aged 4-5) 2. Primary (1-6) – Dimotiko 3. Lower secondary (1-3) – Gymnasium 4. Higher secondary (1-3) – Lyceum	5. Vocational education 6. Technical institute (TEI) 7. University (undergraduate BA) 8. Univeristy (MA) 9. University (Postgraduate)	All Age 5+ Attending school
F4	[if yes] Are there any challenges relating to [Names] school attendance? Do not read list.	1. No challenges 2. Difficulties because of the Greek language 3. Cultural differences (e.g. mixed classes) 4. Discrimination/not accepted by teachers	5. Discrimination/not accepted by the other children 6. Not enough classes/teachers 7. Low quality of the classes 8. Other	All Age 5+ Attending school Not new arrivals
F5	[if no] What is the main reason for not attending school (regularly)? Do not read list.	1. Not know how to enroll 2. Lack of relevant papers to enroll (vaccination card & any ID) 3. Cultural differences (e.g. mixed classes) 4. Difficulties with the Greek language 5. Not able to follow classes (because of level of teaching) 6. Other responsibilities linked to the family	7. Need to work 8. Health condition (incl mental health) prevents him/her from attending 9. No slot available in the school 10. Parent don't see value in child attending school in Greece 11. Long distance to school 12. Other	All Age 5-18 Not new arrivals
F6	Does [Name] attend a Greek language course (NGOs/ other initiatives)?	1. Yes, less than three hours a week 2. Yes, three hours or more per week	3. No 4. Don't know	Age 6+ Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
ROSTER G: Employment & work stats			
G1	Did [Name] have work before coming to Greece?	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Not new arrivals
G2	During the past 4 weeks, has [Name] worked for at least one hour? [By "work" we mean any activities you undertook for remuneration, for example working for wages or in-kind, running a business (e.g. selling on street), or working on a farm or with livestock].	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Not new arrivals
G3	[If yes] How many hours did you in total work the past 4 weeks?	Indicate number of total hours	Age 15+ Not new arrivals
G4	[If having worked] Which of the following statements best describes [Name's] working status at this point in time? Read options	1. I work full time 2. I work part time (same amount of hours per week) 3. I work occasionally (some hours or days with irregular intervals) 4. I work seasonally (some periods during the year)	Age 15+ Not new arrivals
G5	Has [Name] worked seasonally with agriculture or tourism within the last 12 months in Greece?	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Not new arrivals
G6	[if working] what is the sector in which you worked most recently? Do not read list.	1. Agriculture, forestry and fishing 2. Manufacturing 3. Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities 4. Construction 5. Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles 6 Transportation and storage 7. Accommodation and food service activities 8. Information and communication 9. Financial and insurance activities 10. Professional, scientific and technical activities 11. Administrative and support service activity (Cleaning) 12. Public administration and defense 13. Education 14. Human health and social activities 15. Arts, entertainment and recreation 16. Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies (International NGO, UN) 17. Other	Age 15+ Working Not new arrivals
G7	[if working] What is the type of occupation that [Name] had most recently in Thessaloniki? Do not read list.	1. Managers 2. Professionals 3. Technician and associate professionals 4. Clerical support workers 5. Service and sales workers 6. Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers 7. Craft and related trade workers 8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers 9. Elementary occupation 10. Other	Age 15+ Working Not new arrivals
G8_1	[If working] Are you willing/able to share with us information about [Name's] salary?	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Working Not new arrivals
G8_2	[If working,] How much did [Name] receive as payment per day the last time he/she worked? If monthly salary, divide by 25	Insert amount per day	Age 15+ Working Not new arrivals
G9	[if working] Does [Name] also actively look for more work?	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Working Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
G10	[if working, and looking for work] What are the main difficulties for [Name] in finding more work? Do not read list.	1. Not possible to get one's education recognized 2. Not educated or illiterate 3. Education/qualifications not matching available jobs 4. Not able to speak Greek at all/well enough 5. Don't have the needed papers/legal status 6. The work conditions are exploitative (e.g. wages too low) 7. Available jobs are too far away 8. Don't know how to search/get a job 9. To few jobs are available/not possible to get a job 10. Family constrains/responsibilities (having to take care of other family members) 11. Social reasons/ no socially appropriate work is available 12. Employers don't want to hire refugees/migrants (discrimination) 13. Other	Age 15+ Working and looking for work Not new arrivals
G11	[If not working] Is [Name] looking for a job?	1. Yes 2. No	Age 15+ Not working Not new arrivals
G12	[If not looking for a job] Why is [Name] not looking for a job? Do not read list.	1. Too young 2. Fulltime student 3. Retired/ too old 4. Homemaker (taking care of home and family) 5. Disability, medical condition or chronic illness 6. Not possible to get one's education recognized 7. Not educated or illiterate 8. Education/qualifications not matching available jobs 9. Not able to speak Greek at all/well enough 10. Don't have the needed papers/legal status 11. The work conditions are exploitative (e.g. wages too low) 12. Available jobs are too far away 13. Don't know how to search/get a job 14. To few jobs are available/not possible to get a job 15. Family constrains/responsibilities (having to take care of other family members) 16. Pregnant or on maternity 17. Social reasons/ no socially appropriate work is available 18. Employers don't want to hire refugees/migrants (discrimination) 19. Don't want to work 20. Other	Age 15+ Not working
G13	[If looking for work,] What is the main difficulty for [Name] in finding a job? Do not read list.	1. Not possible to get one's education recognized 2. Not educated or illiterate 3. Education/qualifications not matching available jobs 4. Not able to speak Greek at all/well enough 5. Don't have the needed papers/legal status 6. The work conditions are exploitative (e.g. wages too low) 7. Available jobs are too far away 8. Don't know how to search/get a job 9. To few jobs are available/not possible to get a job 10. Family constrains/responsibilities (having to take care of other family members) 11. Social reasons/ no socially appropriate work is available 12. Employers don't want to hire refugees/migrants (discrimination) 13. Other	Age 15+ Not working Not new arrivals
G14	Is [Name] registered at OAED [OAED is the unemployment office]	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	Aged 15+ Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
HH MODULE H: HH economy			
H1	I now have some questions about the general economic situation of your family. I would like to know the 2 most important sources of income for your family. What is the primary source of income/money for this family the last 6 months in Thessaloniki? [if family has been in Thessaloniki for less than 6 months ask only about the period since arrival here] Do not read list.	1. Salary/ wages 2. Rent income 3. Business earnings (incl family enterprises) 4. Remittances (support from friends/family abroad) 5. Cash Assistance Programme 6. Other Support from Government (welfare allowances) 7. Using loans 8. Begging 9. Using savings 10. Other 11. No income	All
H2	If any, what is the secondary source of income/money for this family the last 6 months in Thessaloniki?	1. Salary/ wages 2. Rent income 3. Business earnings (incl family enterprises) 4. Remittances (support from friends/family abroad) 5. Cash Assistance Programme 6. Other Support from Government (welfare allowances) 7. Using loans 8. Begging 9. Using savings 10. Other 11. No income	All
H3_1	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki was your family at any point not able to pay any utility bills?	1 Yes 2. No	Only those renting
H3_2	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki was your family at any point not able to keep home adequately warm?	1 Yes 2. No	All Not for homeless
H3_3	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki was your family at any point not able to face unexpected expenses (of 100 EUR)?	1 Yes 2. No	
H3_4	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki was your family at any point not able to eat meat, fish or a protein equivalent every second day?	1 Yes 2. No	All Not new arrivals
HH MODULE I&J: Access to health, admin, social and humanitarian services			
I1	Has anyone in your family had the need to visit a doctor the past 6 months in Thessaloniki?	1. Yes 2. No	All Not new arrivals
I2	[if yes] Did you or the other family member that needed to see a doctor, visit a health care facility?	1. Yes 2. No	All Not new arrivals
I3	[if yes] What kind of health care facility was this?	1. Public hospital 2. Private hospital 3. Private clinic/doctor 4. Social Polyclinic 5. NGOs (i.e. MDM)	All Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
I4	[if no] What is the main reasons for not visiting a health care facility? Do not read list.	1. Would not be able to cover the costs 2. Expect low quality service 3. Overcrowded facilities 4. Communicating is difficult 5. Treated poorly or made uncomfortable by service providers /discrimination 6. Treated poorly or made uncomfortable by other users of the service/ discrimination 7. Didn't know where to go 8. No insurance 9. Refused service by health care providers (due to lack of required documents) 10. Refused service by health care providers for other reason 11. Transportation too expensive 12. No/bad transportation 13. Other	All Not new arrivals
J1	Has anyone in you household been to a KEP or any other municipal admin service office? [KEP is the public admin service of the Municipality]	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All Not new arrivals
J2	[if no] What is the reason for not having approached a KEP/ municipal admin office? Do not read list.	1. Had no need to go there 2. Communicating is difficult 3. Didn't know where to go 4. No papers 5. Do not know what services they offer/why I would need to go there 6. Other	All Not new arrivals
J3	[if yes] What was the reason for the most recent visit?	1. Issue birth certificate or AMKA 2. Get information 3. Validate signature 4. Other	All Not new arrivals
J4	[if yes] Did you manage to get help at the KEP with the issue you came with?	1. Yes, managed alone to get some help at the KEP 2. Yes, an NGO helped getting help at the KEP 3. No 4. Don't know	All Not new arrivals
J5	[if no] What was the reason for not getting help with the issues? Do not read list.	1. Difficulties in communicating 2. Refused service 3. Not properly informed 4. Treated poorly or made uncomfortable by service providers /discrimination 5. Treated poorly or made uncomfortable by other users of the service/ discrimination 6. Prevented in getting help due to legal status 7. Other	All Not new arrivals
J6	Do you know what KEM (Centre for Integration of migrants) or Community Center (kentra koinotitas) is?	1. Yes 2. No	All Not new arrivals
J7	[If yes] Has anyone in your family ever visited a KEM/Community Centre?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All Not new arrivals
J8	Does any one in your family have a bank account in Greece? [This is not the same as the bank card for cash]	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
J9	<p>I will now list some free social services and benefits provided by the Municipality of Thessaloniki and NGOs and I would like to know if you have heard of them.</p> <p>J9_1 Have you heard of the Shelter for abused women (Municipality service)?</p> <p>J9_2 Have you heard of the overnight homeless shelter or open day shelter for the homeless (Municipality service)?</p> <p>J9_3. Have you heard of the shelter for Asylum seekers (Arsis) or REACT (UNHCR)?</p> <p>J9_4. Have you heard of the Social Grocery or Food Kitchen or Food and Basic Assistance (Municipality service)?</p> <p>J9_5. Have your heard of the welfare benefits, such as social solidarity income (KEA) or disability benefits? (Municipality service)</p> <p>J9_6. Have you heard of the Municipal Health Clinics (Municipality service)?</p> <p>J9_7. Have your heard of the Social Pharmacy (Municipality service)?</p> <p>J9_8. Have you heard of the Nurseries/infant centres (Municipality service)?</p>	<p>[For each questions answering options provided]</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. No</p> <p>3. Don't know</p>	All
J10	<p>J10_1. In the last month, did you or anyone else in your family use the Food service (provided by municipality of NGOs)?</p> <p>J10_2. In the last month, did you or anyone else in your family use the provision of clothes (provided by NGOs)?</p> <p>J10_3. In the last month, did you or anyone else in your family use Shelters to stay during night / homeless shelter (provided by Municipality or NGO)?</p>	<p>[For each questions answering options provided]</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. No</p> <p>3. Don't know</p>	All
HH MODULE K: Social links and interaction			
K1	In the past 6 months in Thessaloniki (or since you arrived) was your family in a sudden need for a bigger amount of money (e.g. 200 EUR) due to an emergency, such as illness or travel?	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. No</p>	All Not new arrivals
K2	<p>[If yes] Whom did your family approach for support?</p> <p>Do not read list.</p>	<p>1. Could cover it ourself</p> <p>2. Relatives in Thessaloniki</p> <p>3. Relatives abroad</p> <p>4. Neighbours or friends in Thessaloniki</p> <p>5. (Formal) financial institutions</p> <p>6. Moneylender</p> <p>7. Religious organizations</p> <p>8. Community organizations</p> <p>9. Humanitarian organization/ aid</p> <p>10. Employer</p> <p>11. Does not know/Does not answer</p> <p>12. I didnt go to anyone/ had no one to go to</p> <p>13. Other/ none of the above</p>	All Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY		
	Questions	Answer options	Responding populations
K3	[If HH includes children] Do the children in your family play with Greek children in the neighbourhood?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. Not applicable / no kids	All Not new arrivals
HH MODULE L: Future intentions			
L1	Now I have some questions about your plans and thoughts of the future. What would be the most important thing that needs to be in place, in order for you to stay longer term in Thessaloniki? Do not read list.	1. No condition, would not consider staying in Thessaloniki longer term under any conditions. 2. Have available education for the children 3. Have access to healthcare 4. Access to accommodation/ assistance 5. Find employment 6. Get a recognized legal status 7. Have a social network (friends, family?) 8. Other	All
L2	Where do you and your family intend to live in one year from now? Do not read list.	1. Here in Thessaloniki, same address 2. Here in Thessaloniki, other address 3. Elsewhere in Greece 4. Other EU country 5. Other country outside of the EU 6. Country of origin 7. Don't know	All
L3	What is the main reason for this intention? Do not read list.	1. To have better education opportunities 2. To have better employment opportunities 3. To have better access to health care 4. Legitimate status 5. To be with family/friends 6. To avoid discrimination/ racism 7. The situation in home country has changed 8. To access economic benefits 9. To find/get housing 10. Safety 11. Other	All
RESPONDENT MODULE M:			
M1	The last questions are only about your experiences and opinions and not about the whole family. Have you ever experienced being physically or verbally harassed within the past 6 months/ since arriving in Thessaloniki? Harassment includes for example: verbal insults, insulting behaviour, threats, physical violence, damage to property)	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All
M2	[If yes] Did you report the incident to the police?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All
M3	Have you ever experienced any verbal or physical harassment by the police or local administration?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	All
M4	How often do you follow the news of your country? Read options.	1. Every day 2. Every week (not every day) 3. Several times per month (not every week) 4. Hardly ever or never	All Not new arrivals
M5	How often do you follow the news of Greece and/or Thessaloniki? Read options.	1. Every day 2. Every week (not every day) 3. Several times per month (not every week) 4. Hardly ever or never	All Not new arrivals
M6	How often do you interact with locals in your neighbourhood (e.g. residents or shop owners) in a positive manner? [If homeless, ask about interaction in general] Read options.	1. Every day 2. Every week (not every day) 3. Several times per month (not every week) 4. Hardly ever or never	All Not new arrivals

#	QUESTIONS FOR THE HH SURVEY			
	Questions	Answer options		Responding populations
M7	[If seldom] What are the reasons for not interacting that often with other persons in your neighbourhood? [if homeless, ask about interaction with local in general] Do not read list.	1. I don't know any one in the neighbourhood 2. There are a lot of tensions with the locals 3. It is difficult to communicate because I don't speak Greek (well enough/at all)	4. The neighbourhood/ neighbours are unfriendly 5. I have not tried/ not that interested to interact with my neighbours	All Not new arrivals
M8	How often do you interact with other refugees or migrants in Thessaloniki in a positive manner? Read options.	1. Every day 2. Every week (not every day)	3. Several times per month (not every week) 4. Hardly ever or never	All Not new arrivals
M9	Do you have an AFM number? [AFM is the tax number you need to get when you work]	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know		Age 15+ All Not new arrivals
M10	[if yes] Do you know that you need to make a tax declaration?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know		Age 15+ All Not new arrivals

Annex 2

Analysis of sample representativity

Population and stratum figures by age, sex and nationality

Accommodated strata

Age	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
0-5	558	19.2	168	16.9
6-17	710	24.4	252	25.3
18-24	472	16.2	144	14.5
25-34	624	21.4	201	20.2
35-54	468	16.1	189	19.0
55 and older	78	2.7	41	4.1
Total	2,910	100	995	100

	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
Females	1,240	42.6	435	43.7
Males	1,669	57.4	560	56.3
Unknown	1	0.0	-	-
Total	2,910	100	995	100

	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
Afghanistan	269	9.2	131	13.2
Iran	81	2.8	48	4.8
Iraq	733	25.2	260	26.1
Pakistan	128	4.4	32	3.2
Syria	1,346	46.3	406	40.8
Other	353	12.1	118	11.9
Total	2,910	100	995	100

Self-accommodated strata

Age	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
0-5	30	5.1	18	7.3
6-17	54	9.1	32	12.9
18-24	174	29.4	60	24.2
25-34	220	37.2	87	35.1
35-54	104	17.6	44	17.7
55 and older	10	1.7	7	2.8
Total	592	100	248	100

	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
Females	126	21.3	62	25.0
Males	466	78.7	186	75.0
Total	592	100	248	100

	Population (N)	Population (%)	Survey (N)	Survey (%)
Iran	22	3.7	17	6.9
Iraq	53	9.0	23	9.3
Pakistan	260	43.9	77	31.0
Syria	119	20.1	60	24.2
Other	138	23.3	71	28.6
Total	592	100	248	100

