

Cities' Expectations from a Common Anti- Racism Indicator Model

Results from the ECCAR-ADIX Survey

Mira Nausner and Klaus Starl

Graz, January 2011

Executive Summary

The European Coalition of Cities against Racism (ECCAR) established a working group in order to elaborate an appropriate system of indicators according to commitment 2 of its Ten-Point-Plan of Action (10PPA) in 2008. The title of this system is the ECCAR Anti-Discrimination Index (ADIX). The ECCAR ADIX working group formulated such model as a human rights-centred model based on the definitions and requirements of the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). Within its mandate the working group carried out a survey to learn about the member cities' expectations, attitudes, opinions and about their principle willingness and readiness concerning measuring racism, assessing and evaluating policy in general and with the proposed tool of ADIX in particular.

The survey was carried out by collecting data through a structured online-questionnaire send out to the cities. Out of 104 ECCAR member cities at the time being 37 cities from 13 countries answered the questionnaire. This represents around 24 Million inhabitants and more than one-third of all members in more than 60% of the countries where member cities are located.

The research interests of the survey were: whether the cities want and need monitoring instruments developed and provided by ECCAR; what are the topics which members want and need to measure with such instruments; whether members are in favour of the ADIX proposal and whether they see advantages in a harmonized municipal approach; what is the existing infrastructure and possible database in the cities and what is their experience in equality monitoring; what is their esteem of willingness for implementation in terms of political will and availability of resources and what could be possible obstacles to the realisation; and last but not least, the survey was designed to find out whether there exist common understanding of 'ethnicity' and the identification thereof. The survey was to answer these principle questions with 75 detailed questions within six clusters.

The results of the survey are surprisingly clear and in many important issues it revealed a broad consensus among so diverse cities finding themselves in very different circumstances. Firstly, ECCAR members are interested in the provision of tools by ECCAR. They explicitly want and need to measure racism and equality and policy implementation, as well as they are interested in policy impact evaluation. ECCAR members deem the human rights-centred ADIX model appropriate for these tasks. ECCAR members appreciate a municipal approach which is harmonized within ECCAR and coordinated with the European

Union and the Council of Europe. Most of the cities think that implementing ADIX will be a difficult task, but worth the effort. Most cities already collect applicable data and use them for policy information and evaluation, partly on an indicator basis. The majority of the members expressed the conviction that their cities will dedicate the necessary financial and administrative resources, as well as experts' capacities.

However, there is some reservation concerning 'ethnic' data collection. There is a widespread belief that this kind of data collection would infringe privacy and data protection rights and be against the respective national laws. A vast majority deems it likely that these data will be subject to misuse. Vulnerable groups are expected to object to this kind of data collection by the municipality. The survey results leave space for the interpretation that there is some common understanding on the 'concept of ethnicity'. The majority expressed its preference to a system of objectification and self-identification. Nevertheless, ECCAR will need to provide human rights compliant methods which then will need to be agreed in terms of legality and feasibility.

Contents

- Executive Summary 2
- Contents..... 4
- 1. Introduction 5
 - 1.1. Goals and Methods 5
- 2. Fundamental Questions 7
 - 2.1. Summary and Discussion 7
 - 2.2. Answers in Detail 7
- 3. Acceptance of the Human Rights-Centred ADIX Model 9
 - 3.1. Summary and Discussion 9
 - 3.2. Answers in Detail 9
- 4. Will ECCAR-ADIX Be Feasible?..... 10
 - 4.1. Summary and Discussion 10
 - 4.2. Answers in Detail 11
- 5. What Data is Available and What Instruments are Applied Yet?..... 11
 - 5.1. Summary and Discussion 11
 - 5.2. Answers in Detail 12
- 6. What ‘Concepts of Ethnicity’ and How to Collect ‘Ethnic’ Data? 13
 - 6.1. Summary and Discussion 13
 - 6.2. Answers in Detail 14
- 7. Conclusion and Outlook..... 15
- 8. Annex 16

1. Introduction

At the ECCAR Steering Committee Meeting in Botkyrka in 2008 the ECCAR-ADIX Working Group¹ was established to elaborate a common indicator model according to commitment 2 of the Ten-Point-Plan-of-Action (10PPA) of the coalition. Having developed a road-map on the basis of the state-of-the-art in the field, the ADIX working group was mandated to formulate a human-rights-based model at the Steering Committee hosted by the city of St. Petersburg in 2009.

The human-rights approach involves several issues: First of all, the model starts from individual rights, secondly the model respects human rights, particularly the right to privacy and data protection, but also the right to equality and non-discrimination, thirdly, it is based on a human rights norm and operationalizes it, i.e. Art. 1 ICERD, and fourthly, it is thought as an instrument to guarantee the human right to non-discrimination. All concepts which are basic to the model, e.g. the concept of ethnicity applied, are in line with human rights principles.

The study on the model was then published by UNESCO early 2010.² The model proposes three sets of indicators, measuring racism, discrimination or equality at the respective municipal level (RIX), assessing the adequacy and progress of municipal anti-discrimination and equality policies (IMPLIX) and evaluates the impact of such policies on the real life of the people in the cities (IMPACTIX).

As a next step, the working group was assigned by the ECCAR Steering Committee in its meeting in Barcelona in 2010 to carry out a survey on the member cities' attitude, perceptions and expectations toward the ADIX model, as well as on their estimation of the feasibility of implementation, available capacities, data availability and, most importantly, on the willingness of implementation.

1.1. *Goals and Methods*

In September and October 2010 the survey on the views of the ECCAR indicators on racism and policy assessment among the 104 member cities was carried out. A detailed online

¹ European Coalition of Cities against Racism – Anti Discrimination Index.

² Study on Challenges in the Development of Local Equality Indicators, Online: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001884/188481E.pdf> (10.12.2010).

questionnaire, available in English, French and German, has been sent to the respective city responsables via e-mail by the ECCAR Secretariat.³

The goal of this survey was to get representative and reliable first-hand information about the member cities needs in respect to anti-racism and equality indicators, their general will to implement the ECCAR-ADIX model in particular, about the cities' assessments concerning feasibility and possible obstacles and objections to the model, about their experience in this field and about already existing and still needed data to be in line with ECCAR-ADIX. Linked to the suggested ADIX human rights-centred model questions about the cities' views on 'concepts of ethnicity' and methods of 'ethnic' data collection have been included in the questionnaire.

37 cities⁴ from 13 countries, representing altogether about 24 million inhabitants, responded to the overall 75 questions. 31 cities answered the questionnaire completely and 6 cities in parts. The response rate was about 36% of all ECCAR member cities. At least one city out of 62% of countries with at least one ECCAR member city submitted an evaluable questionnaire.

In respect to countries Italy and United Kingdom are underrepresented. From Italy only one of seven members submitted a questionnaire and none from the UK which counts nine members.

In respect to represented population figures Italy, Belgium and France are underrepresented. Germany counts with 18 members the most ECCAR members of all countries. It is not surprising that German cities are strongly represented in the survey.

However, the coalition is a coalition of cities and each city answered on its own without reference to the country in which it is located. Therefore, the answers are interpreted by each city independently from the country or other cities in the same country. Additionally, the spreading of the answers within the countries is large enough, so that there is no distortion from the different representation of respondents by country to expect. There is no strong correlation between the results and the countries which the responding cities belong to.

Most questions included the answer options 'I do not know' and 'I do not understand the question'. These alternatives have been included to respect the specific situation that very different persons responsible for ECCAR in the city answering the questionnaire. No one should be excluded from the very beginning. Moreover, possibly occurring language barriers should not be preventing people from filling in the questionnaire.

³ The authors thank the ECCAR Administrative Secretariat at the Menschenrechtsbüro Nürnberg and the Scientific Secretariat at UNESCO for their engagement and support.

⁴ n=37.

2. Fundamental Questions

2.1. *Summary and Discussion*

As a clear result, the cities are interested in an indicator based model like the ECCAR-ADIX and they would also need it. The responding cities also show interest especially in the human-rights-centred approach, because they deem measuring the human rights situation in the city important.

Concerning questions of implementation and availability and dedication of resources, the picture is not that clear. Many cities remain cautious and answer that they do not know or cannot tell. Nevertheless, still very few cities state that they will not provide any kind of resources, that they will not participate or take the necessary steps for implementation at all. One-third of the responding cities explicitly state that they are able to and will dedicate resources in general. Being asked specifically about administrative resources and experts' knowledge, even more cities agree that they are available and that they will be provided.

Moreover, the responding cities see many realistic advantages of a shared municipal ADIX system, to name just a few: having concrete data as input for policy-making, synergies in respect to European-wide efforts to collect data and implement equality data indicators, to bring human rights norms to practice at local level, learning more about the municipality and that it allows cities without a research and development budget to enjoy the benefits of research.

2.2. *Answers in Detail*

At first, it had to be found out if the cities wanted and needed a human rights-based model of indicators and if they could and would provide the necessary financial and administrative resources as well as the necessary experts' knowledge.

More than three-fourths (78%) of the responding cities⁵ state that they are interested in an indicator based model to measure racism, equality and policy performance. Only 6% are not interested while 17% do not know. The same percental distribution occurs in the answers to the question whether the cities needed such a model. Central for a basic assessment of the cities' points of view is that nearly all cities (94%) agree that measuring the human rights situation on a city level is important (no city disagrees).

⁵ n=36 until stated differently.

Concerning questions about the implementation of the model, the answers get more diverse. 57%⁶ agree or rather agree that they will participate and use the model, while 9% think that they (probably) will not participate. Here, quite a big number (34%) is indecisive. Nearly half of the cities (49%) are (rather)⁷ positive about taking the necessary steps for implementing the model, 34% do not know. Asked about the readiness of dedicating the necessary resources, 49% of the respondents state that they do not know. But the second biggest group of answers – about one-third of the cities (34%) – (rather) agree that their cities will dedicate resources. 14% (rather) disagree. 6% preclude the availability or provision of necessary capacities and resources, another 11% have concerns in this respect. On the other hand, 37% are (rather) able to provide resources, while some 43% do not know.

Specific questions about administrative resources and availability of experts' knowledge have been asked too. 46% (rather) agree that they will provide administrative resources, 12% (rather) disagree and 40% do not know. 66% of the cities believe that the necessary experts' knowledge is available in their cities. 9% say that this is (rather) not the case in their cities, while about one-fourth (26%) does not know.

60% of the responding cities, nevertheless, (rather) think that the project would be worth the effort concerning its usefulness in relation to costs and resources needed. 9% (rather) do not think so, 31% cannot tell.

Furthermore, the responding cities see realistic advantages of a shared municipal/local ADIX scheme in contrast to a national approach. 82%⁸ mean having concrete data input for policy making as advantage, 59% are convinced that it allows for synergies in respect to European-wide efforts to collect data and implement equality data indicators, 56% name bringing international human rights norms to practice at local level, and 50% see the possibility to learn more about the municipality as advantage. 47% are of the opinion that it is an advantage that this local approach allows cities without a research and development budget to enjoy the benefits of research.

⁶ n=35 until stated differently.

⁷ This means that the answers 'agree' and 'rather agree', respectively, 'disagree' and 'rather disagree' are counted together.

⁸ n=34 until stated differently.

3. Acceptance of the Human Rights-Centred ADIX Model

3.1. Summary and Discussion

The cities have been asked detailed questions about the suggested model because it is essential to know whether the cities are interested in this model proposed by the working group, or if they have other needs, ideas and fields of interests.

Generally speaking, the cities deem the suggested ADIX model useful and adequate. Nearly two-thirds of the responding cities expect that the model, if implemented, will offer new and important information for policy makers and that it is an instrument for making the fight against racism more successful. The cities have been asked questions about every part of the three-step ECCAR-ADIX model, about RIX, IMPLIX and IMPACTIX. The answers of the cities show approval for the suggested model. The vast majority of the responding cities want to measure racism and equality (RIX). They also want to measure the second step (IMPLIX) – implementation evaluation, and if there is an appropriate policy concept to address the specific situation in the city concerning racism and discrimination. Cities also agree to measure the third step (IMPACTIX). It includes measuring the impact of local anti-discrimination and equality policies, the success of the implemented policies (thus the improvement of the situation, i.e. structures, (more) equal opportunities and respective well-being of people) and the efficiency of respective local policy. Moreover, the cities explicitly declare that the option of results comparability between cities is important to them.

3.2. Answers in Detail

In general, the cities agree that the implementation of an indicator based model will be useful for them (75%⁹). 61% state that the proposed ADIX model will be appropriate to offer new, important information for their policy-makers (one-third does not know, 6% do not think so) and the same number of cities thinks that this model is an instrument for making combating racism more successful (36% do not know, 3% do not understand the question).

The cities have been asked questions about the three steps of ECCAR-ADIX model in order to find out what exactly cities are interested to measure.

A vast majority wants to measure racism (89%) and equality (86%), and always around 50% want to measure distinction, restriction, exclusion and preference on any ground, such as ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’, nationality, language, religion or opinion impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic,

⁹ n=36 until stated differently.

social, cultural or any other field of public life.¹⁰ However, in regard to these questions some concerns about the content and language of the questions might have been occurred. In each case 14% to 19% have chosen the option ‘do not understand the question’.

With IMPLIX cities want to evaluate the adequacy of policy concepts and measures (72%; 8% say ‘no’) as well as their implementation (80%).

The third step if the indicator model is also widely wanted by the cities. 83% want to measure the impact of local anti-discrimination and equality policy; 86% want to measure the success of the implemented policies and also 86% the efficiency of respective local policy. At these questions between 11% and 17% state that they do not know, but there is nearly no opposition.

Nearly all responding cities (rather) agree that the option of results comparability is important to them (96%).

4. Will ECCAR-ADIX Be Feasible?

4.1. Summary and Discussion

While only 6% of the responding cities deem the realisation of ADIX (rather) impossible the vast majority admits that it will be a difficult and complicated task. Nevertheless, two-thirds of the responding cities believe that the project would be worth the effort.

Asked about how ECCAR-ADIX could be realised, a majority answers that specific data collection for the ECCAR-ADIX will be necessary and appropriate. One-third of the responding cities believe that it could be realised by integration in an already existing research and evaluation tool.

The cities also provided information about their opinions of potential obstacles and objections against the implementation of ADIX. The most mentioned potential obstacles are ‘insufficient resources’, ‘accessibility of data’, ‘lack of political commitment’ and ‘legal provisions’ (mentioned by about one-third of the cities, even though ECCAR research has established that legal provisions are no barrier to the realisation of ADIX). Politicians, the respective constitution and vulnerable groups are believed to be most likely to object to implementation (each around 50% of the responding cities). The human-rights-compliance of ADIX could become a strong argument for the implementation. If ECCAR succeeds in cooperating with the European Union and the Council of Europe (these institutions intend to

¹⁰ Article 1 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, online: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cerd.htm>.

set up an indicator based human rights monitoring on all governance levels including the local level) there will be definitely less scepticism or reluctance against implementation. However, the objections of vulnerable groups have to be taken seriously. It may be that the most important networks of vulnerable groups in principle agree with ADIX as the study showed, although the picture may differ at the local and municipal levels.

4.2. Answers in Detail

Concerning the feasibility of the implementation of the ADIX model, 72% of the responding cities¹¹ (rather) agree that this will be a difficult and complicated (77%) task. Around 6% deem the realisation of ADIX (rather) impossible.

Concerning the appropriate way of realisation, 60% believe that the model could be realised (in respect to the city's needs and capabilities) by specific data collection for ECCAR-ADIX, and 31% think that it could be realised by integration in an already existing research tool.

According to the responding cities¹², most likely obstacles for the realisation of ADIX are insufficient resources (79%), accessibility of data (41%), no access to experts' knowledge for processing/evaluating statistical data (38%), lack of political commitment and legal provisions (35% each). Who is believed to be most likely to object: decision makers/politicians (56%), vulnerable groups and the respective constitution (47% each).

5. What Data is Available and What Instruments are Applied Yet?

5.1. Summary and Discussion

Nearly all responding cities collect data concerning social issues. The existing data collections of a majority of the responding cities include 'ethnic' categories in a broader sense (which contains nationality, language, religion, etc.). Two-thirds of cities are already experienced in evaluating policies by using indicators in the areas of housing, labour market, education, health sector, culture and equality monitoring. About 40% use indicators to measure the current condition of the local society in respect to equality between citizens belonging to different 'ethnic' groups (in the broadest sense), and about one-third in respect to racism.

¹¹ n=35 until stated differently.

¹² n=34 until stated differently.

Thus, there is data available in the cities, which stem from the sources: census, administrative registers, NGO data collections and police register data. However, there is still a lot of work to be done: cities responded that they still need to collect data in the following areas to be in line with ECCAR-ADIX: housing, education, equality monitoring, labour market, health sector and human resource.

Even if 71% (rather) agree that there might be difficulties in gathering the necessary data, an important precondition for the implementation of ECCAR-ADIX seems to be fulfilled when cities are experienced in the collection of data and the respective data processing.

5.2. Answers in Detail

Cities have been asked about already existing data to get insight in their specific situation, different stages and different needs. Nearly all cities¹³ (95%) collect data concerning social issues. 43% of them already collect data in the area of equality monitoring. The existing data collections of 71% of the responding cities¹⁴ include ‘ethnic’ categories in a broader sense (including nationality, language, religion...). 64% of cities¹⁵ evaluate policies by using indicators (14% do not; 19% do not know). They¹⁶ evaluate policies in the following areas: housing (79%), labour market (75%), education (75%), health sector (67%), culture (54%) and equality monitoring (46%).

More specifically, 43% of the responding cities¹⁷ already use indicators to measure the current condition of the local society in respect to equality between citizens belonging to different ‘ethnic’ groups (in the broadest sense) (46% do not), and 34% in respect to racism (57% do not).

The available data in the responding cities¹⁸ stem from the following sources: census (71% of the cities state this), administrative registers (74%), NGO data collections (59%) and police register data (47%). Cities responded that they still need to collect data in the following areas to be in line with ECCAR-ADIX: housing (71%), education, equality monitoring, labour market (68% each), health sector (64%) and human resource (56%).

¹³ n=37 until stated differently.

¹⁴ n=35 until stated differently.

¹⁵ n=36 until stated differently.

¹⁶ n=24.

¹⁷ n=35 until stated differently.

¹⁸ n=34 until stated differently.

6. What ‘Concepts of Ethnicity’ and How to Collect ‘Ethnic’ Data?

6.1. *Summary and Discussion*

The responding cities treat this sensitive topic with reasonable care. Concerning ‘ethnic’ data collection, they see both risks and chances. They believe that ‘ethnic’ data collection could reveal problems in the the cities’ societies. Moreover, the cities are of the opinion that ‘ethnic’ data collection is of strategic importance for the fight against discrimination, and that it enables the proof of ‘ethnic’ discrimination. More than 50% of the responding cities are convinced that ‘ethnic’ data collection improves the chance to equal opportunities. The cities also acknowledge that there are difficulties definig ‘ethnic’ data which is important to not risk getting wrong data. The responding cities also deem general misuse and excessive use of ‘ethnic’ data likely risks of ‘ethnic’ data collection. Some cities even worry that ‘ethnic’ data collection could lead to discrimination and stigmatisation of members of ‘ethnic’ groups and the groups as a whole. These suspected risks and worries have to be taken seriously. The design and implementation of the human rights-centred ADIX will require appropriate safeguards for both vulnerable groups and individuals. The proposal tends in the direction of avoiding any ‘deficiency’ approaches and to apply capability approaches in order to not shame or blame anyone, but making discrimination and discriminatory structures visible.

When it comes to questions about concepts of ‘ethnicity’ it becomes apparent that the responding cities are reluctant to measure and disaggregate the categories which would apply best to victims of racism and discrimination (mostly on the reason of avoiding stigmatization or victimization). They rather suggest collecting ‘ethnic’ data by alalyzing proxy data like place of birth, place of birth of parents or nationality. This does not cover all prohibited grounds of ‘racial discrimination’ statet in Art.1, ICERD¹⁹ (which are race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin). Beyond that, it is also contrary to answers of the cities to questions about the suggested model. There, nearly 90% say that they want to measure racism (RIX). This is necessary for the third step of indicators being meaningful (IMPACTIX), which cannot be measured if there is no information about the actual situation (RIX). Anyway, ECCAR will need to count what counts.²⁰

Finally, a few last sentences about the cities views on how to identify the ‘ethnicity’ of an individual, which is essential for ‘ethnic’ data collection. The cities had difficulties answering this question and there cannot be presented an easy solution. But a tendency can

¹⁹ International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

²⁰ To use one of the tellingly expressions of Katerina Tomasevski, former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education (made in the context of racism in education).

be spotted: 40% of the cities say the ‘ethnicity’ of an individual can be identified by a combination of objectification and self-identification, which is in line with ECCAR-ADIX.

6.2. Answers in Detail

The careful answers to these sensitive topics show that the cities look at them with the necessary precaution.

Nationality (48%), national origin, language (26% each) and legal (national) minority status (23%) are ‘concepts of ethnicity’ which are already applied by the responding cities²¹. ‘Concepts of ethnicity’ which maybe could be applied in practice are national origin (45%), language (29%) and nationality (26%). At these questions many cities state that they do not know (16% to 26%).

The responding cities²² tried to answer by what means the ‘ethnicity’ of an individual is identified. 40% say objectification of self-identification nominations and 25% declare only self-identification as appropriate.

The cities²³ also suggest collecting ‘ethnic’ data by using proxy data like place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality and others (68%), self-identification with given categories (52%) and open self-identification (23%). Three cities suggest not collecting ‘ethnic’ data at all.

The cities also answered questions about their opinions concerning opportunities and risks of ‘ethnic’ data collection. On the one hand, 87% express the opinion that it will be (rather) difficult to define ‘ethnic’ data in the first place. In this context they also (rather) agree (74%) that ‘ethnic’ data collection risks getting wrong data. They also (rather) fear excessive use (71%) and general misuse (74%) of ‘ethnic’ data (some 20% [rather] do not fear this). 65% are (rather) worried that ‘ethnic’ data collection can lead to discrimination and stigmatisation of ‘ethnic’ groups, while 29% (rather) do not think so. The cities have also been asked if they deem ‘ethnic’ data collection a violation of the right to privacy. Here, the answers are quite balanced. In total, 42% (rather) agree to this statement – and 42% (rather) disagree (looking more closely a tendency is visible: 26% fully agree while 16% fully disagree).

On the other hand, 77% of the responding cities are (rather) convinced that ‘ethnic’ data collection is likely to reveal problems in the cities’ societies. A majority (74%) (rather) agrees that ‘ethnic’ data collection is of strategic importance for the fight against

²¹ n=31 until stated differently.

²² n=25 because at this question it was possible to give no answer at all.

²³ n=31 until stated differently.

discrimination and that it does enable the proof of ‘ethnic’ discrimination (61%). The responding cities are also (rather) of the opinion that ‘ethnic’ data collection improves the chance to equal opportunities (58%; 29% do not know).

7. Conclusion and Outlook

One-third of the ECCAR members participated in the ECCAR ADIX survey on the expectations for a common racism indicator system. The results can be interpreted as a clear assignment of ECCAR to further develop the indicators and implement the monitoring system in due time.

To summarize:

- ECCAR members explicitly want and need to measure racism and equality and policy implementation as well as they are interested in policy impact evaluation.
- The human rights-centred ADIX model is deemed appropriate to cope with this task.
- ECCAR members appreciate a municipal approach which is harmonized within ECCAR and coordinated with the European Union and the Council of Europe.
- Even though admitted to be a difficult task, most cities collect applicable data and already use them for policy information and evaluation.
- Also important, if not most importantly, the majority of the members expressed the conviction that their cities will dedicate the necessary financial and administrative resources, as well as experts’ capacities.

The survey revealed also a few more fundamental questions. Firstly, questions related to the collection of ‘ethnic’ data are sensitive. There is a widespread belief that this kind of data collection would infringe privacy and data protection rights and be against the respective national laws. Furthermore there is a very cautious, almost pessimistic, attitude toward the risks of such data collections. A vast majority deems it likely that these data will be subject to misuse. And finally, vulnerable groups are expected to object to this kind of data collection by the municipality.

With these results ECCAR and its ADIX working group have a much clearer picture on the expectations and considerations among member cities. The next challenges will therefore be:

- Information on the legality of ADIX data collection and on the safeguards to ensure human rights compliance.

- The elaboration of a common ‘understanding of ethnicity’ and the methods of its identification.
- The discussion and agreement of the first sets of indicators.
- As agreed at the Steering Committee in Uppsala, the ADIX working group will also continue its efforts toward a cooperation with the EU Fundamental Rights Agency and the Council of Europe’s Congress of Local and Regional Authorities.

8. Annex

ECCAR-ADIX Survey

Detailed list of answers

n=37 (except when stated differently)

Basic Information

What size has your city?

Please choose only one of the following:

Up to 100 000 inhabitants	24,3%
More than 100 000 up to 500 000 inhabitants	43,2%
More than 500 000 up to 1 000 000 inhabitants	10,8%
More than 1 000 000 up to 3 000 000 inhabitants	13,5%
More than 3 000 000 inhabitants	8,1%

Assessment of the city’s experience

Does your city collect data concerning social issues?

Yes: 94,6% No: 2,7% Do not know: 2,7% Do not understand the question: 0%

If YES:

In what areas does your city collect data?

Please choose all that apply:

<input type="checkbox"/> Equality monitoring	16 Klicks	(43,2% of cities)
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal counselling	7 Klicks	(18,9%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Information/public relations	14 Klicks	(37,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Labour market	30 Klicks	(81,1%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff office/human resource	22 Klicks	(59,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Health sector	26 Klicks	(70,3%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	31 Klicks	(83,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing	29 Klicks	(78,4%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Culture and art	22 Klicks	(59,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Police services	16 Klicks	(43,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Judicial administration	6 Klicks	(16,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Political discourse	8 Klicks	(21,6%)

- I don't know 0 Klicks
 Other: 11 other answers

From what sources do these data stem from?

Please choose all that apply:

- Surveys 75,7%
 Register Data 81,1%
 Census Data 62,2%
 Other: 7 additional answers

Do your existing data collections include ethnic categories in the broader sense (nationality, language, religion, etc)? (n=35)

Yes: 71,4% No: 17,1% Do not know: 11,4% Do not understand the question: 0%

Does your city develop social indicators from these data? (n=35)

Yes: 60% No: 20% Do not know: 17,1% Do not understand the question: 2,9%

If YES:

Please give some examples: 17 additional answers

Are these data and indicators important parameters for the municipal policy? (n=34)

Yes: 76,5% No: 8,8% Do not know: 14,7% Do not understand the question: 0%

Does your city evaluate policies by using indicators? (n=36)

Yes: 63,9% No: 13,9% Do not know: 19,4% Do not understand the question: 2,8%

If YES:

In what areas does your city evaluate policies by using indicators? (n=24)

Please choose all that apply:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Equality monitoring | 11 Klicks | (45,8% of 24 cities) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal counselling | 3 Klicks | (12,5%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information/public relations | 5 Klicks | (20,8%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Labour market | 18 Klicks | (75%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Staff office/human resource | 11 Klicks | (45,8%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health sector | 16 Klicks | (66,7%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | 18 Klicks | (75%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | 19 Klicks | (79,2%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Culture and art | 13 Klicks | (54,2%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Police services | 9 Klicks | (37,5%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Judicial administration | 3 Klicks | (12,5%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Political discourse | 6 Klicks | (25%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | 7 additional answers | |

Is your city interested in an indicator based model to measure racism, equality and policy performance? (n=36)

Yes: 77,8% No: 5,6% Do not know: 16,7% Do not understand the question: 0%

Do you think that measuring the human rights situation in your city is important? (n=36)

Yes: 94,4% No: 0% Do not know: 5,6% Do not understand the question: 0%

Does your city need such model? (n=36)

Yes: 77,8% No: 5,6% Do not know: 16,7% Do not understand the question: 0%

What would you expect if implementing the ECCAR ADIX model in your city?

Do you think that an indicator based model is useful? (n=36)

Yes: 75% N: 0% Do not know: 25% Do not understand the question: 0%

What would you expect if implementing the ECCAR ADIX model in your city?

Do you think that this model will be appropriate to offer new, important information for policy-makers? (n=36)

Yes: 61,1% No: 5,6% Do not know: 33,3% Do not understand the question: 0%

What would you expect if implementing the ECCAR ADIX model in your city?

Do you think that it is an instrument for making combating racism more successful? (n=36)

Yes: 61,1% No: 0% Do not know: 36,1% Do not understand the question: 2,8%

The Model

What in your opinion should be measured with indicators in your city? <i>Please choose the appropriate response for each item:</i>	Yes	No	Do not know	Do not understand the question
Racism (n=36)	88,9%	2,8%	8,3%	0%
Equality (n=36)	86,1%	2,8%	11,1%	0%
Distinction concerning the enjoyment of human rights (n=36)	55,6%	0%	25%	19,4%
Preference concerning the enjoyment of human rights (n=36)	50%	5,6%	25%	19,4%
Exclusion concerning the enjoyment of human rights (n=36)	50%	11,1%	25%	13,9%
Restriction concerning the enjoyment of human rights (n=36)	52,8%	8,3%	22,2%	16,7%

What should be measured with indicators in your city?

a. Implementation evaluation (n=36)

Yes: 80,6% No: 2,8% Do not know: 11,1% Do not understand the question: 5,6%

b. Whether there exists an appropriate policy concept to address the specific situation in the city (n=36)

Yes: 72,2% No: 8,3% Do not know: 5,6% Do not understand the question: 13,9%

What should be measured with indicators in your city? If the planned measures are implemented in order to promote...	Yes	No	Do not know	Do not understand the question
factual equality (n=36)	63,9%	8,3%	19,4%	8,3%
equal opportunities (n=36)	86,1%	0%	8,3%	5,6%
Inclusion (n=36)	72,2%	2,8%	16,7%	8,3%
equal treatment (n=36)	75%	2,8%	16,7%	5,6%

What should be measured with indicators in your city?

a. The impact of local anti-discrimination and equality policy (n=36)

Yes: 83,3% No: 0% Do not know: 16,7% Do not understand the question: 0%

b. Success of the implemented policies, i.e. the improvement of the situation (n=36)

Yes: 86,1% No: 0% Do not know: 13,9% Do not understand the question: 0%

c. The efficiency of local policy (n=36)

Yes: 86,1% No: 2,8% Do not know: 11,1% Do not understand the question: 0%

Realisation and data

Do you think the implementation of the human rights centred indicator model is...	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
easy to realise (n=35)	2,9%	10,8%	22,9%	40%	22,9%	0%
difficult (n=35)	28,6%	42,9%	2,9%	8,6%	17,1%	0%

complicated (n=35)	31,4%	45,7%	0%	5,7%	17,1%	0%
not possible (n=35)	2,9%	2,9%	17,1%	42,9%	28,6%	5,7%

What do you think about the following statements concerning the realisation of the ECCAR ADIX in your city? (all n=35)	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
There will be difficulties in gathering the necessary data.	34,3%	37,1%	2,9%	5,7%	20%	0%
My city will participate (use the model).	28,6%	28,6%	5,7%	2,9%	34,3%	0%
My city will do the necessary steps.	22,9%	25,7%	14,3%	2,9%	34,3%	0%
My city will dedicate the necessary resources.	11,4%	22,9%	11,4%	2,9%	48,6%	2,9%
My city cannot provide the necessary capacity and resources.	5,7%	11,4%	17,1%	20%	42,9%	2,9%
The option of results comparability between cities is important.	45,7%	45,7%	0%	0%	8,6%	0%
The project is worth the effort concerning its usefulness in relation to costs and resources needed.	28,6%	31,4%	5,7%	2,9%	31,4%	0%
My city will provide the necessary administrative resources.	14,3%	31,4%	8,6%	2,9%	40%	2,9%
In my city there is the necessary experts' knowledge available.	22,9%	42,9%	5,7%	2,9%	25,7%	0%

How much money does your city spend on the fight against racism every year? (n=35)

Please choose only one of the following:

Less than 50 000 € / year	28,6%
Up to 250 000 € / year	28,6%
Up to 500 000 € / year	8,6%
Up to 1 000 000 € / year	0%
More than 1 000 000 € / year	8,6%
Cannot tell	25,7%

Does your city already use indicators to measure the condition of the local society (current situation) in respect to...

a. ...equality between citizens belonging to different 'ethnic' groups (in the broadest sense)? (n=35)

Yes: 42,9% No: 45,7% Do not know: 5,7% Do not understand the question: 5,7%

b. ...racism? (n=35)

Yes: 34,3% No: 57,1% Do not know: 5,7% Do not understand the question: 2,9%

Does your city already use indicators to measure...

a. ...implementation of policies, institutions (processes)? (n=35)

Yes: 51,4% No: 31,4% Do not know: 11,4% Do not understand the question: 5,7%

b. ...results and impact (success) of the implemented measures (outcome)? (n=35)

Yes: 45,7% No: 34,3% Do not know: 17,1% Do not understand the question: 2,9%

How could ECCAR ADIX be realised considering your city's needs and capabilities? (n=35)

Please choose only one of the following:

By specific data collection for ECCAR ADIX	60%
By integration in an already existing research tool	31,4%
Cannot be realised in my city	8,6%

If: BY INTEGRATION IN AN ALREADY EXISTING RESEARCH TOOL:

What is measured by this tool? (n=11)

Please choose all that apply:

Racism	5 Klicks	(45,5% of 11 cities)
Equality	7 Klicks	(63,6%)
Integration / Social cohesion	9 Klicks	(81,8%)
Discrimination	8 Klicks	(72,7%)
Intercultural relations	4 Klicks	(36,3%)
Other:	0 Klicks	

What is the purpose of this tool?

11 answers

What data is available/used? What methods of data collection are applied for your already applied instruments? (n=34)

Please choose all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> Census	24 Klicks	(70,6% of 34 cities)
<input type="checkbox"/> Household surveys	11 Klicks	(32,3%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative registers	25 Klicks	(73,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Justice system data	3 Klicks	(8,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> NGO data collections	20 Klicks	(58,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Equality body data	12 Klicks	(35,3%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Police register data	16 Klicks	(47,1%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Victim surveys	12 Klicks	(35,3%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Surveys focussing on attitudes and stereotypes	13 Klicks	(38,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Survey focussing on behaviour and social distance	5 Klicks	(14,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination testing	8 Klicks	(23,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative primary data	9 Klicks	(26,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative secondary data	7 Klicks	(20,6%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory experiments	0 Klicks	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Housing Data, Sozialplanung, Umfragen		

What of the following advantages of a shared municipal/local ADIX scheme for the cities in contrast to a national approach are realistic in your opinion? (n=34)

Please choose all that apply:

- To bring international human rights norms to practice at local level 19 Klicks (55,9% of 34 cities)
- Focus on individuals rather than (socially constructed) groups 7 Klicks (20,6%)
- Allows cities without a research and development budget to enjoy the benefits of research 16 Klicks (47,1%)
- Allows – within limits – comparison between cities 27 Klicks (79,4%)
- Local autonomy concerning the objectives 13 Klicks (38,2%)
- Synergies in respect to European-wide efforts to collect data and implement equality data indicators 20 Klicks (58,8%)
- Learning more about the municipality 17 Klicks (50%)
- Having concrete data as input for policy-making 28 Klicks (82,4%)

In what areas should data be collected in your city to be in line with ECCAR ADIX? (n=34)

Please choose all that apply:

- Equality monitoring 23 Klicks (67,6% of 34 cities)
- Legal counselling 8 Klicks (23,5%)
- Information/public relations 12 Klicks (35,3%)
- Labour market 23 Klicks (67,6%)
- Staff office/human resource 19 Klicks (55,9%)
- Health sector 22 Klicks (64,7%)
- Education 23 Klicks (67,7%)
- Housing 24 Klicks (70,6%)
- Culture and art 15 Klicks (44,1%)
- Police services 15 Klicks (44,1%)
- Judicial administration 7 Klicks (20,6%)
- Political discourse 11 Klicks (32,3%)
- Other: 7 additional answers (20,6%)

Obstacles and objections

What obstacles might be likely concerning implementation of ECCAR ADIX? (n=34)

Please choose all that apply:

- Lack of political commitment 12 Klicks (35,3% of 34 cities)
- Insufficient resources 27 Klicks (79,4%)
- Danger of abuse 5 Klicks (14,7%)
- No access to data 14 Klicks (41,2%)
- Legal provisions 12 Klicks (35,3%)
- No access to experts' knowledge for processing/evaluating statistical data 13 Klicks (38,2%)
- Other: 2 answers

What groups could object to data collection? (n=34)

Please choose all that apply:

- Vulnerable groups ('minorities') 16 Klicks (47,1% of 34 cities)
- Decision makers (politicians...) 19 Klicks (55,9%)
- Majority population 7 Klicks (20,6%)
- Constitution, jurisprudence 16 Klicks (47,1%)
- Other: 4 answers

‘Ethnic’ data collection, concepts of ‘ethnicity’

What concept(s) of ‘ethnicity’ are or could be applied in your city? (all n=31)	Is applied	Could be applied	Should not be applied	Must not be applied	Do not know	Do not understand the question
Nationality	48,4%	25,8%	3,2%	3,2%	16,1%	3,2%
National origin	25,8%	45,2%	3,2%	3,2%	16,1%	6,5%
‘Race’, skin colour, ethnic descent, ethnic origin	9,7%	16,1%	35,5%	16,1%	19,4%	3,2%
Legal (national) minority status	22,6%	19,4%	19,4%	6,5%	19,4%	12,9%
Language	25,8%	29%	9,7%	12,9%	16,1%	6,5%
Religion	16,1%	19,4%	25,8%	16,1%	16,1%	6,5%
Culture	16,1%	16,1%	25,8%	3,2%	25,8%	12,9%

Are there other concepts of 'ethnicity' applied in your city? Or are there other concepts which could be applied? (n=31)
16 answers

By what means is the ‘ethnicity’ of an individual identified? (n=25)

Please choose only one of the following:

- By self-identification of the individual 28%
- By official attribution 16%
- By a combination of 1 and 2, i.e. objectification of self-identification nominations 40%
- By informal attribution (‘racialisation/ethnicization’) 12%
- Do not understand the question 4%
- No answer: not included in valid percentage)

How do you suggest collecting ‘ethnic’ data in your city? (n=31)

Please choose all that apply:

- Self-identification with given categories 16 Klicks (51,6% of 31 cities)
- Open self-identification 7 Klicks (22,5%)
- Proxy data (place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality...) 21 Klicks (67,7%)
- Attributions by others 1 Klick (3,2%)
- Do not understand the question 0 Klicks
- Other: 4 additional answers (12,9%)

‘Ethnic’ data collection... (all n=31)	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
...does enable the proof of ‘ethnic’ discrimination.	32,3%	29%	3,2%	6,5%	22,6%	6,5%
...improves the chance to equal opportunities.	29%	25,8%	3,2%	12,9%	29%	0%

...is of strategic importance for the fight against discrimination.	35,5%	38,7%	6,5%	6,5%	12,9%	0%
...is likely to reveal problems in the cities' societies.	38,7%	38,7%	0%	9,7%	9,7%	3,2%

'Ethnic' data collection... (all n=31)	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
...has to face difficulties defining 'ethnic' data.	58,1%	29%	3,2%	0%	6,5%	3,2%
...risks getting wrong data.	29%	45,2%	19,4%	0%	6,5%	0%
...risks an excessive use.	45,2%	25,8%	16,1%	3,2%	9,7%	0%
...risks unlawful use.	25,8%	32,3%	19,4%	9,7%	12,9%	0%
...can lead to discrimination and stigmatisation of 'ethnic' groups.	35,5%	29%	19,4%	9,7%	6,5%	0%
...risks misuse.	35,5%	38,7%	16,1%	3,2%	6,5%	0%
...can be a violation of the right to privacy.	25,8%	16,1%	25,8%	16,1%	16,1%	0%

The city's situation

In what field(s) of public life occurs (direct and/or indirect) discrimination of 'ethnic' groups in your city? Please give your assessment of the situation. (n=31)

Please choose all that apply:

- Treatment before tribunals and other organs administering justice
6 Klicks (19,3% of 31 cities)
- Freedom of movement and residence within the city 8 Klicks (26%)
- Housing 26 Klicks (83,8%)
- Labour market 26 Klicks (83,8%)
- Healthcare 13 Klicks (41,9%)
- Education and training 19 Klicks (61,3%)
- Participation in cultural activities 10 Klicks (32,3%)
- Access to any place or service intended for use by the general public (transport, hotels, restaurants, parks...) 14 Klicks (45,2%)
- Media coverage 18 Klicks (58,1%)
- Security of the person and protection against violence or bodily harm
13 Klicks (41,9%)
- Political discourse 13 Klicks (41,9%)
- Other: 5 additional answers (16,1%)

Are there complaints because of cases of discrimination of 'ethnic' groups in your city? (n=31)
Yes: 64,5% No: 12,9% Do not know: 22,9% Do not understand the question: 0%

If YES: (n=20)

To whom they are reported?

Please choose all that apply:

NGOs	17 Klicks (85% of 20 cities)	
Municipal specialised equal treatment bodies		12 Klicks (60%)
Courts	8 Klicks (40%)	
Police	8 Klicks (40%)	
Other:	9 additional answers (45%)	

Are there court convictions because of cases of discrimination of 'ethnic' groups in your city? (n=20)

Yes: 30% No: 30% Do not know: 35% Do not understand the question: 5%

What population groups are most likely to be the victims of 'ethnic' discrimination? Again, your assessment of the situation is needed. (n=31)

Please choose all that apply:

<input type="checkbox"/> North African	20 Klicks (64,5% of 31 cities)
<input type="checkbox"/> Central American	6 Klicks (19,4%)
<input type="checkbox"/> From (other) EU countries	5 Klicks (16,1%)
<input type="checkbox"/> North American	0 Klicks
<input type="checkbox"/> East European (not EU)	12 Klicks (38,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Sub Sahara African	20 Klicks (64,5%)
<input type="checkbox"/> South East European (not EU)	6 Klicks (19,4%)
<input type="checkbox"/> From Oceania	1 Klick (3,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Indian / Pakistani	9 Klicks (29%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean	4 Klicks (12,9%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Turkish	13 Klicks (41,9%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Former USSR	5 Klicks (16,1%)
<input type="checkbox"/> South American	3 Klicks (9,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> From the Near East	8 Klicks (25,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Former Yugoslavia	3 Klicks (9,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Roma/Sinti	18 Klicks (58,1%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	4 Klicks (12,9%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Christian	0 Klicks
<input type="checkbox"/> Muslim	19 Klicks (61,3%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu	1 Klick (3,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist	1 Klick (3,2%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other religious group	0 Klicks
<input type="checkbox"/> Specific linguistic group	3 Klicks (9,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	7 additional answers (22,6%)

Who are the victims of 'ethnic' discrimination in your city? (n=31)

Please choose all that apply:

<input type="checkbox"/> Group(s) of specific 'ethnic' or national origin or descent	19 Klicks (61,3% of 31 cities)
<input type="checkbox"/> Religious group(s)	12 Klicks (38,7%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Linguistic group(s)	4 Klicks (12,9%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Foreigners (without citizenship)	8 Klicks (25,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> Migrants/Immigrants	17 Klicks (54,8%)
<input type="checkbox"/> (Officially recognised) minorities	4 Klicks (12,9%)

- Asylum seekers and / or refugees 11 Klicks (35,5%)
- 'Migrant workers' (season workers, care professional staff...) 5 Klicks (16,1%)
- Illegal immigrants 13 Klicks (41,9%)
- 'Visible Minorities' (skin colour, physical appearance, surname...) 21 Klicks (67,7%)
- 'Minorities' from neighbouring states 1 Klick (3,2%)
- Other: 5 additional answers (16,1%)

Who commits 'ethnic' discrimination in your city (who are the offenders)? (n=31)

Please choose all that apply.

- Administration 12 Klicks (38,7% of 31 cities)
- Politicians 6 Klicks (19,4%)
- Police 13 Klicks (41,9%)
- Judicial Administration 3 Klicks (9,7%)
- Teachers 8 Klicks (25,8%)
- Service providers 10 Klicks (32,3%)
- Private persons 20 Klicks (64,5%)
- Journalists 5 Klicks (16,1%)
- Local newspapers / TV programmes 7 Klicks (22,6%)
- Racist groups (members) 14 Klicks (45,2%)
- Employers 16 Klicks (51,6%)
- Landlords 17 Klicks (54,8%)
- Private security agencies 8 Klicks (25,8%)
- Doctors (medical) 3 Klicks (9,7%)
- Other: 7 additional answers (22,6%)

What forms of offence occur in your city? (n=31)

Please choose all that apply:

- (Hate) crimes 6 Klicks (19,4%)
- Civic discrimination (labour market, housing etc) 20 Klicks (64,5% of 31 cities)
- Institutional or structural (institutions of society, norms...) 14 Klicks (45,2%)
- 'Everyday racism' 23 Klicks (74,2%)
- Harassment 13 Klicks (41,9%)
- Other: 5 additional answers (16,1%)

What is your city like? Please give your assessment of the general situation. Do you agree to the following statements or not?

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
In my city diversity is seen positive.	25,8%	54,8%	12,9%	6,5%	0%	0%
It is important for my city to be seen as multicultural	61,3%	38,7%	0%	0%	0%	0%
My city wants to hide that there are people from a variety of different 'ethnic' groups living on its territory.	3,2%	3,2%	22,6%	71%	0%	0%
My city is a very open city.	38,7%	54,8%	3,2%	0%	0%	3,2%
If something is made differently than in the usual way it is seen as enrichment for the city.	12,9%	41,9%	29%	6,5%	9,7%	0%

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
In the residential areas there is an intermixture of all 'ethnic' groups.	9,7%	58,1%	22,6%	3,2%	6,5%	0%
The different groups of people living in my city stay mainly among themselves.	0%	38,7%	41,9%	9,7%	9,7%	0%
My city does not try to make for an intermixture of all different 'ethnic' groups in the urban residential areas.	0%	9,7%	48,4%	32,3%	6,5%	3,2%
There is solidarity within the different neighbourhoods of the city.	16,1%	48,4%	12,9%	9,7%	9,7%	3,2%

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
In my city the diverse religious groups are all allowed to build and use their buildings of worship.	32,3%	45,2%	9,7%	6,5%	6,5%	0%
In the city a/some religious group/s is/are generally mistrust by the majority group.	9,7%	32,3%	29%	16,1%	12,9%	0%
In my city a/some linguistic group/s is/are generally mistrust by the majority linguistic group.	3,2%	19,4%	22,6%	48,4%	6,5%	0%

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
In the city all population groups have equal access to services in everyday life.	19,4%	38,7%	25,8%	9,7%	6,5%	0%
A/some 'ethnic' group/s is/are disadvantaged in the educational system.	12,9%	45,2%	19,4%	19,4%	3,2%	0%
A/some 'ethnic' group/s is/are disadvantaged in the health system.	9,7%	41,9%	16,1%	19,4%	12,9%	0%
In the labour market of my city all 'ethnic' groups have equal prospects.	0%	25,8%	38,7%	22,6%	12,9%	0%
A/some 'ethnic' group/s has/have difficulties finding accommodation.	29%	48,4%	12,9%	3,2%	6,5%	0%

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
A/some 'ethnic' group/s has/have to reckon that it/they have to face harassment in my city.	9,7%	48,4%	25,8%	6,5%	6,5%	3,2%

In my city some groups have to face racism in everyday life.	25,8%	29%	29%	12,9%	3,2%	0%
In the local media coverage there are tendencies to picture a/some 'ethnic' group/s only in simplifying stereotyping ways.	12,9%	38,7%	32,3%	16,1%	0%	0%

all n=31	Agree	Rather agree	Rather disagree	Disagree	Do not know	Do not understand the question
My city tries to combat 'racial discrimination' with every instrument possible.	22,6%	58,1%	9,7%	6,5%	3,2%	0%
Politicians are aware of the dimensions of racism in the city.	16,1%	48,4%	16,1%	3,2%	12,9%	3,2%
The civil society is aware of the dimensions of racism in the city.	9,7%	35,5%	29%	6,5%	12,9%	6,5%
Officials ignore that racism is a violation of human rights.	3,2%	19,4%	35,5%	38,7%	3,2%	0%
Officials could do more to combat racism in the city.	25,8%	61,3%	6,5%	0%	5,4%	0%
Racism is no topic at all for politicians in my city.	3,2%	6,5%	45,2%	41,9%	0%	3,2%
Some political groups in my city do not try to fight racism but try to agitate some groups against each other.	29%	19,4%	19,4%	16,1%	16,1%	0%

Research endeavours

ECCAR is currently developing a research strategy. We therefore collect research needs and interests in order to prepare research bids for the application of funding. Please give us your opinion what would be important research topics for your city:

ECCAR is planning to establish a research group among member cities. The purpose is to better bundle resources within the ECCAR platform for mutual benefit and to create synergies. Furthermore, important issues concerning all topics related to the fight against racism and

discrimination need a well-founded basis in order to be addressed effectively and successfully. The ECCAR research group is therefore looking for partners to establish a powerful basis to bring research forward. We kindly invite you to take part in this working group.

25 answers

Is your city interested in joining the ECCAR research group? (n=30)

Yes: 56,7% No: 43,3%

If YES:

Can your city make the necessary commitment to join teams for preparing research bids and to commit yourself to participate in the implementation of granted research projects? (n=20)

Yes: 76,5% No 43,3%

Thank you very much for your support!