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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Central Population Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>demographic and health survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Economic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>female genital mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMDAC</td>
<td>Global Migration Data Analysis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>household budget survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPF</td>
<td>High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>health management information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEG</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Expert Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Inclusive Data Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>internally displaced person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>labour force survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>Living Standards Measurement Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>memorandum of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>not in education, employment or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>national statistical office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTD</td>
<td>neglected tropical disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>Office for National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS</td>
<td>reproductive health survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN DESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Women</td>
<td>United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSDG</td>
<td>United Nations Sustainable Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNR</td>
<td>voluntary national review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, LEAVE NO ONE BEHIND, MIGRATION AND DATA

In order to leave no one behind, migrants must be considered across efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as these seek to realize the human rights of all without discrimination. The COVID-19 pandemic has revealed and often exacerbated inequalities around the world, reminding us how important it is for policy to be inclusive of all population subgroups, including migrants.

Meanwhile, migrants are also key actors in sustainable development. Around the world, they make vital contributions to help progress the SDGs, whether these focus on offering high-quality health care, boosting household income or increasing productivity in destination economies. Understanding the many positive links between migration and the SDGs can be complex, yet it is necessary to create migration governance that boosts development.

Data disaggregation is key to this. SDG Target 17.18 calls to increase the availability of “high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity [and] migratory status”. This reflects a growing understanding that disaggregation of data is an important way to ensure inclusiveness for specific population subgroups. It also enables us to identify the many contributions of migrants to development.

To date, migrants are largely invisible in official global SDG data. In 2020, countries had disaggregated by migratory status only one of the recommended SDG indicators at the global level (8.8.1). This means that as we rapidly approach 2030, we still do not know what the effects of the SDGs are on migrants, whether they are being left behind and to what extent. Further still, the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted traditional data collection and SDG reporting around the world, meaning it is even more difficult to identify migrants in development data.

At the same time, many countries regularly generate national disaggregated data. This shows that while disaggregation of SDG data may be a challenge, many countries already disaggregate some key data in different sectors for national use.

Overall, there is a need to boost data disaggregation by migratory status, responding to the above challenges and building on existing good practices. It is important to improve data frameworks to help identify migrants who may be in greatest need and to reach the furthest behind, as well as to understand migrants’ contributions to sustainable development. This Guide responds to this need by providing user-centric guidance on disaggregation of SDG indicators by migratory status. It is aimed at practitioners across contexts who work with international migration and/or SDG data.
In many countries, migrants form the backbone of health systems, yet they are often at higher risk of certain health conditions. While women migrants are major agents of development, they often face heightened risks related to gender and migration. Labour migration promotes growth in destination economies. Meanwhile, labour migrants are sometimes more vulnerable in the workplace than non-migrants. Migration has been linked to reduced inequalities, yet globally many migrants earn on average less than non-migrants. Many migrants face xenophobia and discrimination more frequently than non-migrants.
HOW TO DISAGGREGATE

Why disaggregate?
Disaggregated data enables policymakers to identify and reach migrants. Based on this, policymakers may choose to disaggregate data by migratory status for a few key reasons:

(a) Understanding migrants’ characteristics across sectors to inform targeted policy;
(b) Identifying in what contexts migrants are agents of sustainable development;
(c) Increasing chances to effectively and sustainably meet the SDGs;
(d) Addressing the relative needs of host communities;
(e) Improving resource allocation;
(f) Addressing important gaps in migration data and research – for example, on integration;
(g) Complying with international law duties, especially under international human rights law;
(h) Providing a baseline for other international frameworks.

How to disaggregate?
In practice, the most widely accepted variables used for migratory status disaggregation are country of birth and/or country of citizenship. These identify the foreign-born and foreign-citizen populations respectively. Both variables are commonly used in censuses, surveys and many other data-collection instruments by policymakers who wish to know who are the international migrants in a country.

If it is possible, practitioners may collect data on additional variables that may reflect more complexity in migratory patterns, key characteristics of migrants, or other categories of migrants that are particularly policy-relevant. For example:

(a) Information on year/period of arrival in the country can help distinguish migrants who have recently arrived from those who immigrated many years ago;
(b) Information on country of birth of parents can help distinguish between first- and second-generation migrants and identify migrants who are naturalized citizens;
(c) Acquisition of citizenship;
(d) The reason for migration can help differentiate labour, student and other types of migrants;
(e) Selected proxies – for example, language(s) spoken at home;
(f) Nationally defined variables – for example, particular legal statuses and categories of migrants;
(g) As far as possible, data should also be disaggregated by other dimensions such as age, sex, gender and others, to help gain further insight into migrants’ other characteristics that may be linked to their development outcomes.

Common challenges and opportunities
Disaggregation will look different across contexts. However, there are a few issues typical when using key traditional data sources, as well as some overarching common challenges and opportunities related to disaggregation.

Given that population censuses collect diverse data – from access to basic services to educational attainment and more – they are a key tool for SDG monitoring. Harmonized census microdata in particular are an important resource in this context, given they usually collect information on migration variables. However, as most censuses are conducted every 10 years, data are not timely.

Household surveys are a valuable source of information on SDGs, and many indicators use these as primary data sources. While surveys collect valuable data, they are not always appropriate for disaggregation as their sample sizes may not be large enough to identify migrants, or their focus on the household rather than the individual level hides some migration dimensions.

Alternative data sources can also generate useful disaggregated SDG data. For example, if leveraged correctly, data from administrative sources can be particularly useful. Combining data from multiple sources can be helpful, though challenging if these use significantly different methodologies.

Some migrants are part of hard-to-reach populations that are not easily counted by traditional data-collection tools, and the most vulnerable may rarely appear in official statistics – for example, homeless migrants or migrants in an irregular situation. There are some methods to estimate such populations, some also taking into account measures to make data collection more migrant-friendly.
Executive summary

It is crucial to address data privacy and protection related to disaggregated data, maintaining confidentiality of individual information through all phases of the data life cycle. Any potential risks to migrants should be addressed, for example, through appropriate legislation or installing firewalls between data collection and law enforcement.

In addition, there are often practical challenges halting progress in disaggregation, such as limited coordination, lack of awareness of the importance of disaggregated data, or limited capacity and resources.

Getting started

While action needed to plan and implement disaggregation will vary across settings, a few key steps – which may be taken in any order – may help shape the process:

(a) Establish institutional leads.
(b) Undertake specialized awareness-raising.
(c) Identify SDG indicators and disaggregation needs.
(d) Conduct data mapping.
(e) Design and implement course of action.
(f) Undertake specialized reporting, dissemination and communication.

For each Goal explored in this Guide, there is a rationale for identifying migrants in relevant data and considerations for specific indicators, including data sources that may support disaggregation.

CONCLUSION

As we approach 2030, we still cannot answer several important questions related to the impact of the SDGs on migrants – for example, whether they are being left behind and to what extent, or how far they contribute towards the achievement of the Goals. Without quality data that is disaggregated by migratory status, it is very difficult to answer these questions.

This means that concerted efforts are needed to boost the collection and use of such disaggregated data. As this Guide shows, disaggregation initiatives look different across sectors. However, in parallel, work is needed at a higher level to encourage the inclusion of harmonized migration variables in routine national data collection.

Moving forward, targeted capacity-building is important. Aside from specialized assistance, some common actions could boost chances of disaggregation success in many countries – for example, making better use of existing data for disaggregation and boosting internal coordination. As disaggregation in some contexts lacks political buy-in, efforts can focus on raising awareness of the importance of disaggregation to build up institutional commitments. It is also important to strengthen collaboration and coordination between SDG- and migration-data efforts.

Further, there is a need for all those working in disaggregation efforts to cooperate. Continuous exchange is needed to discuss experiences, good practices and lessons learned, as well as to continue defining and addressing country needs, priorities and challenges.

It is crucial to link disaggregation efforts to the wider agenda of Leave No One Behind and the urgent Decade of Action we are now living in, underlining that inclusive sustainable development can only be achieved through inclusive data. SDG disaggregation can and should catalyse action well beyond 2030. If key national data instruments such as household surveys are adjusted for SDG reporting, disaggregation can outlive 2030, sustainably and regularly providing disaggregated data across sectors – a game changer for migration policy.

Measuring the links between migration and sustainable development is difficult. Overall, disaggregation contributes a practical solution and key starting point to at least one important component of this, which is to measure development outcomes on migrants themselves.
INTRODUCTION
SECTION 1.
INTRODUCTION

Leave No One Behind (LNOB) and migration data

The transformative promise of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is to “leave no one behind”. A central idea of the SDGs is inclusiveness – from development outcomes to programme design and monitoring frameworks – and the promise embodies this idea. Since 2015, this has become a major principle in the international community, seeking to uphold the human rights of all without discrimination.

The 2030 Agenda specifically identifies migrants among those in vulnerable situations, who should be able to achieve empowerment and whose needs should be addressed (United Nations, 2015)\(^1\) – in other words, among those who must not be left behind.\(^2\) There are over 281 million international migrants around the world, accounting for approximately 3 per cent of the global population (UN DESA, 2020a). While not all migrants are in vulnerable situations, many are affected by distinct challenges that could impact their everyday situations negatively. This means that in order to truly leave no one behind, migrants must be considered in all efforts to achieve the SDGs. The COVID-19 pandemic has compounded many individuals’ vulnerabilities, revealing and often worsening inequalities around the world. This has underlined the importance of policy being inclusive for all population subgroups, including migrants who in many settings have faced heightened risks and impacts related to the pandemic.

Meanwhile, migrants are also key actors in sustainable development. Migrants around the world make vital contributions to help progress the SDGs, whether these focus on offering high-quality health care, boosting household income or increasing productivity in destination economies. This means that if countries make efforts to include migrants in SDG policy and programming design, the likelihood of meeting relevant SDG targets will be greater; and in turn, excluding migrants from sustainable development policies impedes the achievement of many SDGs (ODI, 2018). Further still, engaging migrants in programming not only supports SDG achievement but is also linked to reduced inequalities. While exclusionary migration policies can exacerbate inequalities (for example, by preventing migrants’ access to social protection), well-managed migration can reduce social, economic, political and cultural inequalities faced by individuals and communities (IOM, 2020a). Thus, taking into account migrants in policy and programming not only is inclusive but also makes for more effective policy. Well-managed migration can be both a development strategy and a development outcome – how migration is managed is a decisive factor in the achievement of the 2030 Agenda (IOM, 2020a).

As this Guide explores, data is crucial to inform programming that supports sustainable development and helps reduce inequalities. Without good data that is disaggregated by migratory status, it is very difficult both to assess how far migrants are being left behind and to understand migrants’ significant contributions to development. SDG Target 17.18 calls for greater support to developing countries to significantly increase the availability of “high-quality, timely and reliable data, disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity [and] migratory status”.\(^3\) Today disaggregation is one of the nine pillars of the “data revolution” (UNSD, 2020a), which calls on sustainable development to improve the quality and availability of statistics. This reflects a growing understanding that disaggregation of data is an important tool to facilitate inclusiveness for specific population subgroups and is linked to addressing discrimination. The human rights principle of non-discrimination includes the ground of migratory status, meaning that migrants must not face discrimination of any kind due to their migration status or national origin, among other grounds.

---

\(^1\) It also identifies specific categories of migrants, including refugees and IDPs.

\(^2\) Although it did not define who are meant by “migrants”.

\(^3\) Promoting greater data disaggregation is also a key goal of the New York Declaration for Migrants and Refugees, and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (in particular, Objective 1).
There are many key dimensions of disaggregation such as sex, gender, age, disability and, as this Guide will explore, migratory status. The United Nations Inter-Agency Expert Group (IAEG) on SDG Indicators recommends that 24 indicators be disaggregated by migratory status. However, many more can be; while some cannot be easily disaggregated at the global level as they are composite indicators collected by different countries, individual countries may be able to.

Disaggregating data by migratory status can often seem more challenging than doing so by other dimensions. This is often linked to the wider lack of quality data on migration, as recognized most recently in Objective 1 of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. The general dearth of quality migration data and relative underdevelopment of relevant frameworks mean that often, data on migrants is poorer than that on other population groups. Many migrants are part of populations that are not easily counted, and practical factors can also pose challenges – for example, political support, capacity and resources dedicated to disaggregation can be lacking. Sometimes a lack of common understanding of the definitions of migratory status impedes the generation of properly disaggregated, harmonized data. Further, disaggregation in practice requires careful consideration of data privacy and protection issues; the migratory status of a person should never be used to discriminate against them, and appropriate data-protection architecture is necessary.

As countries work to monitor SDG indicators, levels of disaggregation by migratory status remain very low. In 2020, countries had disaggregated only one of the recommended indicators by migratory status at the global level. Indicator 8.8.1 (“Fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries per 100,000 workers, by sex and migrant status”) is the only one disaggregated by migration status in the IAEG-SDG database. In addition, out of 86 countries that reported data on this, only 27 disaggregated by migratory status. The majority of countries that did so are in Europe (22), while none are in Africa. This means that as we rapidly approach 2030, we still do not know what the effects of the SDGs are on migrants, whether they are being left behind and to what extent. Migrants are largely invisible in official, global-level SDG data, and where data is available, this is usually from high-income countries. Further, COVID-19 has impacted traditional data-collection instruments around the world, disrupting many household surveys and population census plans and impacting SDG reporting in many countries.

Meanwhile, encouraging evidence is seen in several practical examples. At the national level, many countries regularly generate disaggregated data across sectors. This shows that while disaggregation may seem complex, it is in essence a simple concept that is often already followed. Countries usually already gather but may not compile relevant data, or may not use such data outside either a specific sector or level (for example, the local level), or are unaware of alternative data sources to leverage. Further, it is possible for the migration community to learn from efforts made by other actors to improve disaggregation of data by other dimensions, such as age, sex and gender. In particular, many practical challenges related to these types of disaggregation are similar (for example, lack of political will and/or coordination), and solutions to address them have been put forward. For example, many initiatives related to disaggregation by other dimensions, in particular gender, focus on addressing poor coordination by setting up cross-ministerial working groups to kickstart a disaggregation exercise. Throughout this Guide, related resources are mentioned where relevant, and further, some examples showcased refer to progress made in disaggregation by other dimensions, to highlight how progress was made elsewhere and the synergies between such work.

If migrants are not to be left behind in efforts to achieve the SDGs, countries need to urgently improve their data frameworks to help identify those who may be in greatest need and to reach the furthest behind first. Further, disaggregation is necessary to understand the positive links between migration and sustainable development, helping policymakers to forge migration governance that boosts development. To make comparable, disaggregated data a reality, efforts need to build on both international frameworks and the many existing national practices.

This Guide

Some guidance on disaggregation by migratory status has been developed. While a key first step, much of this is not yet designed to fit diverse country needs and capacities or specific sectors, and does not focus on providing step-by-step practical assistance to guide a wider disaggregation process. This Guide responds to this. There is a growing focus on data disaggregation and data inclusivity in the international community, often in the context of the 2030 Agenda and LNOB, which this Guide aims to contribute to.

---

4 Note that according to the International Recommendations on IDP Statistics (IRIS) (UNSD, 2020b), 12 priority SDG indicators should be disaggregated by forced displacement.

5 For example, the United Nations Statistics Division, in collaboration with the Population Division and IOM, organized the Expert Group Meeting on Improving Migration Data in the Context of the 2030 Agenda, which released guidance on a stepwise approach (UN DESA, 2017) to data disaggregation by migratory status. There is also guidance specific to particular data sources, such as on censuses by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Note that there is relevant guidance as well on specific categories of migrants – for example, forcibly displaced persons – by UNHCR (2020).
The objective of this Guide is to provide user-centric guidance on disaggregation of SDG indicators by migratory status. It is aimed at practitioners across governments, international organizations or other actors who work with migration and/or SDG data. The Guide is intended to help practitioners at any stage of the disaggregation process – whether it is learning about the topic for the first time, choosing where to place and how to use available resources for disaggregation, or seeking to communicate disaggregated data better. While the document is anchored in the reporting processes of the 2030 Agenda, it aims to remain useful after 2030 as it will refer to key migration data sources that go beyond SDG reporting and are relevant for everyday policymaking.

This Guide uses desk-based research and builds on existing Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) analysis (for example, on using disaggregated census microdata by migratory status for the SDGs) as well as experiences from practical capacity-building work with national statistical offices (NSOs) and other migration data actors across the world. This also builds on dimensions of the monitoring and reporting methodology of IOM’s Migration and the 2030 Agenda: A Guide for Practitioners. The Guide supports IOM’s efforts to implement the IOM Migration Data Strategy (MDS), particularly its second objective dedicated to capacity-building, and the IOM Institutional Strategy on Migration and Sustainable Development, particularly regarding its efforts to improve evidence on the relationship between migration and sustainable development. Finally, this supports IOM’s Strategic Vision by promoting improved policy capacity, data, research and knowledge management to support all three pillars of the Vision (resilience, mobility and governance).

How to use this Guide depends on the context and needs of practitioners. Some practitioners may already know the SDG indicators they wish to disaggregate, while others may wish to learn about the basics of disaggregation to, for example, inform the design of a survey unrelated to the SDGs.

Section 1. Introduction
This section introduces and articulates links between the SDGs, the LNOB agenda and migration.

Section 2. Disaggregation: The basics
This section introduces key reasons why policymakers may wish to disaggregate SDG or other data by migratory status, as well as key components and generic steps related to disaggregation. This includes a discussion on definitions of variables and common challenges and opportunities related to disaggregation and key data sources.

Section 3. Disaggregation: By Goal
Description of key steps in planning and implementing a disaggregation exercise, including, for example, guidance on how to prioritize SDG indicators to disaggregate.

For Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 16:6

(a) What do we know? Snapshots of the situation of migrants across SDGs, compiling key evidence based on key global, regional and national data sources.
(b) Why this Goal? The rationale for disaggregation of data under each Goal and how policymakers can use such data towards informing policy and programming.
(c) How to disaggregate under this Goal. Key considerations for disaggregation related to each Goal and notes relevant for key indicators under each, including key data sources and opportunities for use of alternative sources.
(d) Example. National- and regional-level example(s) of disaggregation of SDG indicators and/or other relevant data by migratory status.

Section 4. Conclusion
This section contains some concluding remarks on disaggregation of SDG and other data by migratory status, including noting potential future opportunities to improve this.

---

6 These Goals include the SDG indicators prioritized for migratory status disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics, and Goal 2 on hunger was added for policy relevance. Note that as migration can be considered cross-cutting across all SDGs, this list is not exhaustive, and indicators in other SDGs may also be disaggregated depending on needs and context.
DISAGGREGATION: THE BASICS
SECTION 2.
DISAGGREGATION: THE BASICS

Why disaggregate?

Disaggregation can sometimes be technically difficult and/or expensive, and many policymakers may not choose to prioritize this. Nevertheless, there are many reasons why governments in different contexts may choose to disaggregate data by migratory status:

(a) Understanding migrants’ characteristics across sectors such as health, education and employment, to inform targeted policy and interventions. Disaggregated data can provide valuable evidence in topics ranging from affordable housing to access to clean energy. Not all surveys or records collect migration information – for example, social protection records often do not collect information on country of birth or citizenship. Changing this would enable policymakers to treat migration as a cross-cutting theme when designing policies in these sectors, thus mainstreaming migration.1 Once disaggregated data is available, policymakers can look beyond averages in SDG and other data, explore why migrants’ outcomes may be different to non-migrants’, examine whether and how any inequalities between these groups change over time, and explore possible reasons behind this. In this way, disaggregation is a key tool for policymakers to refine SDG as well as other national programming, as it can provide a strong evidence base with which to learn where interventions may need to more proactively target and reach migrants so that nobody is left behind.

(b) Identifying where migrants are agents of development. Aside from revealing where migrants may be left behind in the SDGs, some types of disaggregation can also show where migrants are themselves agents of development, contributing to the achievement of some SDGs. For example, disaggregation of Indicator 4.1.2 (“Completion rate of primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education”) by migratory status of children’s parents would show whether results may be different for children with emigrant parents, allowing policymakers to explore any link between receiving remittances and improved education outcomes at the household level. In this way, disaggregation can reveal both the vulnerabilities and potential development power of migrants.

(c) Increasing chances to effectively and sustainably meet the SDGs. If governments proactively include migrants during the design and implementation of policies and interventions targeting specific SDGs, they have a greater likelihood of meeting relevant SDG targets effectively and sustainably (ODI, 2018). Further, early action that first targets the “furthest behind” and accelerates relevant programming makes it more likely that SDG targets will be met; it will be easier to reach universal health coverage by 2030 if migrants are included in 2021, rather than 2028. Not including migrants may limit progress by constraining the comprehensiveness of efforts, particularly in areas where migrants make up a larger portion of the total population. For example, migrant children make up a large portion of the global child population and in some countries or cities can outnumber native children; in these latter scenarios, it will be near impossible to meet SDG 4 targets without specifically including migrant children in policymaking and programming. Further, using disaggregated data that shows how migrants are agents of development – for example, how many medical professionals are migrants – can also help inform policy that harnesses this to meet the SDGs more effectively.

1 Mainstreaming migration into development planning and policy processes, including by amending or developing new frameworks that consider the needs of and challenges faced by migrants, can help maximize the development impact of migration as well as achieve vertical and horizontal policy coherence. See IOM, 2020c.
(d) Addressing the needs of host communities. As disaggregation allows policymakers to track and compare outcomes between migrants and non-migrants, it also allows them to identify and address any specific needs of native populations. For example, large and/or sudden increases in numbers of displaced persons can sometimes pose challenges for host communities – for example, in the short term. In these cases, disaggregated data can help inform evidence-based plans to protect or support the needs of host communities.

(e) Complying with international law duties. It is increasingly recognized that human rights are essential to achieve sustainable development. As concluded by member States during the intersessional meetings on human rights and the 2030 Agenda, the relationship between sustainable development and human rights is profound and indivisible, and the SDGs can only be realized through a human rights–based approach. This mutually reinforcing relationship is crucial for ensuring accelerated progress towards achieving the SDGs. The 2030 Agenda seeks to realize and protect the human rights of all. Rights-holders are the primary beneficiaries of sustainable development, and they must be at the heart of efforts to “leave no one behind”, including migrants, regardless of their migration status and without discrimination. Thus, efforts by States in this direction directly contribute to complying with their duties under international human rights law, by identifying gaps and barriers that need to be addressed and lifted. Thus, including migrants in sustainable development policies also contributes to the realization and respect of the human rights of all, as per States’ duties and obligations under international human rights law.

(f) Improving resource allocation. As disaggregation can improve the targeting of migrants in policymaking and programming, a lack of it thereof can lead to inefficient targeting. It follows that without disaggregation, policymakers are at higher risk of wasting resources. Further, research shows that investing in “left-behind groups” can sometimes yield faster progress than investments in others, generating better value for money, and can yield substantial returns in other areas (Engen et al., 2019). In this way, disaggregation can be seen as a key investment as it allows policymakers to use resources more efficiently.

(g) Addressing important gaps in migration data and research. There is a paucity of data on migrant well-being and migrant integration, which disaggregation can help address. Greater and more standardized disaggregation of data would help address key data gaps, adding valuable information to the evidence base for future analysis and research.

(h) Providing a baseline for other international frameworks. Disaggregated data could have value beyond SDG implementation and national policymaking; the Global Compact for Migration is composed of 23 objectives in policy areas ranging from decent work to access to basic services, yet it has no follow-up and review framework. Having disaggregated data across policy areas would give policymakers stronger evidence on which to base many Global Compact for Migration interventions.

Practitioners may be inspired to disaggregate data based on any combination of the above reasons, depending on their particular context and needs.

How to disaggregate?

There are different ways to define and identify migrants in data, each linked to different ways to define who is a migrant. For example, migrants may be identified on the basis of country of birth or citizenship, their legal status, or other factors. There is no single internationally agreed-upon definition of who is an international migrant, and national definitions can vary significantly. This Guide focuses on how to identify international migrants residing in a country. However, it also offers tips on how to capture information on other migrant subgroups that may be policy-relevant, where possible, such as emigrants, return migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and labour migrants. Which questions are used in data collection will depend on country needs, priorities and context. Practitioners may choose which variables to include based on key migration topics of policy interest in a country, existing state of data availability on the topic, and the capacity and resources available.

2 More information is available at www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/IntersessionalMeeting2030Agenda.aspx.
3 There is a statistical definition of “migrant”, currently under review by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics: “[A]n international migrant is a person who has changed his or her country of residence and established new residence in the country within a given year. International migrant[s] … include those with national or foreign citizenships or stateless persons.” This definition includes a wide range of different categories – for example, refugees but not IDPs (UNSD, 2021).
In practice, the most widely accepted variables of migratory status disaggregation are country of birth and country of citizenship.\textsuperscript{4} Information on country of birth and country of citizenship identifies the foreign-born population and the foreign-citizen population respectively. Both variables are commonly used as proxies by policymakers to understand who is an international migrant residing in a country. See Text box 1 for more information.

---

Text box 1. Basic variables

The **country of birth** information is used to distinguish between the foreign-born and native-born populations in a country. Unlike other characteristics that are sometimes used to identify migrants, an individual’s country of birth cannot change over time.

**How?** Add one of the following questions to data-collection instruments, accompanied by instructions to enter the name of the country:

- Where was [name] born?
- Where did _____’s mother reside when she gave birth to him/her?
  - **This country, specify province and municipality:**
    - **Province:** _______
    - **Municipality:** _______
  - **Another country, specify country according to present borders:**
    - **Country:** _______
    - **Unknown**
  - **Country of birth unknown**

The **country of citizenship** information is used to distinguish between foreigners and citizens in a country. The country of citizenship is the country with which a person enjoys a particular legal bond, while a foreigner is a person who does not have citizenship in the country of enumeration (UN DESA, 2020c). An individual’s country of citizenship can change over time, and acquiring citizenship usually grants additional rights in a country.

**How?** Add one of the following questions to data-collection instruments:

- What is [person’s] country of citizenship?
  - **This country:** _______
  - **This country and another country, specify according to present borders:**
    - **The other country:** _______
  - **Another country, specify country according to present borders:** _______ □ **Unknown country**
  - **Country of citizenship unknown**
  - **No citizenship (stateless)**

Information on both variables should be collected if possible, as information on one of these alone may not necessarily reflect a person’s migratory status or mean somebody is a migrant. For example, it is possible to be a foreign-born citizen or a native-born foreigner, as a person can be born abroad and be a citizen (naturalized migrant), or born in that country and be considered a foreigner. Country of birth may not reflect where a person spent most of their time living, and a person’s country of citizenship can change as those who are not citizens of a country by birth may acquire citizenship through naturalization, marriage or some other method. Further, dual citizens may or may not indicate their citizenship in the country of enumeration even if it is the case.

* See: UN DESA, 2017.

\textsuperscript{4} The Expert Group on Migration Statistics recommends a stepwise approach (UNSD, 2019b), disaggregating by country of either birth or citizenship, followed as necessary/possible by first- and second-generation migration, and then any further relevant variables. Overall the group recommends collecting the following information to distinguish migrants from non-migrants: (a) country of birth; (b) country of citizenship; (c) country of birth of parents; (d) household members who have ever resided abroad; and (e) household members currently residing abroad. The group recommends gathering the following details on migrant characteristics: (a) year or period of arrival in the country; (b) acquisition of citizenship; and (c) reason for migration. Guidance for censuses differs slightly; the United Nations Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses recommends the inclusion of three core questions on: (a) country of birth; (b) country of citizenship; and (c) year/period of arrival.
Information on country of birth and/or citizenship is widely collected by countries in many core national statistical instruments such as population censuses and household surveys. These variables are consistently used to identify migrants in censuses in particular, forming the basis for estimates of migrant stocks in countries. Further, this information is often broken down by country, to make available within this data distinctions among migrants from different countries. For variables such as country name, name of country of birth, name of country of citizenship and name of country of previous residence, automatic coding should be used as appropriate, following the Standard Country or Area Codes for Statistical Use guidance (M49 standard) (UN DESA, 2020c).

These two variables are useful as a baseline for identifying migrants and have established definitions and operationalization recommendations that encourage data comparability. When this guidance refers to disaggregation by migratory status, it refers to the above variables as a baseline, intended to identify migrants residing in a country or territory. However, these variables do not necessarily capture information on certain migrant subgroups such as emigrants, return migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, labour migrants and many others that may be policy-relevant. In some cases, policymakers may wish to go further and collect data on additional variables that reflect more complexity in migratory patterns – for example, identifying migrants in these categories, or characteristics of migrants. There are several additional variables which would yield richer data if needed and possible (see Text box 2 for more). Note that internationally agreed-upon definitions do not yet exist for all of these, meaning that even if countries do collect data, they may not be comparable between or even within countries.

**Text box 2. Possible additional variables**

Information on **country of birth of the person and parents** can help distinguish between first- and second-generation migrants. Combined with the main respondent’s country of birth, data on the country of birth of parents can help compare outcomes between different groups of people: (a) foreign-born persons with foreign-born parents; (b) foreign-born persons with native-born parents; (c) native-born persons with foreign-born parents; (d) native-born persons with at least one parent born in the country; and (e) native-born persons with native-born parents. Defining these groups can be important in assessing their needs, including to inform integration programming. Second-generation migrants are often used to study integration processes and outcomes, and this type of information can be used to analyse changes of characteristics over generations. This type of disaggregation may be particularly valuable for policymakers in countries with historically high numbers of migrants.

**How?** First, add one of the above-mentioned questions on country of birth to data-collection instruments. Second, add the same question again relating to each of the respondent’s parents separately, omitting province or municipality.

For example: According to Spain’s 2011 census, non-migrants born to migrant parents (second-generation migrants) were more likely to have a tertiary education, compared to migrants (first-generation migrants) and non-migrants. Studies found that migrant students and Norwegian-born students with migrant parents achieved lower scores in most national tests than native-born students with Norwegian-born parents (UN DESA, 2020c).

Information on **year/period of arrival** can help distinguish international migrants who have recently arrived from those who arrived many years ago. Questions on duration of stay serve the same purpose. Migrants who arrived more recently in a country often face more challenges related to, for example, communication and administrative barriers, requiring more government assistance compared to those who arrived many years ago. On the other hand, thanks to the “healthy migrant phenomenon”, newly arrived migrants may be healthier and need comparatively fewer health-care services than non-migrants. Such information can help policymakers across sectors understand differences in outcomes between those who entered the country at an early age and those who entered later; analyse migrant characteristics over time, and inform planning or evaluation of integration-related programming.

---

5 Note that such stock data also includes some individuals who are refugees.

6 The Handbook contains guidance on processing, coding, editing and other issues related to this type of data processing.
How?
(a) For countries where immigrants have the right to free movement in and out of the country after having obtained relevant residence status, ask this of foreign-born individuals: In which year and month did [person] first arrive in [this country], and has [person] lived or does [person] intend to live in the country for at least one year? Year: _____ Month: ______ □ Unknown
(b) For countries where people migrate more than once, ask this of foreign-born individuals or return migrants: In which year and month did [person] last arrive in [this country], and has [person] lived or does [person] intend to live in the country for at least one year? Year: _____ Month: ______ □ Unknown

For example: Data on migrants in the United Kingdom disaggregated by year of arrival and educational attainment revealed that those who had arrived in the last 5 years were more likely to have a university degree than those who had been in the United Kingdom for more than 30 years (UNECE, 2015).

The reason for migration and/or admission into a country is important in identifying different migrant subgroups. It may be important to know, for example, the size of the labour migrant population(s) to inform specific labour migration policies. Data on reason for migration is often collected via censuses, border crossing cards, population/foreigner registers, or by a specific category via a country’s department of labour or education, for example. These may vary, though key categories may include work, study, family reunification and asylum.

How? What was the main reason* [person] came to live in this country?
(a) Settlement (long-term/permanent stay)
(b) Employment (including military service)
(c) Education or training
(d) Marriage, family reunification or family formation
(e) Forced displacement (refugees, asylum seekers, temporary protection, etc.)
(f) Other reason (specify): __________

Some countries may be interested in learning more about citizens who were naturalized – for example, to study any differences between naturalized and native-born citizens. To do this, information on acquisition of citizenship may be collected, including if possible information on previous citizenship(s) and the method and year of acquisition of the current country’s citizenship. Such data is sometimes collected via censuses and some administrative sources.

How? For citizens of [this country] including dual citizens:
• Have you had the citizenship of [this country] since birth? □ No □ Yes (skip next three questions)
• How did you obtain citizenship in [this country]?
  □ By marriage □ By naturalization □ Others (specify)*
• What was your previous citizenship? (specify according to present borders)
  Country: __________ □ Country unknown
• In what year did you acquire citizenship in this country?
  Year: ____________ □ Year unknown

To identify return migrants, countries may collect information on respondents’ residency abroad. Data-collection instruments may ask questions on whether the respondent has ever resided abroad for at least 12 months, in the country of residence 5 years prior to enumeration, and if there is indication of return migration, the most recent date of arrival in the country of enumeration.

How? Ask persons over 1 year old and who are citizens of the country where data is being collected: (a) Has [person] ever lived outside [this country] for a period of at least 12 months?
To identify emigrants, countries may collect information on household members’ residency abroad. Questions on household members’ migration or residency abroad can help countries better understand their (temporary or permanent) emigrant populations.

How?

(a) Ask the head of household or reference person: In the last five years, has any former member of this household left to live abroad for at least 12 months, and are they still living abroad now?
   (i) Yes/No. If yes, please list them by name and proceed with the next questions for each.

(b) How many have left to live abroad for at least 12 months and are still living abroad now?

(c) For each person identified as emigrant, specify the person’s name, sex, age at departure, year and month of departure, country where the person moved to live for at least 12 months, person’s main reason for leaving the country to live abroad, highest level and grade or year of school the person attended at departure (for persons 10 years and older at departure), and occupation at departure.

Information on ethnicity is also in some cases used as a proxy for migratory status, although specific ethnic groups are not necessarily migrants. Being left behind can sometimes be linked to belonging to a racial or ethnic group that is marginalized or discriminated against. In many countries, however, such data is not collected in official statistical instruments due to ethical and/or security reasons; it is often deemed too sensitive, and there are fears around potential misuse of such information to harm vulnerable populations or cause inter-ethnic conflict. A total of 65 per cent of countries collected race/ethnicity data in 2000 censuses; this showed high regional variation with only 44 per cent of European countries doing the same, compared to over 80 per cent in North and South America (Morning, 2008).

How? Ethnicity is multidimensional and “based on a shared understanding of history and territorial origins ... of an ethnic group or community, as well as on particular cultural characteristics such as language and/or religion”. This means that as a variable in data collection, it requires respondent self-identification. In addition to or instead of selecting suggested categories, respondents should be able to add a free response, select multiple identities or not answer (OHCHR, 2018; UN DESA, 2017).

For example: In Guatemala, in 2011, an indigenous household was up to 2.5 times more likely to be poor than a non-indigenous household (Rodriguez Takeuchi and Mariotti, 2016). In Viet Nam, an ethnic minority–headed household was 3.5 times more likely to be poor than an ethnic majority–headed one in 2011 (Bhatkal and Mariotti, 2016).

Countries may also wish to use additional variables to capture information on different types of migrant subgroups such as internal migrants, internally displaced persons (IDPs), asylum seekers and refugees.

---

\(^1\) In capturing returned migrants, countries may also choose to use other duration thresholds per national practices.
\(^2\) Unless specified, definitions are taken from UN DESA (2018), prepared with the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.
\(^3\) Note that second generation immigrants are not immigrants unless they were away from the country for at least 12 months and subsequently returned to live in the country for at least 12 months (UN DESA, 2020c).
\(^4\) The ability to measure outcomes over time longitudinally depends on the data-collection instrument used.
\(^5\) Note that countries may use nationally relevant categories and language.
\(^6\) Note that data exchange with countries of destination on their migrant stocks, most often identified via migratory status disaggregation of national data, can also provide information on a country’s emigrants.
\(^7\) France is sometimes seen as a case of a country prohibiting the collection of such data.
\(^8\) See UNHCR’s Data disaggregation of SDG indicators by forced displacement (2020) for an in-depth discussion on generating SDG data disaggregated by forced displacement (including refugees, refugee-related populations and IDPs).
Other proxies for migratory status can also be used. For example, this could include knowledge of a country’s official language(s) or language(s) spoken at home.⁷

For example, in the United Kingdom, data from the Department for Education on educational attainment was disaggregated by “English as an additional language”. This was used as a proxy for migratory status for an analysis of migrant children’s outcomes in England, given that educational records are not disaggregated by country of birth or nationality (ONS, 2019).

This data was presented alongside data on the educational workforce disaggregated by country of birth. This showed how migration contributed to educational human capital; around 12 per cent of school staff in England in 2015–2017 were born outside the United Kingdom (ONS, 2019).

It is possible to disaggregate data using nationally defined variables, including, for example, particular legal statuses and categories of migrants. This type of disaggregation can be the most responsive to a country’s needs and most directly links back to national migration policy. Note that data on certain types of migrants, such as refugees and asylum seekers in particular, are often collected for administrative and not statistical purposes and using definitions following country-specific legislation, policies and practices (European Union and United Nations, 2018). It should be noted that while very useful, these categories are generally not internationally comparable, so some countries may choose to consider disaggregating by these only in addition to the above standard variables. Nevertheless, in particular if data tools already collect relevant information, disaggregating by nationally defined variables can be a very useful starting point.

This Guide focuses mainly on identifying different types of migrants (long and short term, emigrants, returnees, migrants by category if possible, and more) in data. However, policymakers may also be interested in understanding more about families of migrants, in which case migratory status of parent(s)/selected family member(s) of migrants can be captured.

Finally, as far as possible, data should also be disaggregated by other dimensions such as age, sex, gender and disability, to help policymakers gain further insights into migrant populations. Migrants are not a homogenous group, and each has a set of individual characteristics that may also be linked to their development outcomes. The sex, age and level of education of a migrant, among many other factors, may affect their situation at work, their income, their personal safety and more. In some cases, migrants’ different characteristics may interact with each other to further disadvantage them through multiple and/or overlapping inequalities. For example, being female and belonging to a marginalized ethnic group can amplify the experience of being “left behind” (Stuart and Samman, 2017). A female migrant domestic worker faces a unique set of challenges; some are related to being a migrant, some to being a domestic worker, some to being female and some to those characteristics interacting with each other. Further, a transgender woman may face discrimination before and during her migration travel, dealing with sexual harassment and abuse while searching for safety (IOM, 2019a). Knowing more about migrants would help policymakers more effectively target those who may be the furthest behind in the SDGs. See Text box 3 for more. Further, note that once data collection includes variables on country of birth and/or citizenship, such data should be disaggregated by country or region of origin, not just “migrant” and “non-migrant”.

---

⁷ Note that in some countries, language is a sensitive variable in the same way that ethnicity is, and national legislation may prevent data collection on languages spoken for ethical and/or security reasons.
Section 2. Disaggregation: The basics

Text box 3. Further disaggregation: Other dimensions

Generally, international human rights bodies have encouraged data disaggregation on the basis of the prohibited grounds of discrimination, including, among others, sex, age, language, religion, disability, health status, marital and family status, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

**Sex and gender.** Sex and gender can be powerful indicators affecting being left behind – regardless of whether someone is a migrant or not. It is crucial wherever possible to collect data on migrants’ sex; this can help capture the realities of roughly half of the world’s migrants. Data is sex-disaggregated when it includes differentiation of information by sex categories, including the classification of a person as female, male and/or intersex based on a range of bodily characteristics usually assigned at birth. Gender-disaggregated data, on the other hand, refers to information on the socially constructed or defined categories of gender. Gender is a complex set of social categories and identities, behaviours, activities and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for individuals based on the sex they were assigned at birth. To gather data that is gender-disaggregated requires respondents to self-identify by gender, which may or may not correspond with their sex assigned at birth or the gender attributed to them by society (IOM, 2021a). Disaggregating data by sex has been considered fairly commonplace practice for decades. While disaggregating by gender can help uncover the socioeconomic realities of women and gender-diverse people (ibid.), it is worth noting that this practice is relatively recent and can be controversial in some countries. There are 53 gender-specific indicators that explicitly call for sex disaggregation or refer to gender equality as the primary objective (UN-Women and UN DESA, 2019). Nevertheless, gender can be mainstreamed across most SDGs, and thus indicators beyond these can also be disaggregated – many by both migratory status and sex/gender if needed.

**How?** Collecting data by biological sex and socially constructed gender categories (UN-Women and UN DESA, 2019).b

**Age.** One in eight migrants is a child (UNICEF, 2016). Child migrants are often in vulnerable situations and face challenges along migratory routes and upon arrival. Migrants in other age groups are often also of great policy interest, such as adolescents and older persons. Disaggregating by both migratory status and age can help policymakers understand the situations of some of them.

**How?** Aside from collecting information on date of birth, information can be collected/reported by age group. This could be done by 10-year age groups. If possible, 5-year age groups with an open-ended interval set at 85 years and over are recommended to best capture age-relevant specificities.

**Disability.** There is a lack of data on disabled migrants and their characteristics. An estimated 10 million people are disabled within displaced populations, with around 2 million experiencing significant difficulties functioning (IOM, 2016). Many migrants with disability-related needs have heightened concerns related to income, shelter, health care, food and other areas (Gillam, 2014). Policymakers need accurate, reliable data on the experiences of disabled migrants in different stages of migration to respond to their needs.

**How?** The Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG) (2020) designed its Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS), comprised of six questions to identify people with disabilities. This is the recommended tool for disaggregating SDG data and should be used to collect information on the population aged 5 and above, using a proxy respondent for children.

(a) Vision. Do you have difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses?
(b) Hearing. Do you have difficulty hearing, even if using a hearing aid(s)?
(c) Mobility. Do you have difficulty walking or climbing steps?
(d) Cognition (remembering). Do you have difficulty remembering or concentrating?
(e) Self-care. Do you have difficulty with self-care, such as washing all over or dressing?
(f) Communication. Using [your/his/her] usual language, do you have difficulty communicating – for example, understanding or being understood?
For each question, one of the following must be chosen:

1. No difficulty
2. Some difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Cannot do at all
   - Refused
   - Don’t know

Using selected additional variables can help policymakers know whether a policy will reach or impact specific migrants. For example, whether a migrant is both coming from and settling in an urban or rural setting shapes their needs and opportunities (UNSD, 2018). Further, a migrant’s qualifications and educational attainment are associated with their labour-force participation and occupation, so assessing how labour market outcomes differ for migrants and non-migrants with the same educational attainment can provide an indication of how well migrants are integrated in labour markets (GMG, 2017). Further, information on migrants’ skills and current and/or previous employment can help uncover labour market demand and supply dynamics, and help inform policymakers how best to align migrant education and skills training to needs and, for example, skills recognition programmes.

Note that further disaggregation by other dimensions is only possible if sample size allows; in particular, much data based on household surveys, for example, cannot be disaggregated by more than one dimension if they are to remain nationally representative. In many cases, materials produced and other initiatives related to disaggregation by other dimensions — in particular, gender — can be relevant to disaggregation by migration status. For example, some of these detail the steps to set up cross-ministerial working groups to kickstart a disaggregation exercise.

Common challenges and opportunities

The process of adding any of the above migration variables to data instruments will look different for different data sources. However, there are a few common issues when using key data sources — including many used for SDG indicators — as well as some overarching common challenges and opportunities related to disaggregation.

Issues related to censuses

Given that population censuses collect data ranging from access to basic services to enrolment in school and more, they are a key tool for SDG monitoring, in particular for understanding the characteristics of migrants across Goals. Dozens of SDG indicators can be calculated using census data — often as the primary data source as identified in IAEG-SDG indicator metadata or when used as an alternative source. Harmonized census microdata in particular is an important resource in this context and a key potential tool supporting evidence-informed decision-making, as NSOs, international organizations and many others can use this to directly monitor many SDG indicators. For example, IPUMS-International offers nationally representative microdata samples that are harmonized across countries and time (see Text box 4). Further, census data supports the monitoring of other SDG indicators even when it is not the primary data source — but instead used to produce sampling frames and subpopulation-level estimates. Census data can be used in conjunction with other data sources that are themselves not appropriate for disaggregation (for example, those that lack the adequate sample size) to model disaggregated indicator estimates for specific population subgroups. Census data may also provide interim, proxy estimates for Tier II and Tier III indicators where data is not available (Jeffers et al., 2018).
IPUMS-International disseminates harmonized census microdata from around the world through partnerships with NSOs. Data from 473 censuses and surveys covering 102 countries and territories are available for researchers free of charge, covering a broad range of topics, including, among many others, labour force participation, education and housing (Jeffers et al., 2017). This offers several advantages for SDG monitoring. Variable harmonization and data integration make data suitable for comparative analysis across countries and over time by applying a unified coding scheme across samples. IPUMS-International data is nationally representative, as coverage includes quarters such as prisons and religious institutions, providing information on groups often excluded from traditional data collection.

IPUMS-International census microdata identifies migrants by nativity, indicating whether an individual is native- or foreign-born. In 2018, IOM’s GMDAC conducted a pilot study on the potential of using harmonized census data towards measuring whether migrants are left behind in the SDGs. The study focuses on Indicator 8.6.1 (“Proportion of youth not in education, employment or training (NEET)”) (Jeffers et al., 2018). While such microdata can be leveraged for disaggregated SDG monitoring, note that it is usually not made available quickly.

IPUMS-International also compiles microdata related to national household surveys. However, it should be noted that common surveys such as demographic and health surveys (DHS) and others such as Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) often capture variables related to internal mobility, not international migration. Therefore, related IPUMS-International microdata derived from surveys may not always be disaggregated by migratory status.

Nevertheless, census data has certain weaknesses which restrict its potential for use towards SDG monitoring. As most censuses are conducted every 10 years, results are only available in long intervals. Beyond national results, as sharing and harmonizing census data is a complex process, it can be even longer before data comparable across countries is available. Not all countries participate in data initiatives such as IPUMS-International, meaning coverage of such data sets is not always global, and it can be difficult to access data from non-participating countries. Further, while census questions cover a broad range of topics, they often do so with limited detail as they are not designed to investigate each topic in depth; certain household surveys often provide more detail on specific topics. Finally, it is important for policymakers to note that it is difficult to capture information on certain migrant populations using censuses – for example, emigrants. In particular, if an entire household has emigrated, this is not possible, and in some cases, the most vulnerable in a country will already have emigrated. Censuses also usually do not capture data on individuals who are homeless or living in institutional and/or group dwellings, such as prisons. Further, where censuses use a sample of the population, it is important that sample-size calculations are sufficient to represent migrant groups.

Issues related to household surveys

Household surveys are often a valuable source of in-depth information on certain SDG topics; the Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHs) estimates that data for 80 SDG indicators, over a third, can be obtained using household surveys (UNSD, 2019a). In particular, many indicators use DHS, MICS, labour force surveys (LFSs) and others as key data sources. Many of these collect information only on the main respondent’s country of birth and less frequently on the country of citizenship. In household surveys, migration variables are often recorded for the main respondent or head of household, which can limit understanding of migration dynamics within that household. It is preferable for each household member’s migratory status to be recorded separately. While relevant data is often collected in household surveys, it should be noted that many countries do not routinely publish data disaggregated by migratory status or include this in downloadable cross-tabulated data sets, while they do include variables such as age, sex and geographic location.

One further challenge in some cases is to what extent migrants are included in the census sampling frame, as this can vary. Jeffers et al. state: “De jure censuses enumerate only permanent or usual residents. In most de jure censuses, temporarily absent residents are enumerated in their place of usual residence. Many de jure censuses exclude even long-term visitors, which can lead to an undercount of transient persons such as seasonal and short-term migrants. On the other hand, de facto censuses enumerate all persons who are present at the time of the census. De facto censuses may therefore overestimate the size of the migrant population by including tourists and other temporary visitors” (2018).
For example, in Belize the 2019 MICS included, for the first time, new questions to more comprehensively distinguish international migrants from non-migrants. Two new questions were added to capture both the country of birth and the country of citizenship of all household members included in the survey (UNICEF, 2019).

Regular household surveys are usually conducted more frequently than censuses, providing timelier data. In addition to the above-mentioned surveys, more specialized and targeted surveys may also be useful for collecting data on certain population subgroups. For example, some countries manage migration-specific surveys, focusing on labour migration or other topics, though these tend to be ad hoc and not designed for comparison of results over time. Many national surveys may not always reach the most vulnerable migrants (similar to censuses), and to do so, methodologies may need to be adapted if possible.

While household surveys often collect valuable data, they are not always appropriate for migratory status disaggregation due to sample-size issues. The smaller a population subgroup is, the larger the sample size needs to be to capture enough individuals from that group to derive estimates that are statistically meaningful and nationally representative (or generalizable). In most countries, migrants make up a relatively small portion of the total population. As surveys mainly use sampling methodologies that were not originally designed for analysis of specific population subgroups, their often-limited sample sizes make it difficult to identify certain groups such as migrants, let alone specific migrant subgroups (for example, migrants with disabilities). This means that even if different types of migrants were included in a survey, it is often impossible to generate representative estimates for them if they were not the target population. Given the larger sample sizes needed for effective disaggregation by migratory status and other subgroups, setting up new survey instruments can be expensive.

It is possible to adapt survey sampling strategies to enable representative capturing of migrants. Depending on a country’s needs and context, this can be done by oversampling (increasing the number of units within an established design to increase the likelihood of migrants being included), purposive or targeted sampling (using existing information about the geographic distribution of migrants, including from other data sources) or disproportionate sampling (designed to increase survey responses from migrants). Other non-random sampling techniques include random route sampling (applying a random selection procedure in geographic areas known to have a high proportion of migrants) and respondent-driven sampling (using networks to identify more migrant-relevant samples) (OHCHR, 2018).

Alternative data sources and data integration

While historically the majority of SDG-monitoring data is taken from traditional data-collection tools such as censuses and surveys, alternative data sources can also be used. Censuses and surveys have their own sets of strengths and weaknesses which may mean countries in a particular context will need to look beyond them to find SDG-migration-relevant data. For example, countries may need data that is timelier than that from their censuses, or they may not be able to identify migrants using their existing national household surveys due to sample-size issues. Therefore, it is important to examine all potential data sources to assess how far each may be used to provide information on migrants. If leveraged correctly, relevant data from administrative sources can be particularly useful, and practitioners can use administrative records to track the situation of migrants in various SDGs. Some administrative data often has very high or exhaustive coverage of (regular) migrants and is regularly reported through routine systems, making this timelier than census or survey data. Non-official statistics and innovative or “big data” sources can also provide key migration information that can be integrated or otherwise combined with traditional sources. For example, IOM’s Missing Migrants Project, which provides data for SDG Indicator 10.7.3 on migrant deaths and missing migrants, integrates many data sources — including by using media-monitoring tools such as the GDELT Project. Further, a real-time monitoring mechanism of migrant stocks and flows in the European Union was developed using geotagged social media data from Facebook and Twitter (Gendronneau et al., 2019). This aimed to supplement migration statistics with further detail such as geographic locations; if used correctly, such efforts could help monitor different types of migration, including in the context of the SDGs.

Some disaggregated indicator data can be obtained by using multiple sources. It is possible to use different data sources or complement one primary source with others, to capture more information on migrants. There are several innovative examples of small-area estimation techniques that integrate different data sources where the sample size of one single source, such as a survey, is too small (see Text box 5). Further, local-level administrative data can often be exploited to produce disaggregated statistics at the regional or national levels, if definitions are harmonized and if coverage and methodology allow this.

---
9 For an exploration of this, focusing on forcibly displaced populations, see UNHCR, 2020.
Small-area estimation refers to a range of statistical methods that estimate indicators when data is not available at lower levels of geography or in small areas, such as counties, states or districts. These methods can make estimates on different indicators using and linking existing data that countries may collect on that small area and population of interest, such as census and survey data or administrative records. There have been some applications related to migration. For example, a study estimated the prevalence of international migration at the municipal level in Colombia in intercensal periods using data from the census and the DHS (Fúquene et al., 2019). This produced estimates which illustrated the health, education, employment and other needs of local migrant populations, helping inform local policymaking and migration mainstreaming.

Combining sources to generate disaggregated data can be challenging as it is difficult to make direct comparisons across sources. Even when migration variables are captured in various sources in one country, the coverage of each and how migrants are defined might vary. Aside from population registers, most countries’ administrative systems collect data only on migrants they engage with operationally – for example, labour migrants through issuing labour permits (UN DESA, 2017). As methodologies may vary, comparability of data will be affected, and integration and/or harmonization may be difficult. This issue is relevant beyond the national level; global comparisons of disaggregated data are often difficult as even if data is disaggregated, it may be disaggregated differently in different countries. As in the case when designing other statistical recommendations, there is a need for standard-setting organizations to strike a balance between a comprehensive conceptual framework and any practical limitations (UN DESA, 2017).

For example, to generate disaggregated data on migrants’ living conditions in Norway, data is linked between the Central Population Register (CPR), the Directorate of Immigration, and Statistics Norway. Data from the three agencies are linked using a personal pin code. This connects migrant data (on country of birth/citizenship, date of arrival, country of birth of parents, reason for migration) with information across sectors (such as education, income and wealth, child welfare, and crime) using the CPR – and provides disaggregated data for several SDG indicators (Statistics Norway, 2017).

In Denmark and Sweden (Bozorgmehr et al., 2019), a personal identifier is provided to each person either at birth or at a specified time after entry for migrants. The data recorded includes country of birth, citizenship, date of immigration and nationality of both parents. Migrants can be identified through their personal identifier, and their data is linked across national registers, including on health and health care, education, and labour.

Hard-to-reach populations

Some migrants are part of hard-to-reach populations that are not easily counted by traditional data-collection tools, and the most vulnerable may rarely appear in official statistics. Certain migrant subgroups may be relatively rare, physically or otherwise difficult to reach, and/or purposefully elusive. These include homeless migrants, migrants while they are travelling on migratory routes, irregular migrants, migrants living in group quarters, migrants at risk or facing multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination (such as LGBTQI+ migrants), and many others. Further, some mobile workers such as seasonal workers may not change their primary place of residence, meaning they will not be officially counted as migrants, but may be in vulnerable situations. For example, data gathering on irregular migrants can be particularly challenging; administrative sources such as population registers and residence permits by definition exclude them (UN DESA, 2017; UNECE, 2012), as well as most censuses. Further, irregular migrants may not be willing to be included in censuses or other data exercises, for fear of possible detection or deportation by law enforcement.

There are some indirect methods to estimate such hard-to-reach populations based on available statistics or by using special surveys. NSOs in different countries may have their own procedures to collect information on certain hard-to-count population groups. Some local-level authorities also have specialized data-collection systems to reach more elusive populations, often including migrants. Several methods of qualitative analysis can help policymakers understand more. Qualitative data, for example, gathered through interviews can complement quantitative data by
documenting in more detail the experiences of certain migrant subgroups and collecting information that cannot be captured by quantitative statistical tools. While there are many ways to conduct research to include hard-to-reach migrant populations, note that in order to be appropriate for SDG monitoring, such data collection should be nationally representative as far as possible.

Even when certain hard-to-reach populations can be reached, sometimes data-collection instruments are not migrant-friendly or conducive to full migrant participation. This is relevant for not only hard-to-reach migrants but potentially all migrants. Language barriers can also affect migrant data collection; in the Netherlands, questionnaires written in Dutch had an under-representation of migrants compared to those translated into multiple languages (WHO, 2020). To address some of these issues, certain measures can be taken. For example, informed consent needs to be taken for each individual before data collection begins, multilingual data-collection instruments should be used where possible, and interpreters and cultural mediators could be used during data collection. A clear explanation should be offered on how the collected data will be used and shared.

Participation of relevant population groups in data-collection initiatives can be encouraged, particularly if they are included in such exercises for the first time. Specific migrant subgroups can be involved in data planning, collection, dissemination and analysis in different ways, either through direct partnership or consultation, which can in turn improve the relevance and quality of data generated (GMG, 2017). National human rights institutions, civil society organizations (CSOs) and others may assist in this process, as in some contexts they may be in a better position than NSOs to reach certain populations and may be able to advise on engagement approaches (OHCHR, 2018).

For example, the Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement (JDC) works to extend surveys’ sampling frames to include those affected by forced displacement, as well as to carry out separate surveys that do include them and align with existing national surveys. The World Bank and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) carried out the Kalobeyei Socioeconomic Profiling (SEP) Survey in Kenya, aligning this with a range of standard socioeconomic indicators from the national 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) and Kenya Continuous Household Survey (KCHS), and included refugees in this. This generated first-of-its-kind comparable, nationally representative data on poverty for both refugees and host communities in Kenya (UNHCR and World Bank, 2020).

Data privacy and protection

There are a number of potential data privacy and protection concerns related to disaggregated data, which means practitioners need to build relevant solutions and safeguards into SDG data systems to safely and ethically collect, store, process and disseminate data. Overall, an important prerequisite for a disaggregation exercise and collecting, using, analysing, storing or reporting data by migration variables is establishing an ethical data-protection framework. While this Guide encourages the inclusion of migration variables in routine national data collection across sectors, this needs to be done following a sound, ethical data-protection framework.

It is crucial that confidentiality of individual information is maintained through all phases of the data life cycle – from data collection to dissemination – and that any potential risks to migrant individuals and groups are considered. For example, when disaggregating data by multiple variables – such as by age, gender; a specific country of birth and living in a specific locality in a destination country – very few observations may be reached in a specific category. When such data is presented, it can be possible to identify the individuals in these small population subgroups, even if the data does not include any direct identifiers. It is important to prevent this from happening – for example, through data blurring (such as by rounding figures or reporting percentages/ranges instead of exact counts) when it is presented.

Data collection must protect the privacy of migrants, and this must not be used to deny access to essential services or compromise any migrant rights. The NSO or other responsible parties must ensure that international principles on data protection and the right to privacy are respected, and safeguard all personal data against disclosure or exploitation for non-statistical purposes. Data that relates to personal characteristics – in particular, sensitive characteristics such as gender identity and ethnicity – should be collected and stored only with consent of the individual. Data sources should remove or resample data in such a way as to make individuals unidentifiable prior to publication. The use of

10 For more on these issues and solutions, see “Issues of coverage and response” in UN DESA, 2020c.
11 For more on this in the context of irregular migration, see: Düvell et al., 2009.
12 Data suppression (not presenting the data) or perturbation (editing the data slightly to prevent identification) are other common techniques, though the latter limits the policy use of such data. For more information, see: Lavrakas, 2008; Kelly et al., 1992.
data anonymization, firewalls and other measures to this end is key. Effective firewalls should be put in place between data collection and law enforcement to protect migrants, and they should also be clearly communicated to inspire trust and cooperation in such procedures. Many migrants may be cautious in sharing sensitive data to begin with, for fear of confidentiality and disclosure issues. As above, clear communication with and direct participation of migrant groups can help establish and sustain ethical data-collection procedures.

Relevant principles and procedures relating to the above need to be addressed in legislation. Countries or regions may adapt or adopt new specific legal instruments to support the ethical collection and use of migration data. For example, under broader anti-discrimination legislation, the United Kingdom’s Office for National Statistics (ONS) provides comprehensive guidance on how to collect data on ethnicity and national identity ethically and in a way that is comparable throughout the country (ONS, n.d.).

Finally, it is important to recognize that data disaggregated by migratory status can sometimes be politicized by parties or the media, leading to negative consequences for migrants. For example, disaggregated data on use of social security in some countries is sometimes used to scapegoat migrants and can make them more prone to xenophobic attacks. In some cases, the potential costs of publishing disaggregated data could outweigh the benefits. While these are sensitive questions to be answered on a case-by-case basis, often carefully planned dissemination and communication campaigns can support the positive effects of disaggregation (see below sections).

For example, there are different ways to put in place mechanisms to establish and subsequently review disaggregation and its impact on an ongoing basis. In Spain, the Gender Equality Act (2007) states that public authorities must include variables on sex in all data collection, and an ex ante gender impact assessment report is developed each time a new four-year national statistical plan is drafted (OECD, 2018).

Practical challenges

In addition to several methodological and other challenges, there are often more practical challenges halting progress in disaggregation.

Several of these may relate to ways of working within, across and outside of government. For example, there is often a lack of awareness of the importance of data disaggregated by migratory status, as this goes beyond more commonly used dimensions such as sex and age. This can also make it more difficult to coordinate across the government on disaggregation issues. Relevant stakeholders such as NSOs may also have limited resources and/or capacity in general – or specifically, to focus effectively on data related to the SDGs, migration and/or disaggregation. This could be because disaggregation is given insufficient priority in national agendas and, in turn, related budget allocations. Where resources are limited, rather than creating new data-collection instruments, a data-mapping exercise can be conducted to identify and use existing disaggregated data.

Other ways to support disaggregation include creating national data disaggregation action plans that set out strategies and are integrated with relevant national SDG, migration and/or statistical action plans. Disaggregation requires that data producers and users work together across silos and at all levels of government, strengthening cooperation and coordination between NSOs, ministries and others. To this end, dedicated working groups or disaggregation “champions” across ministries can help.

For example, the Inclusive Data Charter (IDC) helps governments generate and use disaggregated data to help ensure that no one is left behind, including through tailored national action plans co-produced with countries’ NSOs and other ministries. Many include migration – for example, the plan produced with Zanzibar’s Office of the Chief Government Statistician focuses on practical steps to improve gender data in Zanzibar, including within migration statistics (IDC and OCGS, 2020). Further, Canada’s gender-based analysis plus (GBA+) is used to ensure that the differential impacts of people of all genders are considered in policy planning, implementation and evaluation.

---

13 Further, in 2017 a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the United Kingdom Home Office and the Department of Health was signed, enabling data sharing between the two to track irregularities connected to individuals’ immigration status. After privacy concerns were raised, in 2018 the scope of the MOU was narrowed to cover data only in cases of criminal investigations, where a person may be a suspect in a serious crime. Following this, the MOU was withdrawn. For more information, visit the webpages of the Department of Health and Social Care and the Home Office.
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Getting started

While specific actions needed to disaggregate data will vary across settings, this section outlines key steps related to planning and implementing an SDG data disaggregation exercise. Not all steps are required, and they can be followed in any order and adapted as needed. Remaining realistic and in order to increase the chances of success, countries may choose one or two steps to focus on, depending on the context – for example, awareness-raising if disaggregation is a relatively unexplored topic, or data mapping if the aim is to use limited resources to pinpoint efficient disaggregation opportunities.

(a) Establish institutional leads.
(b) Undertake specialized awareness-raising and training.
(c) Identify SDG indicators and migration disaggregation needs.
(d) Conduct data mapping.
(e) Design and implement course of action.
(f) Undertake specialized data reporting, dissemination and communication.

Establish institutional leads

If this is not clear from the outset, there may be a need to establish who will take the disaggregation exercise forward or how it may be coordinated with others. There is no one-size-fits-all approach, and this will depend on the context. Disaggregation can require high levels of interministerial coordination – for example, between an NSO, a health ministry at the central level, a local health-care service provider and migration policymakers. Therefore, however the process is led, this should leave room for consultation with necessary stakeholders throughout.

A single agency or unit could be designated to lead the process – for example, the NSO, a ministry or unit responsible for migration, a national SDG reporting body, or a particular line ministry if the area of disaggregation has been decided (for example, the Ministry of Health if this is health). The process could also be jointly led by two or more actors.

Additionally or alternatively, a multi-stakeholder national working group or other coordination mechanisms could be set up to lead the exercise. This could involve key data producers and users across the government, such as the NSO, relevant line ministries, ministries/units responsible for migration, and, if possible, selected non-State actors such as CSOs and migrant groups. Such processes should be inclusive and, through the involvement of CSO actors if possible, enable consultation of migrant groups in data planning, collection, dissemination and analysis, as this can improve the relevance and quality of data generated.

As it is important to coordinate with and feed disaggregation into wider national SDG reporting strategies, a representative from any relevant SDG reporting body should be involved. Some countries have cross-ministerial working groups related to migration or even migration data; in these cases, these existing groups may lead. Selecting disaggregation “champions” or focal points in selected ministries, who can spearhead and follow up on steps such as data-mapping exercises as well as disaggregation workplans, can be a good approach to increase support and keep relevant government ministries or units engaged. Overall it is advisable to build on any existing relevant arrangements – such as a working group on migration – to boost the disaggregation project’s sustainability due to ongoing ownership by key actors. Further, drafting the terms of reference, a workplan, and/or a resourcing plan or budget for the institutional lead(s) is advisable.
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**Undertake specialized awareness-raising and training**

There may be a need to build awareness among stakeholders who need to be involved, of the importance of disaggregated data, particularly if they are not usually involved in migration policymaking. This can be important in order to gain relevant stakeholders’ support to implement the process. The key is to combine data producers and (potential) users so that both understand the policy issue causing the need for selected disaggregated data, as well as the key opportunities and challenges related to collecting and processing disaggregated data in that area. This makes it easier for different actors with different functions to work together, increasing the chances of success in improving disaggregation.

Specialized awareness campaigns, communications, events and training workshops can be helpful. These can target relevant working group(s) or specific members so that they further raise awareness in their own workplaces. This guidance can be used, in particular the “What do we know?” and “Why disaggregate this Goal?” subsections under the SDGs.

It can also be important to raise awareness of the importance of disaggregated data among donors. For example, actors may make the case that to boost the effectiveness of SDG financing, there is a need to identify those who are in greatest need and target them in SDG interventions – which can only be done with disaggregated data.

**Identify SDG indicators and migration disaggregation needs**

There is a wide range of SDG indicators spanning sectors that policymakers may wish to disaggregate. Nevertheless, often resources will not permit all to be disaggregated, and countries need to identify and prioritize those that are most relevant – where migrants may be left behind. A realistic number of indicators should be selected, keeping in mind overall objectives, scope and capacity.

Consultations or focus group discussions (FGDs) could be held. These could gather relevant stakeholders, again leveraging any relevant working group(s) or networks involved in the disaggregation exercise, to discuss migration policy priorities and choose indicators based on them. Discussion questions may include:

(a) What are key areas where migrants may be left behind?
   (i) What subgroup of migrants in particular may be more at risk?
   (ii) Is there sufficient data to understand/create policy on this topic?
   (iii) If not, what additional data is needed?
   (iv) What SDG(s) does this topic correspond to?
   (v) Under this SDG(s), which indicators are most relevant?

(b) Are there any migration policy topics that should be addressed that are not reflected in the SDGs? What could be ways to include them?

(c) Once/If discussing an indicator:
   (i) Why should this indicator under this Goal be disaggregated over another?
   (ii) Should it be disaggregated by country of birth? Country of citizenship? Other variables depending on the migrant subgroup?
   (iii) Should it be disaggregated by any other dimension (e.g. sex, gender identity or age)? For example, are younger or older migrants, labour migrants, or women or other gendered migrant groups, in particular, more at risk of being left behind?

The aim is to produce a list of SDG indicators that would ideally be disaggregated, along with details on which migration variables are needed. For example, a need relating to improving integration programming may mean it is important to know when a migrant entered a country, in addition to their country of birth/citizenship. Bearing in mind that there may be methodological or other challenges around some indicators, some second-tier or alternative indicators could also be noted.

---

1 Parts of this Guide can be used to shape discussion. Further, IOM’s Migration and the 2030 Agenda: A Guide for Practitioners (2018) includes several useful tools and summaries connections between migration and the SDGs, while IOM’s Mainstreaming Migration into International Cooperation and Development (MMICD) project also includes helpful tools.

2 The inter-agency Leaving No One Behind: A UNSDG Operational Guide for UN Country Teams (Interim draft) (UNSDG, 2019) lists five factors that may drive exclusion, which could be used in consultations: discrimination, geography, vulnerability to shocks, governance and socioeconomic status.

3 There is suggested international guidance on disaggregation by certain dimensions for the SDG indicators, available at https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sgds/disaggregation/.
Conduct data mapping

Conducting a data mapping involves assessing what existing data relates to disaggregated information in a sector and/or a chosen indicator. To understand what relevant data is already collected, a stocktaking of data availability needs to take place to gather information on sources, methodologies used and more.

A list should be created of institutions who may hold data relevant to the SDG indicators of interest. This will look different depending on the disaggregation objective but may focus on investigating the extent of disaggregation by migratory status of key data collected in a particular sector, such as health. Data from private, non-governmental and other actors can also be included, keeping in mind that any data used towards SDG indicators needs to be reliable and regularly produced. A questionnaire can be circulated to selected focal points in institutions.

Focal points can list all relevant data sources in the questionnaire. This should include any key sources relating to the sector in question, including any household surveys and administrative records, and how far they collect information on migration variables. Information may be gathered on:

(a) Data availability for prioritized SDG indicator(s);
(b) What relevant data is collected, including whether and how it is disaggregated;
(c) How and how often this data is collected;
(d) How this data is stored;
(e) If and how this data is shared;
(f) How this data is used, disseminated and reported.

### Table 1. SDG indicator data availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG indicator</th>
<th>Produced already?</th>
<th>If yes, disaggregated by migratory status? By which variable(s) exactly?</th>
<th>If no, possible available data for this indicator? Add details.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 2. Other relevant data availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source/ Tool name</th>
<th>Overview of data collected</th>
<th>Disaggregation by migratory status of data collected: specify country of birth and/or citizenship, other</th>
<th>Other disaggregation of data collected: specify sex, gender, age, disability, others</th>
<th>Method of data collection</th>
<th>Frequency of data collection</th>
<th>Storage of data</th>
<th>Data sharing</th>
<th>Data use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any regular data-sharing nationally; specify institution/ department

Any regular international data-sharing; specify body or agency

Any use for statistics (e.g. indicators generated, anonymized microdata produced)

Disaggregation by migratory status of this data

Any reporting and dissemination of this data (e.g. open database, reports, policy briefs)

Disaggregation by migratory status of this data
There could be follow-up interviews to gather more information and/or consolidation workshops to approve synthesized information as needed. The final data mapping should show if there is adequate data to monitor a given SDG indicator; how far this existing data is, or could be, disaggregated by migratory status; and possibly a reassessment of initially identified disaggregation needs.

**Design and implement course of action**

Once there is an overview of relevant available data, a plan of action can be made to introduce or improve the disaggregation of chosen SDG indicators. This can be done by assessing data availability against indicator metadata and other resources, including this guidance. The exact disaggregation needs of indicators can be confirmed, including disaggregation by other dimensions such as sex or age. This will look different across situations, so there is no one-size-fits-all approach. For example, if the aim is to disaggregate an indicator already monitored, disaggregation throughout the data life cycle can be assessed, and migratory status may be added to data-collection instruments without significantly changing the methodology. If the aim is to disaggregate an indicator not already monitored and if there are available resources, new data collection could be introduced that accommodates the disaggregation needs.

Any plan will depend to an extent on the methodology of the chosen SDG indicator and which tier it belongs to. If there is no internationally agreed-upon methodology or the indicator is not easy to operationalize, a proxy indicator could be considered. This could use existing data identified in the mapping. Note that any proxy indicators should use reliable and regularly collected data and be as consistent as possible with international guidance.

To introduce disaggregation, there may be a need to adjust data-processing practices to preserve the detailed information collected. Proper and consistent coding should be used, as mentioned above, and software must allow for storage of new variables, as well as varied cross-tabulation. Further, specialized data-protection measures may be needed. To uphold disaggregation by migratory status, the right legislation, standards, policies and practices need to be in place, potentially requiring adjustments to institutional and legal frameworks. Data collected for disaggregation must be confidential, used exclusively for statistical purposes and regulated by the law. If dealing with administrative data, it may be especially relevant to consider this for the first time and ensure any relevant reflections in procedures and laws. Where data must be shared between government agencies, or where data is collected by various agencies in partnership, actors concerned may have varying data-protection requirements and practices. In these cases, the procedures of the agency with the strictest requirements should be used by all involved (OHCHR, 2018).

Once a course of action is determined for disaggregation, this should be reviewed by others included in the process (for example, a working group), and if there are budgetary implications, funding mechanisms will need to be decided jointly.

**Undertake specialized data reporting, dissemination and communication**

The impact of disaggregated data depends largely on how it is reported, disseminated and communicated. To have the highest possible impact, disaggregated data needs specific strategies to reach policymakers across ministries and effectively convey complex messages to the public. These strategies should not be an afterthought; they can shape if and how data is used in migration policymaking.

It is important to ensure that disaggregation is reflected in all relevant SDG reporting platforms at the local, national, regional and international levels. If a relevant reporting platform already exists, such as an SDG national reporting platform (NRP), disaggregated indicators should be integrated into this. If not, a mechanism should be set up to report indicators; this should ensure data and related analysis are released publicly at regular frequencies, ideally in the national language(s) as well as English. Details need to be included on any further disaggregation of the data, along with those taken from the data-mapping table above. Whichever approach is taken, the following issues should be considered:

---

4 All SDG indicators are classified under one of three tiers. “Tier 1: Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, and data are regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant. Tier 2: Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, but data are not regularly produced by countries. Tier 3: No internationally established methodology or standards are yet available for the indicator, but methodology/standards are being (or will be) developed or tested.” More information is available at https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iasg-sdgs/tier-classification.
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(a) Indicator reporting should be timely. Depending on the frequency of data collection, it could be updated continuously or, more commonly, at regular intervals such as every year.

(b) Standardized information on metadata should be made available for transparency. This could include information on definitions (this is important given some countries may use different definitions), data sources (including details such as their coverage) and methodologies (including use of sampling and sampling errors) – all in non-technical language. Margins of error or upper and lower bounds should be included for disaggregation categories.

(c) If full data sets are shared alongside indicators, privacy and confidentiality must be considered. Information that identifies individuals or discloses their personal characteristics should not be made public.

(d) Data should be reported in formats that are accessible and easy to understand – for example, using statistical snapshots or simple graphics, or enabling users to download anonymized raw data with accompanying guidance.

(i) Enable multilayered cross-tabulations to show marginal totals of any cross-disaggregation involving different variables. For example, labour market participation of migrants could be shown by cross-tabulating country of citizenship against sex, age and duration of stay, to show differences in migrant subgroups.

(ii) Visually reporting SDG progress involving migration disaggregation is complex, because this involves two layers of information: first, progress over time in the same country; and second, differences in outcomes for migrants and non-migrants in the same year of data collection and country. Further, to compare global trends, multiple countries must be included as well (Jeffers et al., 2018). See Figure 1 for one possible way to present disaggregated SDG data, comparing outcomes for migrants and non-migrants both across time and countries. Note that when comparing disaggregated data across time, other factors must be considered and presented alongside the data – for example, additional migration flows and changed composition of migrants. Results across SDG indicators for migrants and non-migrants can also be contrasted easily if presented in a radar chart using different colours for population groups.

In some cases, disaggregated data can be harmonized and contribute towards regional reporting. Where possible, the new migratory status disaggregation at the national level should be included in other SDG information systems, or even other relevant platforms such as any that present Global Compact for Migration–relevant data. Where platforms compile or compare data across countries, it is important to share indicator metadata so that data integration can be considered or any caveats added. At the regional level, there are some examples of compiled comparable and harmonized disaggregated data – for example, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the European Union. These focus on presenting national data on migrants’ characteristics in different areas such as education and living conditions.

It is important to remember that migrants’ situations are shaped by many national factors, making direct comparisons between countries difficult and often of limited use. Overall, disaggregation is directly useful at the national level, but international and regional comparisons of such data should be contextualized appropriately. Key policy and legal frameworks and migrants’ own characteristics determine disaggregated data, and information on these is not always presented alongside relevant data (Jeffers et al., 2018).
Disaggregated data needs to be disseminated and communicated in ways that will maximize its use for policy. This involves determining who the desired audience is and tailoring the information shared and the channels used to reach them. For example, short and action-oriented summaries of evidence and recommendations can be developed and disseminated to target policymakers. Specialized workshops, policy conferences and webinars to disseminate key policy-relevant messages from disaggregated data can also help. The target audience may be the public; policymakers may wish to reach a large lay audience, showing disaggregated data highlighting migrants’ contributions to growth or a specific sector. In this case, specialized, high-impact communications may be needed.

Source: Minnesota Population Center (Jeffers et al, 2018).
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For example, dedicated migration reports could be developed such as the New York City Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs’ Annual Report for 2018 (MOIA, 2019), or a dedicated migration chapter could be added to other publications on well-being, such as the OECD’s (2017) *How’s Life?*

Some countries publish ad hoc or regular reports compiling data on various population subgroups in the context of LNOB. In Sweden, for example, such a report was published using disaggregated data to show outcomes of migrants in different areas relative to those of non-migrants (Statistics Sweden, 2020).

NSOs or policymakers may wish to present an overview of disaggregated data from one sector, or synthesize data from across different sectors – for example, by compiling a set of national indicators disaggregated by migratory status, to periodically analyse how migrants are faring compared to non-migrants. When disseminating and analysing disaggregated data, information on context in a particular sector should, if possible, be provided alongside it. This can help contextualize findings, for example, by highlighting any structural factors that may impact migrant outcomes. Another example is, disaggregated data on non-communicable diseases can be presented with information on migrant access to health care under the law or policies in that country. This is particularly important if presenting cross-country or regional disaggregated data, to help explain any key differences across countries. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) may be useful to this end, a tool comparing integration policies across 34 countries.

However, knowing how to interpret disaggregated data can be a challenge, as large disparities between migrants and non-migrants in particular areas could reflect a mix of factors involving policy, characteristics of those migrants, and many others. Because such disparities could be caused by any number of interacting factors, it is very important to remember that disaggregation should not be used to assess policies. Caution should be used when interpreting disaggregated data; as any observed disparities can be driven by many different factors, such data should be used to begin understanding more about a particular situation and identify focus areas for further study.

Because disaggregated data is closely linked to migration mainstreaming, dissemination and communication require sector-specific strategies. For example, health data disaggregated by migratory status should be presented both to migration policy stakeholders and health-specific national working groups, coordination mechanisms, and bodies. The main objective is to inform, in this example, migrant-sensitive health policies using the disaggregated data, which means reaching a range of policy actors. This can also act as awareness-raising in itself, encouraging others working in this sector to integrate migratory status variables into routine data collection in that area. In this way, data disaggregation and migration mainstreaming form part of a virtuous circle. Disaggregated data enables migration mainstreaming in a sector, and once migration is integrated into sectoral planning, collecting disaggregated data is prioritized given the new need to monitor migration-related outcomes of sectoral plans. As disaggregated data enables the comparison of migrant outcomes over time, this can become a self-assessment tool to facilitate policy monitoring (Jeffers et al., 2018).

Beyond focusing on specific sectors, there are ways to establish coordination to support sustainable consideration of migration as a cross-cutting issue.

For example, in Spain the Institute of Women and for Equal Opportunities (IWEO), which manages the database *Mujeres en Cifras* containing over 300 indicators on women’s characteristics across sectors, collaborates with the Spanish NSO to publish regular joint flagship gender-related reports on the status of women and men in Spain (OECD, 2018). This type of collaboration could be set up between a migration-relevant ministry and the NSO.

Finally, disaggregated data should be integrated into specific SDG follow-up and review processes beyond indicator reporting. The High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) facilitates progress review through voluntary national reviews (VNRs). As each HLPF focuses on different SDGs, actors should ensure that any policy-relevant conclusions drawn from disaggregated data are highlighted in VNRs and any thematic HLPF reviews.
Section 2. Disaggregation by Goal

**SDG 1. No poverty**

End poverty in all its forms everywhere

What do we know?5

**Migrants make significant contributions to poverty-reduction efforts**

Migration can be a powerful poverty-reduction tool for communities of origin and destination, as well as for migrants themselves and their families. In 2019, USD 554 billion remittances were sent to low- and middle-income countries (World Bank, 2020a). Through remittances, higher and/or diversified incomes, and other mechanisms, migration is often a strategy to manage the risks of poverty and can have wider poverty-reduction impacts on communities.

Meanwhile, many migrants are more likely to be in poverty than non-migrants.

Data from 36 countries around the world showed that 35 per cent of international migrants were in or at risk of poverty in 2015, compared to 23 per cent of non-migrants (see Figure 2).6 Exposure to poverty is often greater for specific subgroups of migrants, such as those from countries outside the region. For example, on average 43 per cent of non–European Union citizens in European countries were at risk of poverty in 2015, while only 37 per cent of citizens from other European Union countries were.

Data broken down by more variables may help guide policymakers’ responses. For example, citizenship may be linked to poverty outcomes; in the United States of America, 21 per cent of foreign-born non-citizens were below the poverty line in 2015, while only 11 per cent of foreign-born naturalized citizens were. Native language may also impact poverty: 27 per cent of foreign-born adults in Australia from non-major English-speaking countries were in poverty in 2015, compared to 22 per cent from major English-speaking countries (ACOSS and UNSW, 2018).

**Approximately 22 per cent of labour migrants do not have social protection**

Many migrants, particularly irregular and short-term migrants, can face exclusion from social protection programmes due to ineligibility, inadequate coverage or other reasons. Approximately 22 per cent of international labour migrants are estimated to be neither legally covered by an agreement nor entitled to social protection by host-country law; this falls to under 1 per cent for those moving between South–South countries. Only 23 per cent of international migrants have social protection coverage through a bilateral or a multilateral agreement, and even fewer among those moving from low- and middle-income countries to high-income ones (Hagen-Zanker et al., 2017).

**Why disaggregate?**

Disaggregating this type of data helps illuminate the bidirectional link between migration and poverty. Poverty is multidimensional, and different types of migrants – urban, rural, labour and more – experience this differently. With disaggregated data, governments seeking to improve poverty rates to meet SDG targets can uncover any differences for migrants, try to understand the factors behind and then address them. Migration can also be a poverty-reduction tool for migrants and their families. Through remittances, higher or diversified household incomes, and other mechanisms, migration can be associated with positive impacts on household finances and can make significant contributions to development.

Social protection for some migrants can be low, increasing vulnerabilities and putting them at higher risk of poverty. National social protection data is rarely disaggregated by migratory status, limiting policymakers’ responses. Expanding social protection for migrants is integral to meeting relevant SDG targets; migrants should be eligible for coverage and able to effectively participate in relevant systems.

---

5 Note that “What do we know?” sections compile available harmonized evidence based on disaggregated data. However, such data reflects different policies and other factors affecting the situation of migrants in each country, which should be taken into account with the data before making any comparisons between countries.

6 Countries included are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. Australian data refers to foreign-born adults, European Union data to foreign citizens, and United States data to foreign-born individuals. Australia: Poverty is defined as the percentage of the population group who live below 60 per cent of the median income in the country. European Union countries define persons at risk of poverty if, after social transfers, they have an equalized disposable income below the risk-of-poverty threshold, which is set at 60 per cent of the national median equivalized disposable income. The United States defines poverty when a family’s total income is less than the family’s threshold. See: ACOSS and UNSW, 2018; Eurostat, 2020a; United States Census Bureau, 2016.
SDG 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Migration can be a powerful poverty-reduction tool for communities of destination and origin, and migrants themselves. However, approximately

- 1 in 5 non-migrants
- 1 in 3 migrants

were in or at risk of poverty in 2015 on average in 36 countries.

---

23% NON-MIGRANTS

35% MIGRANTS
Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Most data related to poverty are taken from nationally representative household surveys, while data related to social protection are often generated through administrative records.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 1 are NSOs, ministries of planning/development, and specific agencies such as those related to certain schemes for social protection.

(c) To help uncover how migration can be associated with poverty reduction, relevant household-level data can be disaggregated by household members’ emigration. Particularly in countries with high emigrant stocks, this could help policymakers understand more about any positive impacts of migration on household finances and living standards.

(d) Care should be taken when interpreting migrants’ monetary poverty.
   (i) For example, while statistics may show labour migrants in a particular country to be above the poverty threshold if using income data, they may in effect be living under this threshold if they are regularly parting with a significant portion of their wages through remittances. This common phenomenon highlights the importance of using consumption-based questions instead, as well as measuring multidimensional poverty as far as possible and monitoring indicators that reflect outcomes across development areas.
   (ii) Although comparisons should only be done with caution, when discussing migrants’ monetary poverty using a destination country’s national poverty line, it may also be interesting to compare and contrast this with the origin country’s poverty line.

(e) Additional disaggregation by sex/gender, geographic location (urban/rural), education level, reason for migration and migration duration may be of interest to policymakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims, and the poor and the vulnerable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “How” sections offer considerations for disaggregation related to each Goal and the indicators. This guidance is designed primarily for national stakeholders, to generate and use policy-relevant, accurate and as far as possible globally comparable disaggregated SDG data. Much SDG data is usually produced by countries and shared with custodian agencies to adjust and aggregate before publishing in global-level data sets. This guidance draws on, but may differ from, official SDG metadata insofar as it is designed to help national stakeholders – for example, by making use of existing data. Official metadata for a particular indicator may not mention census data, yet this guidance will if research has shown that IPUMS-International census microdata may be used towards this.
1.4.1 
Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services
Possible data sources include household surveys (e.g. DHS, MICS and Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS)) and IPUMS-International census microdata. See notes for specific indicators on basic services included in 1.4.1.
See metadata.

1.4.2 
Proportion of the total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation, and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure
Possible data sources include selected household surveys, IPUMS-International census microdata and, if available, administrative data on land tenure reported by national land institutions.
See metadata.

1.5.1 
Number of deaths, missing persons, and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people
Data may come from national disaster databases managed by special-purpose agencies, including national disaster management agencies, civil protection agencies and others. Possible other sources include civil registration and vital statistics (CVRS) systems.
Often details of disasters' impacts on migrants are estimated in singular disasters but are harder to come by at the national level on an aggregated, regular basis. Some data on migrants affected by disaster is available via forced displacement data insofar as they were forced to migrate.
See metadata.

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plurinational State of Bolivia</td>
<td>Percentage distribution of the internal non-migrant, immigrant and recent emigrant population by poverty condition measured as unsatisfied basic needs, by department (INE Bolivia, 2018).&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurinational State of Bolivia</td>
<td>Percentage of internal non-migrant and recent migrant population with coverage of basic services (INE Bolivia, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Situation of the population born abroad in relation to the poverty line (Macadar and Pellegrino, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Socially insured employees by nationality, sex, total wages and monthly average wage (DOS Jordan, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Deaths by cause of death, sex, nationality and medical district (FCSA, 2008a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>8</sup> National and regional examples are shown throughout the Guide, where data relevant to each Goal is disaggregated by migratory status or similar variables. While there are very few examples of disaggregated SDG indicators, these examples show how many countries already disaggregate national data across sectors regularly.

<sup>9</sup> “Migrant” is defined as any person who moves between departments and municipalities, but not between countries. Recent migrants are those who changed their residence five years before the census.
SDG 2. No hunger

End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

What do we know?

Some migrants are at high risk of food insecurity or malnutrition

Some migrants are more food-insecure than non-migrants, including in some high-income countries. For example, data from 2016–2017 disaggregated by mother’s place of birth showed that 21 per cent of United States–born children with foreign-born mothers who have been in the United States for more than five years were food-insecure, in contrast to 10 per cent of United States–born children with native mothers (Children’s HealthWatch, 2018). Food insecurity for those with mothers who have been in the United States less than five years was even higher, at 24 per cent. Forced migrants in particular are often more likely to develop malnutrition-related conditions. For example, in 2018, 34 per cent of asylum-seeking children from African countries in Tel Aviv, Israel, were anaemic, compared to 11 per cent of Jewish Israeli children of the same age (Koren et al., 2019).11

Migrant workers can support food security for their children and households

Meanwhile, there is often a link between parental migration and improved nutritional outcomes for their households or children left behind. Evidence from Sri Lanka shows that stunting and wasting is lower in migrant households and having a migrant worker father had a positive effect on child birthweight. Prevalence of stunting and wasting in children in migrant households was 12 per cent and 18 per cent, respectively, compared to 15 per cent and 22 per cent for those in non-migrant households (Jayatissa and Wickramage, 2016) (see Figure 3). Some studies also link parental migration to improved early-childhood nutrition of left-behind children in rural China. A study found that in 2016, children with migrant parents were 43 per cent at risk of anaemia; this rate was 66 per cent for those living with both parents (Shi et al., 2020).13

Why disaggregate?

Disaggregating this type of data can help policymakers understand how migrants experience hunger and what can be done to address this. Sustainably ending hunger and malnutrition around the world, as the 2030 Agenda aims to, requires that all types of migrants have access to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round. Disaggregating this data can help policymakers adapt nutrition-related interventions to target specific migrant population subgroups, such as adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women, and older persons to meet their nutritional needs. Further, addressing migrant child malnutrition is critical to strengthening migrant children’s health and development, boosting their opportunities later in life.

---

10 This refers to children under 48 months.
11 This refers to children aged 6–35 months.
12 This refers to children aged 6–59 months.
13 This refers to children aged 6–17 months.
While migrants often support positive nutritional outcomes, they can be at higher risk of food insecurity and malnutrition-related conditions than non-migrants.

In China a study found that in 2016, infants with migrant parents were 43 per cent at risk of anaemia; this rate was 66 per cent for those living with both non-migrant parents.

In the United States, a study using data from 2007–2016 found that 24 per cent of United States–born children with foreign-born mothers living in the United States for less than 5 years were food-insecure, compared to 10 per cent with native mothers.

In Tel Aviv, Israel, a study using 2018 data found that 34 per cent of African asylum-seeking children were anaemic, compared to 11 per cent of Jewish Israeli children of the same age.

In Sri Lanka a study using 2012 data found that prevalence of stunting and wasting in children in migrant households was 12 per cent and 18 per cent, compared to 15 per cent and 22 per cent for those in non-migrant households.

Note: The maps are for illustration purposes only. They do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.
Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Most data related to nutrition tend to be from nationally representative household surveys.
(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 2 are NSOs, ministries of health/planning/development, and any specific bodies connected to nutrition or food-security programming. If a country uses a food and nutrition surveillance system, relevant data can be found there. Note that there may be some overlap with data sources relevant for SDG 3.
(c) When choosing nutrition-related targets to monitor by migratory status, policymakers may prioritize those related to young children, such as 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Targeting this age group can be an effective prevention strategy against more serious health risks. The first 1,000 days of a child’s life is critical, and implementing nutrition interventions during this time offers stronger chances of survival and makes healthy growth and development more likely.
(d) SDG 2 targets may be especially relevant for those forcibly displaced rather than other types of migrants. In case such subgroups are not included in traditional data instruments in a country, small-area estimation techniques or expanding surveys’ sampling frames to camps and other relevant settlements may be helpful to understand specific food-related needs.

Targets under SDG 2 aim to address the nutritional needs of specific population subgroups such as adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women, and older persons – this means that for relevant indicators, additional disaggregation by age or sex is needed. Further disaggregation by geographic location (urban/rural) or migration duration, among others, can be helpful to policymakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Prevalence of undernourishment</td>
<td>Household surveys are the most common sources for undernourishment data (e.g. DHS, MICS and LSMS). See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)</td>
<td>Data is usually from experience-based food security scale questionnaires used in household surveys. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Prevalence of stunting (height for age &lt; -2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age</td>
<td>Most anthropometric data come from household surveys. Wasting is an acute condition that can change frequently and very rapidly. This makes reliable data collection on this over time difficult, as data can only ever record a snapshot in time. This may be especially relevant when collecting data on forcibly displaced or certain hard-to-reach populations. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Prevalence of malnutrition (weight for height &gt; +2 or &lt; -2 standard deviation from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age, by type (wasting and overweight)</td>
<td>Data is based on household surveys. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status</td>
<td>Possible data sources include household surveys and IPUMS-International census microdata insofar as they capture relevant data on food producers. Target 2.3 requires a specific focus on indigenous peoples, and relevant disaggregation is recommended. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Body mass index of the adult population, by sex, country of birth and age group. Population aged 18 and over (INE Spain, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Percentage of children aged 0–23 months who were appropriately breastfed during the previous day, by sex, nationality and mother’s education (Planning and Statistics Authority of Qatar, 2012).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDG 3. Good health and well-being

Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

What do we know?

National health systems around the world rely on migrants
Many countries around the world rely heavily on foreign-born workers in health-care services (OECD, 2019). For example, 33 per cent of doctors and 22 per cent of nurses in the United Kingdom in 2015/2016 were foreign-born (see Figure 4). This means that migrants contribute crucial skills, addressing critical human resources for health deficits and labour needed in health systems to meet a variety of health-related SDG targets. Migrant workers form a critical part of the care workforce around the world and will continue to be a critical part of the care needs in ageing societies (IOM, 2010). Systematic reviews have also revealed how migrant health-care workers are also at higher risk of work-related injuries and discrimination compared to their non-migrant peers (Schilgen et al., 2017).

Meanwhile, some migrants experience poor physical or mental health outcomes
While many international migrants are healthier than their native counterparts (“healthy migrant phenomenon”) (Aldridge et al., 2018), some are more at risk of certain conditions and carry comparatively higher disease burdens. For example, the proportion of tuberculosis attributable to foreign-born individuals in the European Union/European Economic Area (EEA) was estimated at 73 per cent using 2011–2014 data (ECDC, 2016; WHO, 2018a). Further, between 9 and 36 per cent of refugees in Europe reported post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), compared to 1 to 2 per cent among the native-born. Few studies present anxiety prevalence rates in first-generation migrants, and there is wide variation in those that do; prevalence ranged from 4 to 40 per cent compared with reported prevalence of 5 per cent in the general population (Close et al., 2016; WHO, 2018b).

Foreign-born women may be more at risk of maternal mortality than native-born women
Some foreign-born women are more likely to die during or after a pregnancy than native-born women. For example, maternal mortality of foreign-born women in France is 2.5 times higher than for those who are native-born (it is 3.5 times higher for women born in sub-Saharan Africa) (Deneux-Tharaux and Saucedo, 2017; WHO, 2018a). WHO also reported that in South-East Asia (2018c) and Africa (2018d), migrant women experience poorer maternal outcomes than natives, highlighting the need for better disaggregated data from countries in other regions.

As for each Goal, note that the themes presented here are evidence snapshots of selected existing migration health–related data; there are many other migration health themes of key policy interest.

Why disaggregate?

Throughout the migration process, certain factors may increase migrants’ risk of exposure to negative health outcomes, and migrants often face obstacles in accessing health care due to their status, language barriers, discrimination, a lack of inclusive or affordable services, or other reasons. In this way, migration is a social determinant of health. Therefore, to effectively meet SDG targets related to health, it is important to proactively consider migrants in interventions and ensure they are migrant-friendly. Disaggregated data is needed for this; it is not possible to plan national health services and programmes without knowing the needs of specific population subgroups. Including migrants in SDG health programming has positive knock-on effects. Addressing the health and well-being of migrants is a precondition for their contributions to social and economic development, as this is necessary to work productively and contribute to society.

Disaggregation can also help uncover positive health-related effects of migration. For example, households often have improved health outcomes as a result of a household member emigrating, and migrants make up large

---

14 Note that there are significant country differences.
15 Inclusion criteria include “first-generation migrants” (adult and children) who migrated to high-income countries, most frequently the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, Sweden and the United States.
In many countries, MIGRANTS form the backbone of health systems, yet they are often at higher risk of certain health conditions.

One study based on 2010–2012 data found maternal mortality of foreign-born women in France is 2.5 times higher than for those native-born. It is 3.5 times higher for women born in sub-Saharan Africa.

Another study based on 2011–2014 data estimates the proportion of tuberculosis attributable to foreign-born individuals in the European Union/EEA is 73 per cent.

Another study found 9–36 per cent of refugees in Europe reported post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), compared to 1–2 per cent among the native-born. Also, 4–40 per cent of refugees in Europe reported having anxiety disorders, compared to 5 per cent among the native-born.
proportions of many countries’ essential medical workforces – disaggregated data can give policymakers more information on these phenomena.16

How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Data related to health and migration is taken from a range of sources, including household surveys (such as DHS), censuses, administrative health-related records, birth registry, death registry, pre-migration health assessment programmes, disease surveillance programmes, routine health-care data, health insurance data and research project data. While there are many data sources relevant to migration and health, they tend not to be integrated effectively. This and the challenge posed by a lack of descriptors (for example, disaggregation by age, sex or migrant populations), along with their inclusion in national health systems, can make it difficult to gain an accurate picture of migrant health in a country. Except for countries with population registers, in practice the predominant and most relevant data sources tend to be medical records, disease-specific records and notification data (ISGlobal and IOM, 2020).

(i) National health management information systems (HMISs) are usually the primary source of health-related data, combining data from various sources such as national health-care institutions and programmes. While these vary greatly across countries, they tend not to integrate a migration module to capture details by migratory status, such as country of birth (see also WHO, 2020).

(ii) Electronic health records can also generate relevant data used to monitor migrant health (Chiesa et al., 2019). Also, a systematic review undertaken in 2019 aimed at identifying health records developed specifically for migrants and refugees globally suggested that health records, especially electronic ones, might be efficient and effective tools for registering, monitoring and improving the health of migrants and refugees.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 3 are NSOs and ministries of health and other national health institutions (such as those working on health research or disease control), as well as ministries of planning, development and/or labour.

(c) To inform integration programming, policymakers may be interested in migrants’ health data, particularly in outcomes, disaggregated by duration of stay. While this is useful, extra care must be taken when collecting information on certain migration variables such as legal status and duration of stay through health-care providers. This may affect the trust between the migrant and health-care provider, as the migrant may fear that such data may be shared with law enforcement or used to stigmatize or discriminate. Many indicators already require data from hard-to-reach migrant groups (for example, those with substance abuse issues), meaning extra sensitivity is needed. In practice, HMISs vary considerably across countries, with some collecting information regularly on country of birth or citizenship and others on legal status and/or ethnicity (GMG, 2017). So that migrants do not avoid accessing health-care services, migrant-friendly outreach and clear communication of rights and intention of use of data collected are crucial.

(d) To help assess migrants’ positive impacts on the health sector in destination countries, data on the national health workforce can be disaggregated by migratory status to reveal how many nurses and doctors are migrants. To help assess impacts on health in origin countries, data on remittance could be disaggregated by household-level use to uncover how much may go to health care; this could also be an interesting complementary data point to measure alongside Indicator 3.b.2 (“Total net official development assistance to medical research and basic health sectors”). Further, data could be collected on returning migrants’ skills, including a medical skills category.

(e) Overall, it is important to note that the achievement of many other SDG targets, from orderly and safe migration to child welfare and gender-based violence, is critical to realize the objective of achieving migrant health and well-being (IOM, 2020b).

(f) Additional disaggregation by age, sex, gender, geographic location (urban/rural), education level and reason for migration may be of particular interest to policymakers.

16 Additionally, the bidirectional link between migration and health, and health and migration, should be holistically considered and understood prior to a disaggregation exercise. “Migration health” refers to not only the health of migrants, but also the impact of human mobility on disease (Wickramage et al., 2018), and it is important to take this, as well as related practical challenges in migrant typologies, into account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1* Maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td>Most data are collected through vital registration systems, which may already collect information on country of birth/citizenship of the deceased. Alternatively, IPUMS-International census microdata or administrative records can be used. Household surveys may also be used, such as MICS. However, as maternal mortality is relatively rare, large sample sizes would be needed to make these nationally representative if disaggregated by migratory status. It may be challenging to record migrant maternal mortality on migratory routes or for newly arrived migrants, as this requires strong continuity of health care. For example, there may be underreporting or misclassification of cause of death if a migrant woman's pregnancy or pre-existing condition was not known before her death. To better understand migrant maternal mortality, data on other related indicators should be disaggregated if possible, such as proportion of women aged 15–49 who received four or more antenatal care visits or who have postpartum contact with a health provider within two days of delivery; proportion of births delivered in a health facility; skilled birth attendance among migrants; and postnatal care (PNC) attendance, given that most neonatal deaths go unreported. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel</td>
<td>Common data sources include household surveys such as DHS, MICS or reproductive health surveys (RHS). See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1* Under-5 mortality rate</td>
<td>Data is mainly derived from civil registration, where death registrations should record information on migratory status of the mother and child. Data from censuses (including IPUMS-International microdata) and household surveys may also be used. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Neonatal mortality rate</td>
<td>Common data sources include those listed for 3.2.1. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1* Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population, by sex, age and key populations</td>
<td>Common data sources include household or other surveys with HIV incidence testing (including at focused antenatal clinics (FANC) where expectant mothers are tested) and countries’ regular surveillance systems among key populations if they have them, including a range of health-related administrative records. As new infection rates can be low in some countries, large sample sizes would be needed for surveys to be nationally representative if disaggregated by migratory status. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2 Tuberculosis incidence per 1,000 population</td>
<td>Possible data sources include countries’ surveillance systems or other ways to show annual case notifications, surveys of tuberculosis prevalence, or death (vital) registration systems. Note that few national disease control programmes such as those on HIV, tuberculosis and malaria capture data by migratory status. Countries that have reached elimination phases and with cross-border regions with high disease burden are more likely to have regular data capture; however, these are ad hoc and not always integrated into the HMIS (WHO, 2017). As incidence can be low in some countries, large sample sizes would be needed for surveys to be nationally representative if disaggregated by migratory status. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3 Malaria incidence per 1,000 population</td>
<td>Common data sources include countries’ surveillance systems or other ways to show numbers of positive, suspected and/or tested cases. Surveys such as DHS or the Malaria Indicator Survey (MIS) can also be used. As incidence can be low in some countries, large sample sizes would be needed for surveys to be nationally representative if disaggregated by migratory status. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>Hepatitis B incidence per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.5</td>
<td>Number of people requiring interventions against neglected tropical diseases (NTDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1*</td>
<td>Mortality rate attributed to cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Suicide mortality rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial, and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance-use disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>Harmful use of alcohol, defined according to the national context as alcohol per capita consumption (aged 15 years and older) within a calendar year in litres of pure alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>Death rate due to road traffic injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.1</td>
<td>Proportion of women of reproductive age (aged 15–49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td>Adolescent birth rate (among women aged 10 to 14 years and aged 15 to 19 years) per 1,000 women in that age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1*</td>
<td>Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, noncommunicable diseases, and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2*</td>
<td>Proportion of population with large household expenditures on health as a share of total household expenditure or income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1</td>
<td>Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Mortality rate attributed to unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack of hygiene (exposure to unsafe water; sanitation and hygiene (WASH) for all services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3</td>
<td>Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.1</td>
<td>Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 15 years and older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b.1</td>
<td>Proportion of the target population covered by all vaccines included in their national programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c.1</td>
<td>Health worker density and distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.
Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>Live births by time, mother’s age and place of birth, gender, weight and length (StatBank Greenland, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Incidents of infectious diseases by disease, age and citizenship (FCSA, 2008b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctors by speciality, grade, nationality, sex and medical district (FCSA, 2008c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses by category, medical district, nationality and sex (FCSA, 2008d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children who had diarrhea and did not receive any treatment, by sex and nationality (Planning and Statistics Authority of Qatar, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Life expectancy in good health of Swiss and foreign nationals (Swiss Federal Statistical Office, n.d.a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text box 6. Migrants and COVID-19: The case for disaggregation

Migrants around the world play an important role in the response to COVID-19. Among the 20 countries with the highest numbers of COVID-19 cases as of November 2020, at least 8 – the United States, France, Spain, the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany, Chile and Belgium – rely significantly on foreign-born health-care workers (IOM, 2021b; OECD, 2019). Further, on average 13 per cent of all “key workers” in the European Union are migrants (Fasani and Mazza, 2020).

At the same time, migrants are often among the most affected by the pandemic due to factors such as differentiated access to health-care services, support and information when compared to non-migrants. For example, studies in a number of OECD countries found infection risks among migrants at least twice as high as those of the native-born (OECD, 2020a). This also places some migrant health-care workers at increased risk of transmission. For instance, Philippine immigrants represent the largest share of America’s 512,000 registered nurses, estimated at 28 per cent – representing more than a quarter of migrant nurses in the country, with a significant portion working in emergency rooms. As of August 2020, at least 193 registered nurses in the United States have died of COVID-19 and related complications. Of those, about 30 per cent were Filipino (Batalova, 2020). Other categories of migrants may also be more exposed to COVID-19 and/or unable to access related health care, including stranded migrants and certain migrant workers at disproportionate risk due to poor living and working conditions.

Relevant data is not always disaggregated. A review found that a limited number of migration variables are collected in the European Union/EEA notification system for infectious diseases (Bozorgmehr et al., 2019), and ethnicity is not recorded in death certificates in England. The United Kingdom’s ONS linked COVID-19 death registrations with census records to analyse how COVID-19 affects people of different ethnic groups, showing a strong link between ethnicity and an increased risk, with black African men nearly four times more likely to die from the disease than white men (ONS, 2020). Overall, data on ethnicity in patients with COVID-19 in published medical literature remains limited. However, emerging data suggests black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) individuals are at an increased risk of acquiring COVID-19 infection compared to white individuals, as well as worse clinical outcomes from the virus (Pan et al., 2020). Further work on the role of ethnicity in the current pandemic is of urgent public health importance. While such associations are correlated, further research is needed to understand these underlying determinants by migrant status and ethnicity (BMJ, 2021).
Disaggregating COVID-19-related data by migratory status and as far as possible by sex, age and/or disability to identify overlapping vulnerabilities is essential to capture the impacts on migrants and better target them in prevention and response programming. This is necessary to benefit host communities as well. Given the full public health impacts of COVID-19, vaccination programmes can only be realized through an inclusive approach. Migrants need to be included as countries develop their vaccine deployment plans. For this, timely disaggregated data is needed, particularly on health workers and at-risk groups.
SDG 4. Quality education

Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

What do we know?

Displaced children and young adults have lower schooling levels than natives
It is estimated that refugee children are five times more likely than non-refugee children to be out of school, and girls are particularly disadvantaged (Nicolai et al., 2016). This is reflected in refugees’ low enrolment rates across education levels in comparison to non-migrant children. For example, 61, 23 and 1 per cent of refugees around the world are enrolled in primary, secondary, and university or college respectively, compared to global enrolment of 91, 84 and 36 per cent (UNHCR, 2017). Refugee girls remain particularly disadvantaged; for every 10 refugee boys in secondary school, there are fewer than 7 refugee girls. Disparities in school enrolment, attendance and/or educational outcomes between migrants and non-migrants are common in many countries (for example, see Statistics Sweden, 2020).

Foreign-born youth are more likely to be neither employed nor in education or training
Leaving school early or not attending at all has a significant impact on youth’s transition to the labour market. Disaggregated data shows that in many countries, foreign-born youth tend to have a higher probability of being neither employed nor in education or training (NEET) than their native-born counterparts. A 55-country analysis based on the 2010 census round showed that in most top migrant-hosting countries in all regions, foreign-born youth aged 15–24 were more likely to be NEET than those native-born (Jeffers et al., 2018) (see Figure 5). This rate varied – for example, in Kenya this was 38 versus 15 per cent for migrants and non-migrants, while in Kyrgyzstan this was 28 versus 19 per cent. In some countries, migrants were in fact less likely to be NEET – such as in the Sudan and Armenia.

Why disaggregate?

Roughly 1 in 70 children live in a country different from their birthplace (Nicolai et al., 2016) – each with a right to education. Given the high numbers of migrant children around the world, including them in education interventions is essential to meeting SDG targets. Migrants can face difficulties accessing education, due to language or socioeconomic barriers and many other intersecting factors such as sex, as exemplified above, and often achieve poorer learning outcomes that non-migrants. In this way, SDG education targets present new opportunities to expand and improve migrant education.

Improving migrant education can also be a strategic priority and long-term investment, as this can help unlock migrants’ development contributions and achieve other Goals (Nicolai et al., 2016). Improving migrants’ education is linked to improving their income and health and helps foster stronger integration of migrant boys and girls in host societies, as well as higher level of political participation.

17 The Overseas Development Institute calculated this estimation using unpublished analysis conducted by UNHCR using education enrolment rates from 2014 compared to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics and OECD.
In over half of the world’s top migrant-hosting countries, foreign-born youth were more likely to be neither employed nor in education or training (NEET), in the last census round, compared to the native-born.

**NEET RATE (%) AMONG YOUTH**

1. Data from European countries are among youth aged 15–29 while those from the rest of the other countries are among youth aged 15–24.
2. This is based on the 2010 UN DESA international migrant stock.
3. Data from European countries are from Eurostat, while those from other countries are from the Minnesota Population Center.
4. The maps are for illustration purposes only. They do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.
How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Most data related to education are from household surveys, censuses and statistics generated through national educational records. There are also key regional-level sources with comparable disaggregated data on educational outcomes in some regions (for example, from Eurostat).

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 4 are NSOs and ministries of education. For example, in some countries, education statistics are generated by administrative records from education ministries and education management information systems, without processing or other involvement by the NSOs.

(c) Data on student mobility in particular may be fragmented, given the many actors often involved in this: education policymakers, tertiary education institutions, foreign affairs and interior ministries, and migration policymakers (GMG, 2017). Sharing of data can be helpful in such scenarios, as destination countries share disaggregated data they already collect on migrant students’ enrolment, outcomes and attainment with relevant origin countries. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Eurostat and the OECD also collect data on the mobility of tertiary-level international students.

(d) Note that it can sometimes be difficult to use disaggregation to capture the true skill profiles of migrants, if certain skills or qualifications from one country are not easily recognized or categorized in a destination country. For example, a migrant may not recognize their own qualification from a shortlist of national qualifications in a survey or census, or have this experience easily accredited formally in the destination country. Facilitating skills recognition is important to understand the impacts of labour migration in destination countries, as well as planning for labour market integration of migrants. Selected resources can help address this, including through helping harmonize relevant data-collection variables (ILO, 2020a).

(e) To help assess migrants’ positive impacts on the education sector in destination countries, data on the national education workforce can be disaggregated by migratory status to reveal how many teachers are migrants (see Indicator 4.c.1).

(f) Data on remittances could be disaggregated by household-level use to uncover how much may go to education-related expenditures for household members, to help policymakers understand part of the impact of remittances on education in origin countries.

(g) Additional disaggregation by age and sex is key when assessing educational outcomes. Disaggregating by duration of stay (to inform integration programming), country of birth of parents, and status (for example, irregular, refugee and/or asylum seeker) may also be of particular interest to policymakers, insofar as these can be key factors impacting learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of children aged 24–59 months who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months, by sex

Data sources include administrative data from schools and other centres of education and training, household surveys, and IPUMS-International census microdata.

See [metadata](#).

### Proportion of youth and adults with information and communications technology (ICT) skills, by type of skill

Data sources include household surveys.

See [metadata](#).

### Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, by sex

Data sources include specialized skills assessment surveys, national adult literacy surveys, other household surveys and IPUMS-International census microdata.

See [metadata](#).

### Percentage of teachers in: (a) pre-primary; (b) primary; (c) lower secondary; and (d) upper secondary education who have received at least minimum organized teacher training (namely, pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country

Data sources include administrative records from schools and other organized learning centres, IPUMS-International census microdata and household surveys (e.g. LFS).

See [metadata](#).

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.

### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Distribution of all residents (aged 3 years and above) according to attained educational level and nationality (CAS, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Illiteracy rate among the population (15–24 years) by year, citizenship and gender (FCSA, 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Immigrants by educational attainment (pre-primary, primary, secondary, tertiary, university, none and others) and sex (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2012).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDG 5. Gender equality

Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

What do we know?

Migrant women participate more in the labour force than non-migrant women

Migration is linked to increased female labour participation. Since 2013, labour force participation rates of female migrants have been higher than those of non-migrant women (ILO, 2015, 2018). In 2017, this was 64 per cent and 48 per cent for migrant and non-migrant women respectively. Their contributions to development are also significant; women migrant workers tend to remit a larger portion of their earnings home than men do, and these are more likely to be spent on health, education, family and community development (UN-Women, 2020) (see Figure 6).

Many migrant women are more exposed to gender-specific risks and dangers

Migrant women may be more at risk of trafficking; it is estimated that female migrant workers constitute 98 per cent of all victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation (Hennebry et al., 2016), and in 2018, 81 per cent of human trafficking victims recorded by the Counter Trafficking Data Collaborative (CTDC) were female. Further, 73 per cent of the world’s migrant domestic workers in 2013 were women and adolescent girls (ILO, 2015). First- and second-generation migrant women in some countries are more at risk of female genital mutilation (FGM) practices. All women and girls in Sweden in 2015 who were exposed to FGM (38,000) underwent it before migrating to Sweden (Statistics Sweden, 2017). In England, at least 56 per cent of all cases of women and girls who underwent FGM were born outside England, primarily in East, West and North Africa (NHS, 2020).

Why disaggregate?

Migrant women and girls often face a number of vulnerabilities due to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. Therefore, in order to effectively meet gender-related SDG targets, it is important to understand and address the different realities and needs of migrant women, men, girls and boys. This requires data that is disaggregated by migratory status, sex and gender across topics such as domestic or intimate-partner violence and domestic work, as far as possible covering the different stages of the migration cycle.

A lack of sex- and gender-disaggregated migration data keeps hidden the experiences of women and gender-diverse migrants and fails to address structural inequality and systemic discrimination within migration policies. Adopting a gender analytical framework in data is key to realizing the Global Compact for Migration’s guiding principle of “gender-responsive, human rights–based migration policy”. It can be done by collecting and analysing data on migrants’ gender-specific experiences, outcomes, and processes and understanding how gender shapes all aspects and stages of migration, often with unequal outcomes for women and LGBTQI+ migrants (IOM, 2021a). If managed effectively, migration can significantly enhance women’s and people of all genders’ potential to become agents of development. For example, migration can offer improved access to education, higher incomes and stronger labour rights. Selected disaggregated data could also help uncover more of these effects.

---

18 This holds for all groups of countries except low-income ones.
19 This is between April 2019 and March 2020, with a total of 6,590 cases. A total of 41 per cent did not report their country of birth.
While women migrants are major agents of development, they often face heightened risks.

The labour force participation rate of migrant women is higher than that of non-migrant women; in 2017 this was 64 per cent versus 48 per cent.

Analysis of data from 11 national household surveys shows women migrant workers tend to remit a larger portion of their earnings than men. Further, these are more likely to be spent on health, education, family and community development.

Migrant Domestic Workers accounted for 17% (11.5 million) of the world’s domestic workers (67.1 million) in 2013 (ILO, 2015). Within that portion, 73% were women and adolescent girls, who can be more vulnerable to exploitation.

In 2018, 81% of the victims of human trafficking recorded on the global Counter Trafficking Data Collaborative (CTDC) database were women and girls.
Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Data relevant to migration and gender can come from a range of national sources. Depending on the topic explored, this could mean data from civil registration, surveys, censuses or other sources that is disaggregated by both migratory status and sex. Further, there are specific data sources for specific gender topics explored in SDG 5, detailed on the next page.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 5 are NSOs, ministries of gender/family if these exist, as well as a range of other ministries depending on the topic.

(c) Data on some topics under SDG 5 can be especially difficult to collect as they require accessing hard-to-reach populations or seek to measure “hidden” or elusive topics — for example, domestic and care work. For some areas, there is no agreement on a standard operational definition, such as for measuring psychological violence as part of Indicator 5.2.1. Identifying migrant women among these groups may be especially difficult. To understand specific issues related to gender and migration/human mobility further in a particular context, policymakers may consider carrying out special studies using small-area estimation techniques and/or data integration.

(d) Data from across sectors that is already disaggregated by both migratory status and sex/gender is crucial to understand the specific characteristics of migrants of all genders. As both migration and gender are cross-cutting issues, such data can show how they each may impact migrants’ situation across areas. However, when setting up a new data collection that is disaggregated by both dimensions, in order for this data to be representative, sampling frames will need to be very large.

(e) If additional disaggregation is possible, age can be of particular interest to policymakers, as well as many other variables such as educational level, marital status, employment status, number of children or duration of stay, depending on the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources include specialized surveys or additional modules in existing household surveys. Administrative data related to health, police, courts, and judicial and social services, among other services, may also be helpful, but these only reveal information on cases reported. Most relevant data are an underestimate, as women may be reluctant to share experiences. This means it can be difficult to compare nationally representative rates of migrants with those of non-migrants. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources as under 5.2.1. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>Proportion of women aged 20 to 24 years who were married or in a union before age 15, and before age 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. MICS and DHS), other sources that collect information on age at first marriage (such as IPUMS-International census microdata), and marriage registers. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>Proportion of girls and women aged 15–49 years who have undergone FGM, by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. MICS and DHS) and national health records or specialized surveillance systems. Some countries disaggregate such data by ethnicity or religion. Doing this by parents’ migratory status can also be useful for policymakers, to monitor the phenomenon among second-generation migrants. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.4.1
Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location

Data sources include dedicated time-use surveys or modules integrated into other household surveys.

See metadata.

### 5.5.1
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments

See 16.7.1. Disaggregation by country of birth may be more relevant than by country of citizenship, as in many countries non-citizens cannot hold office.

See metadata for national parliaments and local government.

### 5.5.2*
Proportion of women in managerial positions

Data sources include household surveys (primarily LFS), censuses (including IPUMS-International census microdata) and administrative sources.

Some sources, such as some administrative records, may only cover formal or large enterprises, potentially excluding proportionally more migrant women than non-migrant women.

See metadata.

### 5.6.1
Proportion of women aged 15–49 years who make their own informed decisions regarding sexual relations, contraceptive use and reproductive health care

Data sources include household surveys (e.g. DHS).

See metadata.

### 5.a.1
(a) Proportion of the total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure

Data sources include household surveys (e.g. household budget surveys (HBS) and LFS), IPUMS-International census microdata, and specialized agricultural surveys or records.

See metadata.

### 5.b.1
Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex

Data sources include IPUMS-International census microdata or administrative records.

See metadata.

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.

### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence by place of birth (INE Spain, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Proportion of women in the labour force by nationality, occupation and sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current use of contraceptives by age, education and nationality (Planning and Statistics Authority of Qatar, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Identified cases of FGM by country of birth and country where the FGM was carried out (NHS, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya, South Africa, Botswana, Zambia, Ghana, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Nigeria, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Board directorships in listed companies (blue-chip index or all-share index) by gender (AfDB, 2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do we know?

Migrants promote growth in destination economies

There are links between labour migration and increases in domestic economies’ GDP. For example, an OECD and International Labour Organization (ILO) study (2018) found that migrants contribute, on average, an estimated 7 per cent to host countries’ GDP, using labour market and population data from 10 countries. Migrants contributed from 1 per cent of GDP in Ghana to 19 per cent in Côte d’Ivoire. The McKinsey Global Institute (2016) used disaggregated labour market, population and income data to estimate that migrants contributed around 9 per cent to global GDP in 2015. Employment levels differ between foreign-born and natives. In 2019, in OECD countries migrants’ employment rate was on average 1.8 per cent lower than that of the native-born (OECD, 2020b). Around the world, however, the picture is mixed overall, with different trends in different countries, labour markets and skill levels. In many countries, foreign-born individuals are in fact more likely to be employed than the native-born – for example, in Luxembourg (72% versus 62.8%) and the United States (72.2% versus 69.8%).

Foreign-born employees are at higher risk of being injured at work

Data on SDG Indicator 8.8.1 from over 20 European countries showed that foreign-born employees are in higher danger of occupational injuries than their native-born peers (UN DESA, 2020b). A total of 5 out of 100,000 foreign-born employees versus 2 out of 100,000 native-born employees experienced a fatal injury in 2015 (see Figure 7). Non-fatal occupational injuries are also more common among foreign-born employees. In 2015, 1,314 out of 100,000 foreign-born employees experienced non-fatal injuries, compared to 1,122 among the native-born.

Why disaggregate?

Disaggregating data related to employment would give policymakers a better understanding of labour migration and migrants’ characteristics in different sectors. Visibility of migrants in data on unemployment and underemployment, in particular by sector, can show where migrants may be more or less integrated in labour markets and where interventions are needed to better address their and the host communities’ needs. Many migrants make key contributions to destination countries through their labour – through boosted productivity, innovation and other mechanisms – and disaggregated data can help uncover this. Further, disaggregated data for selected indicators under Goal 8 would help policymakers understand child labour, occupational injuries, financial inclusion and other specific topics.

---

20 This study was conducted between 2014 and 2018 in Argentina, Côte d’Ivoire, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Rwanda, South Africa and Thailand.

21 OECD defines the native-born unemployment rate as the share of unemployed native-born persons aged 15–64 in the native-born labour force (the sum of employed and unemployed native-born) of that same age group. The foreign-born unemployment rate is calculated as the share of unemployed foreign-born persons aged 15–64 in the foreign-born labour force (the sum of employed and unemployed foreign-born) of that same age group.

22 An occupational injury is any personal injury, disease or death resulting from an occupational accident.
Labour migrants promote growth in destination economies, boosting gross domestic product (GDP). One study based on 10 countries found that migrants contribute on average approximately 7 per cent to host countries’ GDP. Meanwhile migrants are sometimes more vulnerable at work.

Migrants contributed 1 per cent of GDP in Ghana and 19 per cent in Côte d’Ivoire.

employees experienced a fatal injury at work in 2015 in selected European countries.
How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Most data related to decent work and growth come from household surveys (in particular, LFS), censuses, various labour-related records from across the government, various growth-related indicators such as balance of payment (BOP), statistics, and administrative records from national labour inspections, workers unions and other sources.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 8 are NSOs, ministries of labour, ministries of economics/finance/planning/development, central banks and others.

(c) Some specific labour migration topics are particularly challenging to collect data on, such as migrants working in informal sectors, irregular migrant workers, and temporary or seasonal labour migrants. If policymakers are interested in disaggregating data to identify such groups – for example, to understand the contributions of seasonal agricultural workers – different data sources could be integrated or small-area estimation techniques could be used.

(d) To understand the positive impacts of migrants on labour markets, policymakers may be interested in exploring disaggregated data on annual growth rate of real GDP per employed person (Indicator 8.2.1) or other indicators not covered in the SDGs, such as contributions to the national tax system (GMG, 2017).

(e) It is important to use available standards across data sources where possible to enable comparison – for example, the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO).

(f) Additional disaggregation to enable comparative analysis across migrant worker groups is useful by age, sex, occupation, educational attainment, labour force status, working conditions (such as formal or informal), reason(s) for migration, duration of stay, recruitment mechanism, legal status and many others (GMG, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS), IPUMS-International census microdata and records from ministries of labour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5.1*</td>
<td>Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS), IPUMS-International census microdata, establishment surveys (though these may exclude small establishments and/or informal sector establishments, thus excluding proportionally more migrants) and a variety of administrative records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5.2</td>
<td>Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS), IPUMS-International census microdata and relevant records from ministries of labour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of youth (aged 15–24 years) not in education, employment or training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS) and IPUMS-International census microdata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.1</td>
<td>Proportion and number of children aged 5 to 17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS, DHS), IPUMS-International census microdata, and records on human trafficking and rights violations from labour ministries and/or national human rights institutions. This may include administrative data on identified victims of trafficking, traffickers arrested/charged/prosecuted/convicted, and/or trafficking investigations started/completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to find quality data on child labour, and the worst forms of child labour are still not captured, such as slavery, certain types of trafficking, recruitment and use of child soldiers, and use or procurement of children for prostitution or other illicit activities. It is very unlikely that migratory status disaggregation of any such data would be nationally representative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.8.1*
Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries, by sex and migrant status

Data sources include administrative data such as national surveillance systems for occupational injuries, labour inspection records, social security, insurance and compensation records, and death registers. Some household surveys may be useful.

See metadata.

### 8.10.2*
Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institutions or with a mobile-money-service provider

Data sources include household surveys and selected records from central banks or ministries of finance. Information on those using mobile-money-service providers will be especially relevant to identify many migrants.

See metadata.

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.

## Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>Labour force participation rate (%) by sex, migratory status and education attainment (MOFE Brunei Darussalam, 2019a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment in the informal economy and its components as percentage of non-agricultural employment, by sex, migration status (local/non-local), disability status, educational attainment and district (MOFE Brunei Darussalam, 2019b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth unemployment by sex, migratory status, race and district (MOFE Brunei Darussalam, 2019c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Percentage distribution of (internal) migrant employed persons 10 years of age and over by employment status, number of hours worked during reference week, and sex (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Number of migrants with employment by occupation, sex, region, province and current area (NSO Thailand, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDG 10. Reduced inequalities

Reduce inequality within and among countries

What do we know?

Many international migrants earn less than citizens

Migration has been linked to reduced inequality at different levels (Weyl, 2016; McKenzie and Rapoport, 2007). However, migrants themselves often experience unequal outcomes in relation to non-migrants. Migrants in all regions are more likely to earn on average less than natives, according to an IOM analysis using Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), ILO (2017, 2020b, 2020c), Eurostat (2020a), United States, and Canadian census23 and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) (2019) data24 (see Figure 8). In both Europe and North America and Oceania, 85 per cent of migrants live in countries where migrants earn on average less than non-migrants. This number is slightly lower in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) (43%), Asia (25%) and Africa (21%), though there is less data available in these regions. At the same time, many migrants have higher average earnings than natives. For example, 22 per cent of migrants in Africa live in countries where they earn on average more than non-migrants; this is 21 per cent in LAC. Relevant income data is not available, primarily in Asian, African and LAC countries.

Many migrants incur high recruitment and remittance costs, reducing earnings

In order to move between countries, migrants are often required to pay recruitment fees to countries or agents. Disaggregated data shows these differ between migrant corridors, disproportionately affecting low-skilled and financially constrained migrants (World Bank, 2017). For example, recruitment for migrants moving from Spain to Qatar is worth around one month of income in the host country, while this costs almost 11 months of income for low-skilled workers from Pakistan moving to Saudi Arabia (World Bank, 2017). Remittance transaction costs also remain high – the global average is approximately 7 per cent (World Bank, 2020b). By cutting into migrants’ earnings, high recruitment and remittance costs limit the development potential of migration.

Why disaggregate?

Targets and indicators under SDG 10 are varied and cover diverse topics from income to remittances, discrimination and others. Underlying all of these, however, is the single concept most relevant to disaggregation – inequality. SDG 10 seeks to promote social, economic, and political inclusion and equality of opportunity. Disaggregation across SDG indicators produces evidence that shows the situations of migrants and non-migrants, side by side, enabling policymakers to see any inequalities between these groups.

23 More information on the Canada census is available at www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dt-ds/Rp-eng.cfm?LANG=E&APATH=3&DETAIL=0&DIM=0&FL=A&FREE=0&GC=0&GID=0&GK=0&GRP=0&PID=110560&PRID=10&PTYPE=109445&S=0&SHOWALL=0&BID=0&Temporal=2017&THEME=120&VID=0&NAMEE=&NAMEF=&wdsable=true#h4. More information on the United States census is available at www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/p60/266/tableA1.xls.

24 This uses countries’ income data, which is disaggregated either by country of birth or citizenship. This analysis uses the latest income data reported, which is from 2008 to 2019. As 84 per cent of the data used is from 2017, UN DESA’s 2017 migrant stock estimates were used in the calculation. Data used is the mean nominal monthly earnings of employees by citizenship or place of birth; except for the United States and countries in Europe where due to data availability, data on median earnings was used.
1. Data used are mean nominal monthly earnings of employees by citizenship or place of birth, except for countries in Europe where only data on median income were available.
2. There are some limitations to the data and calculations used. Available income data is from different years (from 2008 to 2019). Note that as 84 per cent of the income data used is from the year 2017, UN DESA’s 2017 migrant stock estimates were used in the calculation. Countries’ disaggregation of income data varies and is by country of either birth or citizenship.
3. The maps are for illustration purposes only. They do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.

Notes:
How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Data that is relevant to migration and inequality can come from a range of national sources. SDG 10 calls to ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome. Therefore, data from across sectors that is already disaggregated by migratory status is relevant to SDG 10, as it is crucial to understand specific characteristics of migrants and reveal inequalities when compared to non-migrants. Further, there are specific data sources for specific topics explored in SDG 10 such as remittances, detailed below.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 10 are NSOs and ministries of planning/development, as well as other ministries depending on the topic.

(c) SDG 10 promotes social, economic and political inclusion of all people – a key topic for migrants. In this context, policymakers may wish to go beyond SDG indicators and measure different types of migrant inclusion using different methodologies – for example, focusing on migrants’ civic engagement and political participation.

(d) To better understand the development contributions of migrants, data on volumes of remittances could be added to or reported alongside Indicator 10.b.1 (“Total resource flows for development, by recipient and donor countries and type of flow (e.g. official development assistance, foreign direct investment and other flows)”), even though this is not listed as a type of flow in official metadata.

(e) SDG 10 also houses several indicators that directly measure migration topics – including migration governance, missing migrants and more. While these are not suitable for disaggregation by migratory status, some are mentioned below to note if and how they can be disaggregated by other dimensions.

(f) Additional disaggregation of some indicators by age and sex may be of particular interest to policymakers, and by other dimensions depending on the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.2.1    | **Proportion of people living below 50 per cent of median income, by sex, age and persons with disabilities**  
Data sources include household surveys collecting income- or consumption-based information. See Indicator 1.1.1.  
See metadata. |
| 10.3.1    | **Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law**  
Data sources include household surveys, such as specialized victimization surveys. Indicator metadata recommends adding the following explanation of grounds in relevant data collection:  
• Ethnicity, colour or language: such as skin colour or physical appearance, ethnic origin or way of dressing, culture, traditions, native language, indigenous status or being of African descent.  
• Migration status: such as nationality or national origin, country of birth, being refugees, being asylum seekers, migrant status, being undocumented migrants or being stateless persons.  
Note that this data is not disaggregated by migratory status, but it shows the prevalence of discrimination based on migratory status, ethnicity and/or other migration-relevant grounds among the total population. If sample size allows and if needed, this could be disaggregated by migratory status.  
See metadata. |
| 10.4.1    | **Labour share of GDP**  
Data sources include national GDP estimates and administrative records or other data showing compensation of employees.  
Given that this indicator shows the total compensation of employees and labour income of the self-employed as a percent of GDP, it may be possible to disaggregate by type or other subcategory of migrant workers, if disaggregation information is harmonized across sectors.  
See metadata. |
| 10.4.2 | Redistributive impact of fiscal policy (Gini coefficient) | Data sources include microdata sets (from surveys such as HBS or income and expenditure surveys) and relevant fiscal and budgetary data. Some countries already regularly disaggregate such data by ethnicity. See [metadata](#). |
| 10.7.1 | Recruitment cost borne by employee as a proportion of yearly income earned in country of destination | Data sources include household surveys (e.g. LFS). This could be disaggregated by sex, age group, education groups, reason for migration, legal status, occupation, industry and more. See [metadata](#). |
| 10.7.2 | Number of countries with migration policies to facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people | Data sources include national-level data collected via the United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development. This data is compiled internationally for regional and global reporting of 10.7.2, but country data available can be used for national reporting. See [metadata](#). |
| 10.7.3 | Number of migrants who died or disappeared in the process of migration towards an international destination | Relevant data sources are diverse and include data on repatriations, press releases, official records of border deaths and many others. If possible, this could be disaggregated by location, age, sex, country of origin and others. See [metadata](#). |
| 10.7.4 | Proportion of the population who are refugees, by country of origin | Relevant data sources are administrative asylum systems and refugee registration databases. If possible, this could be disaggregated by sex, age, geographical location, place of residence (in camps/out of camps) and more. See [metadata](#). |
| 10.c.1 | Remittance costs as a proportion of the amount remitted | Relevant data sources include remittance service providers via the Remittance Prices Worldwide (RPW) and any national estimates. This could be disaggregated by instrument used (e.g. cash, bank account, debit/credit card and mobile money). See [metadata](#). |

### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Proportion having experienced discrimination in different areas, by country of origin (in per cent) (Statistics Norway, 2008a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Percentage of women and men aged 15–49 who in the last 12 months have felt discriminated or harassed on selected grounds (National Statistical Committee of the Republic of Belarus and UNICEF, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>Average monthly wages by age group, migration status (local/non-local), race, district and persons with disabilities (MOFE Brunei Darussalam, 2019d).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 These are internal migrants employed outside their villages and towns for more than six months per year and those who do non-agricultural work in their villages and towns for more than six months in the year.

26 These include ethnic or immigration origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief, disability and other reasons.
What do we know?

Foreign citizens are more likely than nationals to live in overcrowded households
Almost one in five migrants are estimated to live in cities, and in some cities, the foreign-born population outnumbers the native-born ( Çağlar, 2014; IOM, 2015). In some countries, migrants are less likely to have access to adequate housing. For example, foreign citizens are at higher risk than citizens to live in overcrowded households in the European Union (Eurostat, 2020b) (see Figure 9). In 2018, almost one in three foreign citizens (30%) in 31 European countries lived in an overcrowded household, compared to less than one in five natives (18%). Foreign citizens from non–European Union countries have an even higher overcrowding rate (34%). In Accra, Ghana, it is estimated that 92 per cent of migrant households live in one slum, Old Fadama, without a stable supply of water or access to toilet facilities (Awumbila, 2014; IOM, 2015). Many migrants are also more likely to be homeless.

Environmental disasters often disproportionately affect migrants
Migrants often live in informal settlements or poorly planned, hazard-prone areas, which often makes them the first and worst affected by natural disasters. For example, the number of projected earthquake casualties in Turkey increased from 1 to 26 per cent when accounting for Syrian refugees (IOM and Council of Europe, 2017). While more disaggregated data is necessary to understand the scope and extent of migrants’ vulnerabilities to natural disasters, available data indicates that migrants are more vulnerable to death or loss.

Why disaggregate?

Goal 11 calls for countries to address the needs of urban populations. As migration has become an increasingly urban phenomenon and cities are at the forefront of migrant dynamics, Goal 11 monitoring and action needs to include migrants. Migrants in cities can be especially vulnerable due to many intersecting factors, leading to a reduced ability to access resources and opportunities in housing, education, employment, and basic services such as health care. Policymakers can use disaggregated data to shape urban access to services, inform integration policies, and mainstream migration in urban planning and implementation.

Target 11.5 calls to mitigate the negative impacts of disasters. SDG programming in this area should take care to generate and use data disaggregated by migratory status, given that migrants can be disproportionately impacted by disasters. Policymakers need disaggregated data to include migrants in disaster risk reduction and management efforts, emergency response, and early-warning systems. For example, data disaggregated by migratory status can inform translation and dissemination of early-warning messages in different languages, communicating life-saving information to more migrants.
Different types of migration contribute to urban growth and diversity in cities around the world. However, many urban migrants have poorer living conditions than non-migrants.

About 30 per cent of foreign citizens in European countries lived in overcrowded households in 2018, compared to 18 per cent of citizens.

Note: A household is considered overcrowded when it does not have one room for the household, a couple, a single person aged 14 or more, a pair of single people of the same sex between 12 and 17 years of age, or two children under 12.
How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) Relevant data related to cities can come from a range of national-level data-collection tools such as household surveys and censuses, as well as statistics generated through local-level data collection and administrative records across sectors.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 11 are NSOs, ministries for housing and transport, and a range of government agencies, units and service providers operating at the local/municipal level.

(c) In some contexts, many of the most vulnerable urban migrants may be excluded by data-collection tools (for example, irregular migrants or those living in informal settlements). Depending on the context or migrant subgroup of interest, small-area estimation and other techniques may be used to learn more about them.

(d) Additional disaggregation by age, sex, duration of stay (to inform integration programming), country of birth of parents and status (for example, irregular, refugee and/or asylum-seeker) may also be of particular interest to policymakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1.1*</td>
<td>Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2.1</td>
<td>Proportion of the population with convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and disability status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5.1</td>
<td>Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7.2</td>
<td>Proportion of persons who are victims of physical or sexual harassment in the previous 12 months, by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommended for disaggregation by the Expert Group on Migration Statistics.

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plurinational State of Bolivia</td>
<td>Percentage distribution of the non-migrant and absolute and recent migrant population by type of home ownership (INE Bolivia, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage distribution of the non-migrant and recent migrant population by availability of sanitary service, bathroom or latrine, and department (INE Bolivia, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>Immigrants according to the existence of electricity in housing per municipality (INE Cabo Verde, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Own dwelling abroad, alone or together with someone, by country of origin (in per cent) (Statistics Norway, 2008b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEAVE NO MIGRANT BEHIND: The 2030 Agenda and Data Disaggregation

SDG 16. Peace, justice and strong institutions

Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

What do we know?

Many migrants face xenophobia and discrimination

Migrants around the world often face discrimination, in some instances in multiple and intersecting forms. In Switzerland, 28 per cent of the population with a migrant background\(^27\) suffered at least one racial discrimination experience in 2018,\(^28\) compared to 10 per cent without any (Swiss Federal Statistical Office, n.d.b) (see Figure 10). A total of 43 per cent of Venezuelan migrants across LAC countries felt discriminated against due to their nationality (UNHCR, 2019).\(^29\) In 2018, 30 per cent of United Kingdom–born adults with migrant parents felt they were a member of a group discriminated against on grounds of colour/race, nationality, religion, language or ethnicity, compared to 5 per cent of United Kingdom–born adults with United Kingdom–born parents (Fernández-Reino, 2020).\(^30\) In New Zealand in 2014, 19 per cent of long-term migrants\(^31\) stated they had experienced discrimination, compared to 16 per cent of those New Zealand–born (Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

Many migrant children face risks of violence

Migrant children around the world – in particular, unaccompanied or separated children – are subject to different types of abuse and violence that need to be urgently addressed. For example, over 80 per cent of migrant children in Libya – around 50,000 – experienced violence, exploitation or abuse in 2017 (IOM and UNICEF, 2017; IOM, 2019b), and nearly 1,600 children have been reported dead or missing along migratory routes since 2014 (IOM, 2019b). Finally, displaced newborns may be at higher risk of not having a legal identity, increasing chances of being stateless. For example, UNHCR, the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Programme (WFP) (2018) found that 79 per cent of Syrian refugee children in Lebanon were not registered.\(^32\)

Why disaggregate?

Goal 16 calls to provide legal identity for all, through universal birth registration. This would help reduce statelessness, help create pathways out of irregular migration, especially among children, and overall protect the rights of migrants. Expanding legal identity is a vital first step to improve migrants’ access to basic services and would help remove barriers that some migrants (including stateless people) face regarding social protection, education, health care and many other areas. This would significantly boost chances of successful migrant inclusion and integration.

Disaggregated data on other SDG 16 indicators is also important. For example, this could help policymakers combat violence and/or discrimination against migrants. Disaggregated data on institutions, for example on leadership or representation, could also help policymakers assess migrants’ participation in public decision-making.

---

\(^{27}\) This is defined via country of citizenship and/or birth of the individual and/or parents (i.e. first- and second-generation migrants).

\(^{28}\) This is related to at least one of the following: nationality, religion, ethnic origin, skin colour or other distinctive physical features.

\(^{29}\) UNHCR interviewed 7,846 migrants from January to June 2019.

\(^{30}\) UNHCR interviewed 7,846 migrants from January to June 2019.

\(^{31}\) This is related to at least one of the following: nationality, religion, ethnic origin, skin colour or other distinctive physical features.

\(^{32}\) This is related to at least one of the following: nationality, religion, ethnic origin, skin colour or other distinctive physical features.
SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Many migrants face xenophobia and discrimination more frequently than non-migrants

In Switzerland, 28 per cent of those with a migrant background* suffered at least one racial discrimination experience in 2018, compared to 10 per cent of those without one.

Across Latin America and the Caribbean, 43 per cent of Venezuelan migrants felt discriminated against in transit or asylum countries, mainly due to their nationality, in 2019.

In the United Kingdom, a study using 2018 data found that 30 per cent of United Kingdom–born adults with migrant parents described themselves as members of a group discriminated against due to colour/race, nationality, religion, language or ethnicity, compared to 5 per cent of United Kingdom–born adults with United Kingdom–born parents.

New Zealand data from 2014 showed that 19 per cent of long-term migrants** stated they had experienced discrimination in the last 12 months, compared to 16 per cent of the native-born.

*Migrant background is defined via country of citizenship and/or birth of individual and or parents (i.e. first- and second-generation migrants).

** A migrant who arrived in New Zealand more than five years ago.

Note: The maps are for illustration purposes only. They do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the International Organization for Migration.
How?

Key notes to consider in data collection, use and interpretation:

(a) SDG 16 topics are diverse and data-relevant for they come from a number of sources such as household surveys, censuses and administrative records, depending on the topic.

(b) Institutions likely to be involved in producing and using data relevant to Goal 16 include NSOs, ministries of planning/development, national human rights institutions, other monitoring mechanisms and many others, including CSOs.

(c) Some topics under SDG 16 tend to be measured using events-based data on human rights violations and abuses – for example, records from criminal justice – meaning that in reality, prevalence of a particular phenomenon may be much higher. It is important to note that in many cases, the unknown prevalence may be even higher for migrants than for non-migrants, as often the former are less able or likely to report to or engage with government authorities.

(d) Additional disaggregation for SDG 16 indicators depends on the topic; for most of them, age and sex would be useful for policymakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES AND NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age</td>
<td>This indicator combines data from criminal justice and public health/civil registration systems. Care needs to be taken for the migration variable to use the same definition in sources used. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause</td>
<td>Data sources include information from civil registration, hospital records, security forces, police and other law enforcement agencies, health authorities, international organizations, CSOs and others. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1.3 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months</td>
<td>Data sources include household surveys. See 5.2.1. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1.4 Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live in</td>
<td>Data sources include victimization and other surveys. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2.1 Proportion of children aged 1–17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month</td>
<td>Data sources include household surveys (e.g. MICS and DHS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation</td>
<td>Data sources on detected cases include administrative records from criminal justice and other official sources such as police, social services, immigration and asylum, and border-control agencies. Available data focuses on detected rather than undetected cases of trafficking in persons, meaning this is an underestimate. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18–29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18</td>
<td>See 16.2.1. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict-resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>Data sources include victimization and other surveys, penitentiary and criminal justice records, and other data on intentional homicide. If disaggregated, this can monitor migrants’ trust and confidence in authorities. If surveys are used, it will be difficult to produce disaggregated, representative data. See metadata.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.3.2  
Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population  
Data sources include prison records.  
This can help monitor immigration detention (although access to facilities may be restricted) and could also be disaggregated by length of unsentenced detention.  
See metadata.

16.3.3  
Proportion of the population who have experienced a dispute in the past two years and who accessed a formal or informal dispute-resolution mechanism, by type of mechanism  
Data sources include household surveys.  
This can help monitor migrants’ access to justice. Disaggregation by type of mechanism can help assess the type of justice institutions and mechanisms available for migrants.  
See metadata.

16.7.1  
Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions  
Data sources include records from national parliaments, public institutions and national judiciary systems. Metadata recommends disaggregating by nationally relevant population groups (groups with a distinct ethnicity, language, religion, indigenous status, nationality or other characteristics).  
See metadata a, b and c.

16.7.2  
Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group  
Data sources include household surveys. Metadata recommends disaggregating by nationally relevant population groups.  
When using internationally recommended survey questions, high-quality translation into various languages as well as appropriate enumerator training are needed, given this includes the idiom “to have a say”, which has different meanings in different languages.  
See metadata.

16.9.1  
Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age  
Data sources include civil registration, household surveys (e.g. DHS) and censuses (collecting data on children who acquired their right to a legal identity).  
Disaggregation by maternal migratory status could be useful.  
See metadata.

16.b.1  
Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law  
See 10.3.1.  
See metadata.

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR REGION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Feeling of security by migration status (Swiss Federal Statistical Office, n.d.c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Elected representative in the county councils by age, country of birth, citizenship, level of education and children (Statistics Sweden, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Zealand       | Proportion of migrants feeling safe/very safe walking alone in the neighborhood after dark, by migrant status and age group, in 2016–2017 (Statistics New Zealand, 2019).  
Proportion of migrants feeling safe/very safe while using/waiting for public transport at night, by migrant status and New Zealand deprivation status, in 2016–2017 (Statistics New Zealand, 2019). |
| Qatar             | Number of cases of violence against children over the past three years, by nationality, sex and age.  

---

33 This includes low-, medium- and high-deprivation areas.
CONCLUSION
As we approach 2030, we still cannot answer several important questions related to the impact of the SDGs on migrants – for example, whether they are being left behind and to what extent, or how far they contribute towards the achievement of the Goals. Based on existing SDG data, it is difficult to know how many of those with low incomes, in poor health or those lacking education are migrants, given they are largely invisible in official global SDG data. Some migrant subgroups who are most at risk of being left behind are especially elusive in official data – for example, those in irregular situations or those in detention. Further still, the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted traditional data collection around the world, disrupting many national plans for population censuses and household surveys, negatively affecting SDG reporting. This means that it will be even more difficult to identify migrants in development data in the short to medium term.

This is significant because inclusive sustainable development can only be achieved through inclusive data. As stated in the Secretary-General’s report “The road to dignity by 2030”, progress means that targets can only be considered achieved if they have been met for all relevant income and social groups. While not all migrants are vulnerable, many are affected by distinct challenges that could impact their everyday situations negatively. The pandemic has highlighted how important it is that policy is inclusive – for example, ensuring that migrants have access to health care and vaccinations, irrespective of legal status – and this is only possible through disaggregated data. Meanwhile, as migrants are not only rights-holders but also key actors in sustainable development, quality disaggregated data can enhance our understanding of the positive links between migration and sustainable development. Such data can help identify migrants’ contributions to sustainable development across sectors and make it easier to create migration governance frameworks that boost sustainable development outcomes by building on these contributions.

In practical terms, this means more data is needed that is disaggregated by migratory status. As detailed in this Guide, disaggregation projects will look different across sectors, as key data sources used – for example, in emergency health programming and early-childhood policymaking – are not the same. However, in parallel, concerted efforts are needed at a higher level to encourage the inclusion of harmonized migration variables in routine national data collection. If more census and household surveys included migration variables in data collection and analysis, countries around the world have the potential to responsibly generate quality data across sectors that are disaggregated by migratory status. Further, this Guide has shown that in order to capture detail on different types of migrants, migration data also needs to be disaggregated by other variables. Migrants are not homogenous groups, and development interventions will need to be tailored accordingly.

Moving forward, targeted capacity-building on migration data is needed to boost disaggregation, including by following several of the steps outlined in this Guide. While initiatives need to be tailored to country contexts, there are a few additional actions that could boost the chances of success of disaggregation efforts in many countries. For example, this Guide has shown that there is more harmonized disaggregated data from high-income countries, yet at the national level, a plethora of good practices exist from around the world. This suggests that capacity-building efforts could be effective by focusing to a large extent on making better use of existing data for disaggregation. Capacity-building should also focus on boosting coordination within countries, in particular by connecting migration data producers and users who may be in different areas of government. As disaggregation often lacks the political buy-in necessary to spark real change, efforts can also focus on raising awareness of the importance of disaggregation, with a view to build up institutional commitments. It is also important to strengthen collaboration between SDG data initiatives and migration data disaggregation efforts (Koch and Kuhnt, 2020).
Aside from specialized national-level assistance, efforts should also focus on improving regional harmonization of disaggregated data (and boosting the exchange of census and survey microdata), as well as facilitating information-sharing between countries. Even if disaggregated data is available, it will only have an impact when used by migration policymakers.

SDG disaggregation can and should catalyse action well beyond 2030, with the aim of leaving no one behind and in respect of the human rights of all without discrimination. Many of the same national data-collection instruments that generate SDG data — from household surveys to censuses and different types of administrative records — are used on a daily basis by policymakers in that country to make decisions. If these instruments are adjusted for migratory status disaggregation as part of an SDG exercise, the disaggregation can easily outlive 2030, sustainably and regularly providing disaggregated data across sectors — a game changer for migration policy in years to come. In this way, rather than an SDG reporting burden, disaggregation can be a simple concept that when applied and fully leveraged becomes invaluable for policy.

Finally, there is a need for all those working in disaggregation efforts to cooperate. This should include working closely with countries, involving NSOs and line ministries, to discuss experiences, good practices and lessons learned, as well as to continue defining and addressing country needs, priorities and challenges. In particular, innovative examples of countries tackling specific challenges such as improving disaggregation without significant additional resources will be useful to ensure practical progress can be made in the near future. Innovative approaches may also be needed to counter the pandemic’s impact on data, as practitioners may need to increasingly explore potential alternative data sources for SDG indicators, including administrative records or big data.

Beyond this, at the global level it is important that all actors working on topics linked to disaggregation — on age, sex, disability and other variables — unite to make inclusive data a reality around the world. It is more important than ever to link such efforts on data disaggregation to the wider agenda of LNOB and other initiatives as part of the urgent Decade of Action we are now living in.

Measuring the links between migration and sustainable development is challenging. Work should continue to address selected migration data gaps, and while disaggregation is a key way of starting to understand migrants’ lives, such data should be contextualized with policy and other background information. Overall, however, disaggregation contributes a practical solution and key starting point to at least one important component of this, which is to measure sustainable development outcomes on migrants themselves. In this way, the 2030 Agenda provides a unique opportunity to improve how we measure migration and sustainable development, providing in turn an opportunity to improve the way migrants enjoy their rights and to include them in sustainable development strategies.
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