

---

# EPC Policy Update for the European Programme for Integration and Migration<sup>1</sup>

November 2014

*Andreia Ghimis and Yves Pascouau*

---

## Highlights

Although calm at the legislative level – due to the great number of institutional changes the EU has been going through recently – the migration, asylum and integration areas have been very present in the media in the last couple of months. Several events related to immigration and border control have contributed to this.

- The [Joint Operation Triton](#) was launched on 1 November as the Italian Mare Nostrum mission is expected to end following a two-month transition period. With a more limited scope than Mare Nostrum and a clear border control mission, Triton is feared not to be as efficient in saving lives as the Italian operation.
- The [Justice and Home Affairs Council met in Luxembourg](#) on the 9 and 10 October with important conclusions being adopted to “*Tak[e] action to better manage migratory flows*”. They are structured in three pillars: cooperation with third countries; reinforcement of border control and FRONTEX; and implementation of the Common European Asylum System.
- The [Mos Maiorum police operation](#) took place between 13 and 26 October. Coordinated by the Italian Presidency of the European Council, its aim was to gather information about irregular border crossings and to prosecute and disrupt organised crime groups.

This edition’s special focus is dedicated to the [new Commissioner for Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship](#), Dimitris Avramopoulos. Who is he, what are his objectives, and how did he perform at the hearing before the Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) committee of the European Parliament (EP)?

All these questions and other significant developments are addressed in this November EPIM Update.

---

<sup>1</sup> This document provides a focused analysis of recent EU-level policy-making, legislation and jurisprudence relevant to EPIM’s three focus areas – (1) asylum seekers; (2) undocumented migrants; and (3) equality, integration and social inclusion of vulnerable migrants and covers the period from 1 September until 1 November.

Should you, as representatives from EPIM’s Partner Foundations or EPIM-supported organisations, have questions related to the analysis provided in this document or on EU developments in the field of migration and integration in general, you are invited to contact the authors ([a.ghimis@epc.eu](mailto:a.ghimis@epc.eu), [y.pascouau@epc.eu](mailto:y.pascouau@epc.eu)). The sole responsibility for the content lies with the author(s) and the content may not necessarily reflect the positions of EPIM, NEF or EPIM’s Partner Foundations.

For more information on EPIM, please visit [www.epim.info](http://www.epim.info).

## Special Focus

### A new Commissioner for migration – Dimitris Avramopoulos

On October 22, the European Parliament voted in favour of the new European Commission designated by Jean Claude Juncker, who is now the President of the European Commission (423 votes in favour, 209 against and 67 abstentions).

#### **Who is Dimitris Avramopoulos?**

In charge of the migration portfolio will be the Greek Dimitris Avramopoulos (EPP, 61 years old). He was mayor of Athens from 1995 to 2002 and held several portfolios in the Greek government: tourism (2004-2006), health (2007-2009), defence (2011) and foreign affairs (2012-2013).

#### **What is his mission?**

In his [mission letter](#) to Avramopoulos, Juncker put forward several objectives to be achieved by the future Commissioner:

- develop a new European policy on regular migration;
- boost the effectiveness of FRONTEX;
- ensure the correct and full implementation of the Common European Asylum System and develop a strategy to improve EU's response to emergency situations;
- work with the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy to improve cooperation with third countries;
- work closely with the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the Commissioner for International Cooperation and Development and the Commissioner for Trade to strengthen EU's strategic partnership with Africa.

Although not directly addressed to Commissioner Avramopoulos, Cecilia Malmström, the former Commissioner for Home Affairs, wrote an article for the EPC publication "[Challenge Europe](#)" (p.64) giving her vision on the priorities to be addressed in the future: flexible labour migration policies, solidarity among Member States, protected entries for people in need and stronger cooperation with third countries.

#### **How is he planning to tackle migration?**

Avramopoulos' [hearing](#) in front of the EP LIBE committee took place on the 30 September.

On this occasion, he expressed his intention to collaborate with the Commission Vice-President, Frederica Mogherini, in order to improve the coordination between the external policy and migration issues. He also underlined his commitment to encourage Member States to resettle more refugees from countries which are under high pressure. More interestingly, Avramopoulos underlined that he was envisaging the possibility of enabling asylum seekers to introduce asylum demands at the EU delegations in third countries. In addition, in order to address EU's labour force shortages, he plans to engage in a regular dialogue with Member States, businessmen and trade unions. Regarding FRONTEX, his intention is to ensure that the Agency's capacity is used to the fullest without making Europe a Fortress Europe.

### **An evaluation of his performance**

For the EPC analysts, Avramopoulos' hearing seemed a formality, a rather low ambition exercise. Indeed, the ideas he put forward were positive, nevertheless, except the option of enabling people in need of protection to ask for asylum more easily (i.e. via EU delegations), no other innovative solutions have been presented. Steve Peers (University of Essex) [considers](#) that Avramopoulos' "*understanding of the practical details and the overall coherence of the policy is clearly a work in progress*".

What also needs to be taken into consideration is that Avramopoulos' capacity to innovate EU's migration policy will be limited by several factors: the [strategic guidelines](#) on freedom, security and justice adopted by the European Council in June 2014 (see previous [EPIM update](#)), the [mission letter](#) drafted by the Commission President Jean Claude Juncker and the coordination envisaged with the Vice-Presidents of the European Commission, especially Federica Mogherini.

There is no risk in saying that the migration portfolio will be one of the most challenging for the future European Commission. Indeed, the political message sent by distinguishing between the home affairs and the migration areas – comprised in the same portfolio – confirms this perception. However, to this point, no fundamental changes are envisaged in the relationship between the two dossiers. Furthermore, following the last modifications made due to some reluctances expressed by the MEPs in relation to Tibor Navracsics, the Hungarian Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Avramopoulos also inherited the citizenship dossier. This could be an opportunity to create better links between the free movement of EU citizens and intra-EU mobility of third country nationals.



## General Developments

### **Justice and Home Affairs Council Conclusions – 9 and 10 October**

The Justice and Home Affairs Council met in Luxembourg on 9 and 10 October. Aiming to respond to current and future migratory pressures at EU level, the Italian Presidency presented some proposals structured in three pillars. Their proposals have been adopted as JHA Council conclusions: "[Taking action to better manage migratory flows](#)".

The first pillar focuses on the cooperation with third countries. Under this pillar, the JHA Council considers that emphasis should be put on cooperation with **Western Africa** (Niger, Mali, Chad, Gambia, Ghana, Mauritania, Senegal, Nigeria), **Eastern Africa** (Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia) and **Northern Africa** (Libya, Egypt, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia). In addition, JHA Ministers state that special attention should be given to the four countries that are under huge migratory pressure due to the Syrian conflict: **Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey** and **Iraq**. Cooperation with these countries should take place in line with the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, building on Mobility Partnerships.

The second pillar is dedicated to reinforcing external borders' management and FRONTEX. In this sense, according to the JHA Council, the Triton operation (see below) will aim at securing EU's external borders. For this purpose, additional operational assets should be provided to FRONTEX by Member States.

The third pillar consists of actions at Member States' level. The most important item of this pillar is the implementation of the Common European Asylum System, and more precisely, the identification, registration and fingerprinting of migrants.

The EPC sees these conclusions as a prolongation of the security-oriented migration policy that the EU has been developing in the last years. Indeed, the migratory pressure is likely to increase as there are many politically unstable areas in EU's proximity (Syria, Libya, Iraq, Ukraine, etc.). Therefore, initiatives focused on providing support to origin and neighbouring countries are welcomed, but not sufficient as they do not solve the problem of people in need of protection. Moreover, measures aimed at reinforcing border control may make it more difficult for people in need of protection to seek asylum in the European Union. Thus, the EPC considers that despite the remarkable efforts the EU is making in terms of humanitarian aid, a more radical rethinking of EU's migration policy is needed in order to ensure the effective protection of people fleeing conflicts.

### Launch of Triton operation (FRONTEX Plus)

Following the tragic Lampedusa events (3 October 2013), the Italian authorities had launched the Mare Nostrum operation, a surveillance and rescue mission which is credited with having saved over 150 000 people.

Despite its efficiency, the costs of this operation (9.5 million EUR/month) have pushed Italy to ask for more solidarity at EU level. This led to the development of the Joint Triton operation which has been launched on 1 November 2014.

#### Who will participate in the Triton operation?

Triton is a joint operation requested by the Italian government and coordinated by Frontex with the participation of other Member States. 21 Member States have indicated their willingness to participate with human (65 guest officers in total) and technical resources (12 technical assets) at the start of the joint operation Triton. Others might follow in the coming months.

### Is Triton replacing Mare Nostrum?

The scope of Triton is more limited than Mare Nostrum's. Similarly, Triton's budget is substantially lower: 2.9 million EUR/month compared to 9.5 million EUR/month for Mare Nostrum.

Furthermore Triton will not have an obvious search and rescue mission. According to Gil-Arias Fernandez, *"... the primary focus of operation Triton will be border control, however I must stress that, as in all our maritime operations, we consider saving lives an absolute priority for our agency"*.

### What do stakeholders say about Triton?

Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International [regret](#) that Triton does not have the mandate and resources to rescue boats throughout the Mediterranean. ECRE and ProAsyl [reiterated](#) that if the Mare Nostrum search and rescue efforts were downsized, the death toll in the Mediterranean would rise.

EPC analysts acknowledge that this initiative is a positive development in what concerns the solidarity among EU Member States. However, this is a small drop in the ocean. Solidarity and responsibility sharing are very much needed outside the area of border control. Therefore, the EPC (alongside other organisations) [pleads](#) for more systemic and comprehensive solutions of migration flows management: opening legal channels for migration, engaging into resettling more migrants, providing protection for refugees outside EU borders.

## Reports on migration, asylum and human rights



### International Organisation for Migration

IOM launched a report entitled "[Fatal journeys: tracking lives lost during migration](#)". It aims at examining how data on migrant deaths are collected and shared in different parts of the world. In relation to the EU, a few very interesting findings can be highlighted:

- in 2014, up to 3,072 migrants are believed to have died in the Mediterranean (compared to approximately 700 in 2013);
- globally, around 40 000 migrants have died since 2000 (22 000 trying to reach the EU territory);

However, the real numbers are likely to be significantly higher, as many migrants die in very remote areas and their bodies are difficult to discover.

Several policy solutions are put forward by the IOM:

- setting up an independent body to collect data on migrants deaths at a global scale;
- improving governments' data collection methods;
- constantly reminding that behind this data are stories of human tragedies.



### Amnesty International

In its “[Lives adrift: refugees and migrants in peril in the central Mediterranean](#)” report, Amnesty International also looks at the number of arrivals by sea in the EU. Similar to IOM, Amnesty International considers that the lack of collected data does not allow authorities to make better informed policy decisions. Therefore, they recommend that EU institutions and Member States take urgent measures to ensure the recording of information and identification of refugees and migrants who die or are lost at sea.



### Italian Council for Refugees

The report: “Access to protection: bridges not walls” aims to analyse the compliance of recent EU legislation with the ECHR ruling in the [Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy](#) case of February 2012 with this jurisprudence. Although, much more complex, the essence of the Hirsi judgment is condemning the entire Italian push-back policy, particularly the push back of Eritrean and Somali nationals in high seas towards Libya. The report shows that a number of changes made to the EU’s visa policies, border control and surveillance and FRONTEX’ mandate demonstrate a willingness to comply with the Hirsi ruling. Nevertheless, further legislation is required but not foreseen in the [strategic guidelines](#) for freedom, security and justice which envisage an implementing mode rather than an innovation mode for legislation in the next five years.

## Asylum seekers

*Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 1*

### Syrian asylum seekers

The European Commission’s DG Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection published in October 2014 a new [factsheet](#) on the Syrian refugee crisis.

The most recent statistics show that the number of Syrian refugees in the five neighbouring countries is worryingly increasing:

**Lebanon:** 1 142 425

**Turkey:** 1 065 902

**Jordan:** 619 376

**Iraq:** 215 387

**Egypt:** 140 023

While the humanitarian situation is continuously deteriorating (also due to the progression of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant – ISIL in Syria), the magnitude of humanitarian needs is overwhelming. In this

context, the total EU funding (Commission and Member States) reached 2.9 billion EUR (humanitarian, development, economic and stabilisation assistance). In September 2014, the European Commission [announced](#) that it is increasing its aid to Syria and neighbouring countries by 215 million (€50 million in humanitarian aid and €165 million to support longer-term development).

Whereas this is a positive development, the EPC also encourages Member States to address these acute needs for protection through the creation of channels to grant protection outside the EU territory and the resettlement of more refugees. Currently, the EU 28 Member States resettle 5500 refugees/year. As the United States offer 70 000 places a year, in order to have a credible resettlement programme, the EU would need to resettle at least 50 000 refugees/year (Philippa Candler, UNHCR).

## Reports regarding the implementation of EU asylum rules by Member States



### European Asylum Support Office – Annual Report 2013

EASO published its [Annual Report on the situation of asylum in the European Union in 2013](#). The following trends deserve to be highlighted:

- in 2013, 435 760 persons applied for international protection in the EU28 (the highest number since 2008);
- the most significant number of applicants came from: Syria, Russia and the Western Balkans countries;
- the main receiving countries were: Germany, France, Sweden, UK and Italy;
- the overall recognition rate at EU level (28 Member States) was around 34,4%.



### Asylum Information Database (AIDA) Annual Report

AIDA published their second annual report: “[Mind the gap: An NGO perspective on Challenges to accessing protection in the Common European Asylum System](#)” summarising the positive developments and challenges identified by NGO experts in the area of asylum in 15 EU Member States. The report shows that despite the [second generation of EU harmonising rules](#) significant divergences still exist among Member States. For instance:

- there is no consensus among Member States as to which third countries can be considered safe countries of origin;
- access to free legal assistance and representation varies considerably;
- some Member States still detain frequently – and not exceptionally – asylum seekers and maximum periods vary from a few days (45 days - France) to no limit (UK – no maximum period);
- unaccompanied children are still detained in practice in countries such as Greece.

A few policy proposals have also been put forward in the report:

- use of legal channels to access protection in the EU: protected entry procedures and humanitarian visas;
- ending push-back practices;
- access to free and quality legal assistance;
- access to an effective remedy;
- timely and early identification of asylum seekers in need of special procedural guarantees;
- ending asylum seekers detention;
- providing decent reception conditions.



### Study for the European Parliament LIBE committee

This study, entitled “[Humanitarian visas: option or obligation?](#)”, looks at Member States’ practices in terms of humanitarian visas and explores the possibility of having clear EU rules in this area in the context of reforming the EU visa code ([proposal made by the European Commission in April 2014](#)).

According to this study, [the current EU visa code](#) – Article 19(4) and Article 25(1) – lacks clarity as to whether Member States are obliged to consider visa applications for humanitarian reasons. However, research shows that, over the last decade, Member States have implemented a variety of humanitarian visa schemes. Consequently, the authors consider that the Visa Code should be amended in order to ensure that Member States meet their international obligations by issuing visas to the most vulnerable third country nationals.

## Undocumented Migrants

*Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 2*

### Border control activities - Mos Maiorum operation

Between 13 and 26 October a joint police operation entitled “[Mos Maiorum](#)” was implemented under the Italian Presidency. This initiative was [revealed](#) in an official EU document published by the NGO StateWatch. However, this operation is not unique. Indeed, similar operations have been held at EU level by several Presidencies of the Council of the EU, for example: Greece, Cyprus, Lithuania, etc. Also, national operations are held on a regular basis in countries such as France and Belgium.

The aim was to apprehend irregular migrants; identify, prosecute and disrupt organised crime groups; carry out controls along the most frequently used irregular migration routes and gather information related to secondary movements.



The Mos Maiorum operation generated a series of vivid reactions (manifestations, petitions, etc.) among civil society organisations. Nevertheless, the European Commission chose to distance itself from this operation highlighting that it was not involved and that EU money was not used to finance it. The EU fundamental rights agency emphasised that “*fundamental rights safeguards should be considered when apprehending irregular migrants*”.

## External borders

### FRONTEX

#### FRONTEX quarterly – second quarter 2014 (April-June 2014)

According to the FRONTEX report, the increase in irregular border crossings in the second quarter of 2014 was far above what would usually be expected, even taking into consideration the seasonal fluctuations. Indeed, compared to the second quarter of 2013, detections increased by 170%. However, it must be emphasised that the most important nationalities of detected people were: Eritreans, Syrians, Sub-Saharan Africans, Malians and Afghans. This shows that most are actually seeking for asylum in the European Union.

Essentially, during this period, the number of asylum applications exceeded 100 000, the highest number since data collection began. Syrians continue to be the number one nationality seeking international protection representing approximately 20% of all the asylum applications. The top Member States where Syrians introduce the most numerous asylum demands are Germany, Sweden and the Netherlands.

### Special Report – External Borders Audit (European Court of Auditors)

The External Borders Fund (EBF) is the main EU financial instrument in support of external border management, amounting to 1.9 billion EUR for the 2007–13 period. The European Court of Auditors (ECA) analysed its impact, efficiency and added value.

On the one hand, ECA underlined that the EBF contributed to fostering financial solidarity among Member States. On the other hand, ECA points to serious deficiencies in the ex-post evaluations by the Commission and the Member States. In addition, in several key Member States (Greece, Spain, Italy, Malta) substantial weaknesses have been identified in the implementation of the fund (such as inadequate procurement procedures).

The Court therefore recommends to:

- ensure the availability of information on overall results;
- increase the EU added value of the fund;
- embed the EBF in a national strategy for border management;
- strengthen the implementation of the fund.

## External Dimension

### Visa policy

#### Visa liberalisation –Turkey

The European Commission published the [first report](#) on Turkey's efforts towards visa-free travel deal with the EU. This first report is the result of the first year of discussions between the two partners. Progress has been made on the Turkish side and this has been acknowledged by the European Commission. Nevertheless, further steps need to be taken in terms of issuing passports with biometric data and developing cooperation with EU Member States in detecting forged and fraudulent travel documents.

#### Visa non-reciprocity

As a consequence of some visa non-reciprocity cases with the USA and Canada, the reciprocity mechanism has been revised in 2013 via the [Regulation 1289/2013](#) which came into force in January 2014. This new mechanism aims for more solidarity among Member States in this area.

In October 2014, the European Commission published a [report](#) assessing this new mechanism.

Since February 2014, the Commission received several non-reciprocity notifications from the following Member States: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Poland and Romania. These notifications concerned: Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Japan and the USA. Nevertheless, on this occasion, the Commission decided not to install any temporary restrictions.

#### Infringement procedure – judicial review for visa refusal/annulment/revocation

The European Commission issued reasoned opinions urging the Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland and Slovakia to provide an effective judicial remedy against a visa refusal/annulment/revocation. Indeed, for the time being, these countries only provide for the possibility to appeal before a non-judicial administrative authority. The Member States concerned have two months to take the necessary measures to comply with the Commission's request. If they fail to do so, the European Commission may decide to refer the matter to the European Court of Justice.

### Readmission agreements

The [EU-Turkey readmission agreement](#) entered [into force](#) on the 1 October 2014. The agreement includes provisions relating both to the readmission of EU and Turkish citizens, and to the readmission of any other persons including third country nationals that entered into, or stayed on, the territory of one of the sides arriving from the territory of the other side.

The EU and Turkish authorities are also negotiating a visa waiver agreement which is not supposed to come into force until at least 2016.

## Mobility partnerships

A mobility partnership has been signed between the **EU** and **Jordan**. Twelve EU Member States are participating in this partnership: Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and Sweden. This mobility partnership is the first one to be signed with a Middle East country. Such partnerships already exist with Moldova and Cape Verde (2008), Georgia (2009), Armenia (2011) and Azerbaijan (2013). They aim to ensure that the movement of persons is managed as effectively as possible.

The signature of this partnership represents an acknowledgment of Jordan's commitment to peace, democracy and human rights in the region and of the efforts conducted in order to lessen the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis.

## Relevant reports



### Migreurop

Migreurop launched a thought-provoking booklet entitled "[The hidden face of immigration detention camps in Europe](#)". Every year, close to 600 000 migrants are detained on the EU territory. However, there is an increasing acknowledgement of the fact that detention can impact widely on the migrants.

The study concludes that despite its modest efficiency, detention is still very frequently used by EU Member States in order – as they claim – to deter irregular migrants from coming to the EU and to avoid them moving inside the EU. This procedure breaches migrants' fundamental rights and is very arbitrarily used by Member States. Consequently, there is a need to rethink and rewrite the EU rules in this field.

## ECJ case-law

### *Air Baltic, [C-575/12](#), 4 September 2014*

This case concerns a fine the airline company Air Baltic Corporation was imposed on by the Latvian border control authorities because they transported an Indian citizen (from Moscow to Riga) who, according to the Latvian authorities, did not have a valid visa. Indeed, at the Riga airport, the Indian national presented a valid passport without a uniform visa on it, and a cancelled passport to which a multiple entry visa was affixed and which presented the following annotation "Passport cancelled. Valid visas in the passport are not cancelled".

Air Baltic brought an action contesting the fine imposed on them.

The European Court of Justice (ECJ) firstly underlines that a third country is not competent to annul a uniform visa and that when a competent authority does it, the ground for annulling a visa must coincide with one of the grounds provided for in Articles 32(1) and 35(6) of the Visa Code.

Secondly, the ECJ remarks that the objective of the [Schengen Borders Code](#) is to "*combat illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings, and to prevent any threat to the internal security, public policy, public health and international relations of Member States*".

In order to achieve this objective, third country nationals are subject to thorough checks. Although the examination is more difficult when two documents (one valid and one invalid) are presented, this cannot be a sufficient ground for refusing the entry of the third country national.

Thirdly, the ECJ states that Member States cannot apply a condition (having a valid visa necessarily annexed to a valid travel document) that does not exist in the Schengen Borders Code. According to the Court, if that was possible, the uniformity of the [Schengen Borders Code](#) would be jeopardised.

Steve Peers (University of Essex) [welcomes](#) the strengthening of the rule of law in this field and highlights that this ruling is nevertheless not very unexpected taking into consideration the [Koushkaki, C-84/12](#), case-law in which the Court ensured the uniform interpretation this time of the [EU Visa Code](#).

#### *Ben Alaya, C-491/13, 10 September 2014*

Mr. Ben Alaya is a Tunisian national born in Germany in 1989. In 1995, he left Germany to live in Tunisia. After obtaining his baccalaureate in Tunisia in 2010, he decided to continue his studies in Germany. He was accepted on several occasions by the Technische Universität Dortmund to study mathematics. Subsequently, the applicant introduced several student visa applications in order to attend the mathematics course or a language training organised by the university for foreign students. All these applications were refused.

The last negative decision issued by the German authorities was justified by doubts relating to Mr. Alaya's motivation to study in Germany (due to the low grades previously obtained), his weak knowledge of German and the lack of connection between the course and Alaya's intended career. The applicant brought an action against that decision.

The Court explains that, under [Directive 2004/114](#), Member States have room for manoeuvre while considering applications for admission. However, the ECJ reminds that the objective of this Directive is to approximate national legislation relating to the conditions of entry and residence and to promote the mobility of foreign students. Furthermore, when the applicant meets the general (Article 6) and the specific conditions for students (Article 7) set out in the Directive, competent authorities can only refuse the admission of a third country national if there are grounds relating to the existence of a threat to public policy, public security or public health.

Therefore *“Member States are obliged to admit to its territory a third country national who wishes to stay more than three months in that territory for study purposes, where that national meets the conditions for admission exhaustively listed in Articles 6 and 7 of that Directive and provided that that Member State does not invoke against that person one of the grounds expressly listed by the Directive as justification for refusing a residence permit”*.

The European Policy Centre considers this judgment as a very positive one. Indeed, it recalls the harmonisation purpose of the Directive and prevents Member States from imposing additional admission conditions. The ECJ's ruling can contribute to making the EU more attractive for students outside the EU. In an era in which the EU's need for innovation is noticeable, it would be very beneficial if the EU legislator followed this trend while negotiating the [recast of this Directive](#).

## Equality, Integration and Social Inclusion of Vulnerable Migrants

*Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 3*



### People for Change Foundation (Malta) – comparative report

The People for Change Foundation published a [“Comparative report on integration monitoring mechanisms and indicators”](#). The study was conducted in five “old” Member States with considerable migration inflows (Austria, Belgium, Greece, Italy, Spain) and five “new” Member States with evolving migration patterns (Bulgaria, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia). Researchers conclude that integration monitoring is a relatively recent concept which is difficult to implement, especially in countries that have not dealt with immigration in the past. Furthermore, the study shows that further efforts are needed to develop indicators to monitor the integration of specific vulnerable groups of migrants: migrant women, children and victims of human trafficking.



### Joint EU-OECD report

The report entitled [“Matching economic migration with labour market needs”](#) highlights the important demographic challenges the EU will be facing in the coming years. For example, the working age population of the EU28 countries is expected to drop by up to 11.7 million (under a zero net immigration scenario).

One of the solutions proposed in this report is to ensure better integration of migrants. Therefore, in order to facilitate migrants’ access to the host countries’ job market, EU Member States should simplify the diplomas and professional qualifications recognition procedure. Furthermore, language training should be provided according to migrants’ skills and qualifications.

Another idea put forward in the EU-OECD report is to attract the skills needed in the EU labour market. Studies show that employers are reluctant to hire third country nationals. As a consequence, there is a need to implement better mechanisms enabling employers to identify more easily potential migrant workers (including students).

Finally, the report shows that efforts to reduce barriers to intra-EU mobility needed to be increased as part of a broader mobility strategy.



### Eurostat statistics

In order to be able to integrate migrants in host societies, it is very important to understand who they are, where and why they are coming to the EU Member States. Therefore, statistics such as those published by Eurostat in October ([residence permits for non-EU citizens in the EU28](#)) are essential.

The Eurostat report shows that in 2013:

- **2.36 million** residence permits were issued by EU28 (UK:30.7%, Poland: 11.6%, Italy: 10.3%, France: 9%, Germany: 8.5% and Spain: 8.3%);
- **Italy and Spain** were the two Member States with the highest number of permits issued for **family reasons**;
- **UK** was the first destination for **education** related permits;
- **Poland** issued the most permits for **employment** reasons;
- **Ukraine, India** and the **USA** were the three most important **origin countries**;
- **Ukrainians** benefited from residence permits mainly for **employment reasons**, **Chinese** for **education**, and **Moroccans** for **family reasons**.

## EU Calendar

### *Upcoming events*



#### Council

The Justice and Home Affairs Council will meet on **4 and 5 December** in Brussels.



#### European Parliament

Next LIBE committee meetings will take place on **5 and 6 November 2014**.

Next EP Plenaries will take place between **24-27 November 2014** and **15-18 December 2014**.



#### European Commission

##### **26-27 January 2015**

The first [meeting](#) of the *European Migration Forum* will take place.

This forum is a prolongation of the European Integration Forum whose scope was extended in order to cover more topics related to immigration and asylum. The European Commission published a call for interest for the organisations aspiring to become part of this new **European Migration Forum** (deadline 10 November).



#### Other Events

##### **3-7 November 2014**

International Metropolis [Conference](#), “Migration: Energy for the planet, feeding cultures”, in Milan

##### **4-5 December 2014**

*Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve* is organising:

[Conference](#): La seconde génération du Régime Européen d’Asile Commun en droit belge