



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL HOME AFFAIRS

Directorate B : Immigration and Asylum  
Unit B1 : Immigration and Integration

MIGRAPOL  
European Migration Network  
Doc 284

**EUROPEAN MIGRATION NETWORK**  
**SYNTHESIS OF EMN NCP CONTRIBUTIONS**  
**FOR THE COMMISSION'S**  
**4<sup>th</sup> ANNUAL REPORT ON IMMIGRATION AND**  
**ASYLUM (2012)**  
**Version 2: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013**

**Subject:** Initial draft Synthesis of EMN NCP contributions to the Commission's Annual Report on Asylum and Migration, based on the Annexes of EMN NCPs' Annual Policy Report 2012. The current version includes contribution from 25 EMN NCPs (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, IE, IT, FR, EL, HU, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SK, FI, SE, SI, UK and NO), received up to and including 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013. It includes comments made by AT, BE, CZ, DE, FI, FR, IT, LT, LV, NL, NO, PL, SE and SK EMN NCPs

**Action:** The purpose is to keep this Synthesis Report as concise as possible. Therefore, contributing EMN NCPs are invited to check the entries which relate to their Member States and to suggest changes / additions only where necessary. Please provide further comments in Track Changes to the EMN Service Provider (ICF GHK-COWI) at [emn@ghkint.com](mailto:emn@ghkint.com) (cc. COM: [Maria.Braettemark@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Maria.Braettemark@ec.europa.eu)), at the latest by **11<sup>th</sup> March 2013**. The Report will at the same time be circulated internally to COM and to the JAI Counsellors.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**on the 4th Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2012)**

*Accompanying the document*

**Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council**

**4th Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2012)**

***DRAFT AS OF 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013 – containing information on National level activities only  
Note that this is a draft document which may be subject to further restructuring/ editing by  
the Commission.***

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Abbreviations used.....	5
I. Legal migration and mobility .....	7
II. Irregular migration .....	20
III. International Protection Including Asylum.....	32
IV. Unaccompanied Minors and other vulnerable groups .....	36
V. Actions against Trafficking in Human Beings.....	37
VI. External Dimension of EU Migration Policy .....	41
VII. Provision and Exchange of Information to Support Policy Development .....	44
VIII. Statistical Annex .....	47

## INTRODUCTION

This paper provides a factual overview of the main developments in migration and international protection during 2012 at both EU and national level. It complements the accompanying Communication from the Commission<sup>1</sup>. The reporting period is from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012.

The paper is structured according to the following main Sections: (I) Legal Migration and Mobility; (II) Irregular Migration; (III) International Protection including Asylum; (IV) Unaccompanied Minors and other Vulnerable Groups; (V) Actions against Trafficking in Human Beings; (VI) External Dimension of EU Migration Policy; and (VII) Provision and Exchange of Information to Support Policy Development. Further sub-sections on more specific topics within these broad categories are also included. In addition, a detailed Statistical Annex (*Section VII*) providing data for at least the first 9 months of 2012 is also given.

Information on developments at EU level (to be developed) were provided primarily by the Commission, with developments at national level<sup>2</sup> based primarily on the information provided by National Contact Points of the European Migration Network (EMN NCPs), including Norway,<sup>3</sup> as part of its Annual Policy Report activity.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> To be confirmed.

<sup>2</sup> Given the focus of and the manner in which this paper was produced, it should not be treated as an exhaustive identification of all relevant Member State activities. In particular, the fact that a Member State is not identified in relation to a certain activity or policy does not mean that it did not or does not pursue that activity or policy, but rather that there were no specific developments in 2011 and/or because such developments were not reported by the EMN NCP(s)

<sup>3</sup> Contributions from Norway provided by the NO EMN NCP are included as they participate in the EMN via a Working Arrangement concluded in November 2010.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.emn.europa.eu> under "Annual Policy Reports" for the individual National Reports

## ABBREVIATIONS USED

ABC System	Automated Border Crossing System
AFM	Armed Forces of Malta
API	Advanced Passenger Information
AVR	Assisted Voluntary Return
AVRR	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
CABSI	Central Asia Border Security Initiative
CCV	Common Visa Centre
CEAS	Common European Asylum System
CGAP	Independent policy and research centre
DAPS	Ministry of the Interior, Directorate of Alien Police Service (CZ)
DSR	Daily Statistics Reports (Frontex)
EAC	European Asylum Curriculum
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
ECHR	European Court of Human Rights
EIF	European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals
EMN	European Migration Network
ESF	European Social Fund
ERF	European Return Fund
ERPUM	European Returns Platform for Unaccompanied Minors
EUROSUR	European External Border Surveillance System
FRAN	Frontex Risk Analysis Network
FRA	The EU Agency for Fundamental Rights
FREEMO	Family reunification and on the free movement of persons
GIA	Common Integration Agenda
GDISC	General Directors' Immigration Services Conference
IBM	Integrated Border Management (AT)
ICMPD	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
ILO	Immigration Liaison Officer

IND	Migration Authority (NL)
INIS	The Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service
INPS	National Institute for Social Pensions (IT)
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JIT	Joint Investigation Team (Frontex)
JSG	NGO Joint Strategic Group (UK)
MIDA	Migration for Development in Africa
MIEUX	Migration EU Expertise
MIM	Mutual Information Mechanism
MSR	Monthly Statistics Reports (Frontex)
MTV	Mobile Security Monitoring
NCC	National Coordination Centre (NO)
NCIS	National Crime Investigation Service (NO)
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NSHF	Nordic Cooperation in Migration and Asylum
NVIS	National Visa Systems
OPMI	Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (IE)
PNR	Passengers Name Record
SIS	Schengen Information System
TAIEX	Technical Assistance and Information Exchange
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UAM	Unaccompanied minor
UKBF	UK Border Force
VREN	Voluntary Return European Network

## I. LEGAL MIGRATION AND MOBILITY

### I.1 Key Statistics

Table 1 in the Statistical Annex gives a provisional overview of the residence permits issued in 2012 by reasons (education, remunerated activities and other reasons). Of the Member States providing such statistics, most residence permits were issued in 2012 by United Kingdom (701 820), Italy (246 740) and France (101 410). Member States which issued permits mainly for family reasons were France (53% of all permits), Portugal (49%), Italy (48.5%) and Sweden (48%). The highest proportions of permits issued for the purpose of education were by Germany (40%), United Kingdom (35%), Finland (32%) and Hungary (31%). Those who issued permits mostly for the purpose of remunerated activities were Lithuania (71%), Cyprus (66%) and Slovenia (58%). The highest share of permits issued for ‘other reasons’ were by Luxembourg (53%) and Latvia (51%).

### I.2 Promoting legal migration channels

At national level, Member States attach high importance to providing information to third country nationals on the routes and conditions of legal migration routes. This is demonstrated by the fact that all<sup>5</sup> Member States and Norway provide information on legal migration routes, generally through online instruments as well as information campaigns or projects. Many Member States (AT, BE, BG, CZ, DE, FI, FR, IE, IT, LT, LV, LU, NL, PL, PT, SK, SE, UK) and Norway undertook efforts to improve this information. Multilingual websites and more general information campaigns and projects were the most commonly-used instruments. All Member States and Norway have at least a website or portal in place which is updated regularly in order to ensure that the latest information is available to (potential) migrants. Some websites target specific groups, such as (qualified or highly qualified) professionals (AT, BE, DE, FR), students (BE, FR, IT, LT, SE) and investors (IE, PT).

In addition to online facilities, information campaigns, materials, projects and programmes were launched by nine Member States (BE, CZ, FI, IE, IT, LT, PL, SE, SK, UK) plus Norway, with a view to improve the provision of information on legal migration channels. Examples of such measures include introduction packs (BE, CZ, IE, UK), television programmes (SK, continued from 2011) and brochures to inform employers (PL). These measures, and especially the online materials, have the advantage also of targeting third-country nationals at pre-departure stage. Two Member States reported launching specific pre-departure orientation programme, in IT, targeting Moroccan nationals, and UK which has enhanced cooperation between service providers at pre-departure stage.

Other measures to facilitate information provision include the establishment of Local Coordination Offices in Countries of Origin (IT), a specific project to improve communication and services to third-country nationals to promote legal labour migration (SE) and a “contact point system for employers” whereby employers are assigned a contact person to deal with any queries they may have in relation to legal migration channels for third-country nationals (NO).

---

<sup>5</sup> This Synthesis Report includes contribution from 25 EMN NCPs (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, IE, IT, FR, HU, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SK, FI, SE, SI, UK and NO) received up to and including 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013.

During 2012, all Member States contributed their national information to the EU Immigration Portal. Initial information and subsequent updates were provided to the EU by EMN NCPs.

### **I.3 Economic migration**

#### ***I.3.1 Key statistics***

Table 2 in the Statistical Annex gives a provisional overview of the unemployment rate of third-country nationals. Only nine Member States and Norway have been able to provide these statistics. The highest rates are reported by Sweden (29.9%<sup>6</sup>, compared with a national average of 6.5%) and Portugal (28.3%, compared with a national average of 14.9%). Hungary (10.5%), United Kingdom (11%) and Norway (9.7%) reported the lowest rates. However, because of different sources the reported unemployment rates are not likely to be fully comparable between countries.

#### ***I.3.2 Satisfying labour market needs***

At national level, methods and tools to analyse labour market needs and shortages are considered to be helpful for both Member States that are facing high unemployment rates as well as Member States that (foresee to) have (sectorial) labour shortages (AT, BE, BG, CZ, DE, EE, EL, IE, FR, IT, CY, LV, LT, PL, SI, SK, FI), for example, the use of annual analysis on labour market trends, shortages and demand (EE, EL, IE, IT, PL, FI), via the Public Employment Services (SI, SK), lists of occupations experiencing ‘bottlenecks’ (AT, BE, LT) and mechanisms for forecasting (IT, LV, FI). In 2012, Czech Republic and Germany initiated new projects on labour market forecasting; Germany established an employment monitoring service for analysis of current and long-term labour market needs and expects to issue its first labour market prognosis in 2013; and Poland identified new plans for the monitoring of labour migration. Malta has strengthened links with private employment agencies, social partners and other organisations to better understand the better understand foreign direct investment patterns and the types of employment this may generate in the short and medium terms.

Thirteen Member States (AT, CY, CZ, FR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV, PL, PT, SE, UK) amended or introduced changes in their approach to legal migration. These changes appear to suggest two parallel trends, with some introducing more restrictive labour market policies towards labour migrants (e.g. CY, UK), whilst in others there is an emphasis on attracting (high-level) skills e.g. AT, FR, LV, SE, UK (see also Section I.3.4 below). The latter five Member States and HU introduced legislative changes to facilitate or simplify the entry of qualified or highly qualified workers in some instances to cope with labour shortages (in certain sectors). In United Kingdom, for example, the skills threshold for skilled workers was increased to graduate level (National Qualifications Framework (NQF) 6) in most cases, to improve selectivity, while the resident labour market test was relaxed for jobs paying £70 000 (€81 000) or above, or requiring PhD-level skills. In terms of specific sectors with skills shortages, Austria has granted skilled workers access to designated shortage occupations (some 26) and there exist residence permits, introduced in 2011, that allow third-country national workers in shortage occupations entry and access to the labour market, based on a defined points-based system. The main occupational fields covered are construction, wood production, agriculture and horticulture, forestry, automotive and machinery, electro-technics, electronics and telecommunications, as well as information technology and health / medicine.

---

<sup>6</sup> Eurostat data

In France, regional lists of occupational shortages applicable to third-country nationals (30 professions including six on a national level, in certain sectors such as audit and accounting, IT, construction and public works, electricity and electronics sectors) were established under the Decree of 18 January 2008. Finland identified shortages in nursing staff, Ireland identified medical staff, Latvia reported on staff in international shipment and Estonia foresees labour shortages in the coming decade in manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, construction, education, and transportation and storage. In Malta, in sectors such as construction, hospitality and caring, skills shortages have been identified. In general it seems that some Member States with more open labour market migration policies have targeted (highly) qualified workers, investors or entrepreneurs.

Conversely, Sweden does not focus on particular skills or qualification levels, and rather than operating “selectively”, the system is demand-driven, according to the individual needs of employers who decide themselves whether they have a shortage and need to recruit from outside the EU or not. This approach applies to unskilled, skilled and highly qualified workers.

### ***1.3.3 Skills Recognition***

At national level, several Member States (AT, BE, DE, EE, IE, LT, MT, PL, SI, SK, SE) and Norway undertook actions related to skills recognition and labour matching in order to address labour market needs and with the aim in some Member States to attract (highly) qualified workers. Changes in 2012 included simplifying and shortening recognition procedures (AT, BE, LT), facilitating validation procedures and increasing information provision (AT), the extension of the Act on the recognition of qualifications, to include (amongst others) long-term residents, refugees or those under subsidiary protection (SI) and better cooperation between service providers to facilitate procedures (BE). In Germany, following amendments to the Recognition Act, vocational qualifications acquired abroad can now be recognised as equivalent to a German qualification, and over 500 occupations will no longer require candidates to be nationals and in Malta a legal notice for the validation of informal and non-formal learning came into force, allowing third country nationals to have their skills and competences validated against the national occupational standards already developed.

In terms of future plans on skills recognition, Norway expects to complete its database of approved higher education programmes in 2013 which should ensure faster and improved processing of applications for recognition and Slovak Republic also expects to introduce legislative changes that simplify recognition procedures.

With regard to improved labour matching, the Public Employment Service in Austria assesses since 2012 the migration background of registered unemployed/job-seekers in order to ensure “targeted services” (e.g. German courses, basic skills acquisition) for third-country nationals. Austria has also implemented a project “Mentoring for Migrants” where tutors support qualified migrants to enter the labour market. In Poland an online portal has been launched to provide entrepreneurs with information on, for example, relevant regulations.

Sweden intends to launch labour matching programmes in 2013. In relation to the growth agenda, Sweden plans to introduce labour market matching for third-country nationals and employment schemes to encourage employers to hire more third-country nationals. Apprenticeships and training ‘on the job’ are also planned for low skilled third-country nationals, as well as funding to increase efforts for generating growth among third-country

national entrepreneurs. Norway plans to launch a programme aiming to increase labour market participation of third-country nationals, and particularly of women, and an Action Plan in 2013 on how to better use the skills of third-country nationals. In Malta, third country nationals who may have initially arrived in Malta in an irregular manner, and obtain a legal status, can participate in training programmes and employers of such migrants may seek reimbursement for any training costs incurred. In Italy, 41.3 % of foreign workers employed are over-educated in relation to the duties they perform; as a result, the public debate has mainly focused on issues of *brain waste*.

**Comentário [MJ1]:** Note to IT: Does this refer to Third-country nationals or all non-national workers please?

#### ***1.3.4 Cooperation with partner / third countries for economic migration***

At national level, several Member States (BE, BG, CZ, FR, NL, PL, PT, SE) reported on their continued participation in the EU Mobility Partnerships including those with Georgia (BE, CZ, FR, PL, SE), Republic of Moldova (CZ, FR, PL, SE), Armenia (BE, BG, CZ, FR, PL), Tunisia (PL, SE), Azerbaijan (BG, CZ) and Cape Verde (FR, NL). BE, IT and PT expects to participate in the EU Mobility Partnership with Morocco which is planned to be concluded in 2013.

Other Member States (HU, IT, NL, PL, SI, SK, SE) concluded bilateral agreements with third-countries in 2012, including Ukraine (PL), India (SE), New Zealand (HU, SK), Bosnia and Herzegovina (SI) and Azerbaijan (NL). Italy signed agreements with Egypt, Albania, Moldova, and Sri Lanka and concluded agreements with Bangladesh, Philippines, Ghana, Morocco, Tunisia and Peru. The concluded bilateral agreements mostly aimed to strengthen cooperation in labour migration management with countries of origin that generate the largest inflows of third-country nationals (IT), developing a working holiday scheme for youth (HU, SK), set general principles of employment for third-country nationals (SI) and reach agreements on pensions and accident insurance (DE).

In terms of planned bilateral agreements, Bulgaria has opened negotiations with Moldova, Armenia, and Ukraine for labour migration agreements, the first two in the framework of Mobility Partnerships. Italy expects to conclude agreements with India, China, Ecuador, Ukraine and Russia in the near future and Germany plans on starting negotiations on social insurance agreements with the Philippines in March 2013 with the main purpose to agree on pensions and accident insurance thereby avoiding “double insurance”. Luxembourg plans to conclude an agreement on circular migration with Cape Verde and Hungary will ratify a working holiday scheme with the Republic of Korea in 2013.

#### ***1.3.5 Highly qualified workers***

At national level, attracting highly qualified workers, as well as investors and entrepreneurs, gained increasing importance. Several Member States (AT, BE, CY, DE, IT, PL, PT, UK) implemented measures to facilitate entry of highly qualified workers. Ten Member States (AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EL, IT, LT, PL, PT) transposed the EU Blue Card Directive. Other incentive mechanisms for attracting highly qualified workers included: the 5-point programme on skills recognition of third-country graduates with a view to facilitating labour market access (AT), shortened period for granting residence permit for the purpose of family reunification (EL), and agreements of Memorandums of Understanding between government and employer associations to facilitate the entry of highly qualified third-country workers (IT). Estonia organised consultations with social partners in order to improve legislation and smoothen procedures for attracting highly-qualified workers.

Attracting investors (HU, IE, LV, PL, PT, SE) and/or entrepreneurs (IE, FR, LV, PL, UK) is on the political agenda in several Member States. Measures to attract investors include granting a residence permit for those that make an exceptional economic contribution (FR, PT), fast-track procedures for granting a long-term residence permit (HU), accelerated procedures for intra-corporate transfers of third-country national investors (CZ), a third-country national investor programme offering entrepreneurs and investors rights to reside in the Member State in return for an investment for the purpose of “saving or creating jobs” (IE) and plans to determine conditions for the entry and residence of investors and entrepreneurs (LV). Specific measures for attracting entrepreneurs included targeted information provision to third-country national entrepreneurs (PL), a new immigration route for Graduate Entrepreneurs, who have been recognised by their higher education institutions (HEI) as having exceptional business skills or ideas (UK) and plans to allocate funding for targeted efforts for generating growth among entrepreneurs with a migration background in 2013 (SE).

With regard to actions planned in 2013, United Kingdom plans to extend the Graduate Entrepreneur route for 2013 to enable up to 1 000 MBA graduates of UK Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) to stay on in the UK and will also establish a scheme to enable the ‘brightest and best’ graduates of overseas business schools to enter as Graduate Entrepreneurs. Czech Republic aims to attract highly-education third-country nationals and therefore plans to produce a list of occupations for highly educated third-country employees.

### ***1.3.6 Students and researchers***

At national level, several Member States (AT, BG, DE, FR, IE, IT, LT, PL, PT, SE, SK, UK) undertook new measures to further facilitate the reception of students and researchers and their movement within the EU. Three Member States (PL, SK, SE) made legislative changes or implemented a national strategy to facilitate mobility of students (PT). Other measures implemented in 2012 include simplified and faster procedures to enable individuals to transfer from a student permit to a work permit (FR), scholarship programmes for students (AT, IT), entry quotas (IT), issuance of temporary residence permits to students and researchers (PL), simplified admission process for international students (SE), funding of high-qualified non-EEA students (UK) and facilitated access for third-country nationals by granting “International Student Status” (PT). Bulgaria has introduced provisions to prolong residence permits for the families of researchers from third countries, in line with that of the researcher. Moreover, Estonia organised consultations with social partners in order to improve legislation and smoothen procedures for students and researchers. Slovak Republic aims to facilitate access for students and researchers by the exemption of payment of an administrative fee for issuance of a Schengen visa and a shortened decision-making period for temporary residence permit.

Ireland announced a “student probationary extension” for those students who had been continuously resident since before 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005. The new arrangements will allow eligible students to continue to remain there for (up to) an additional two years. Greece reported that the presence of international students leads to economic advantages for educational institutions and the national economy.

With regard to researchers, two Member States (DE, UK) introduced measures, that included an accelerated visa procedure for this group (and their spouse) who have unrestricted access to the labour market (DE) and relaxation of the resident labour market test and exemptions for those in specified PhD level occupations from minimum salary requirements at the point of settlement (UK). Lithuania made legislative amendments in order to facilitate the entry and

residence conditions for both researchers and students. In Italy the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is financing bilateral scientific projects in order to increase the mobility of researchers from third countries. Lastly, Luxembourg increased the government budget on research, development and innovation and plans to implement a number of measures related to the recruitment, training, skills and careers prospects of researchers.

#### **I.4 Family Reunification**<sup>7</sup>

At national level, several Member States (BE, BG, IT, LT, NL, PT, SK, SE, UK) and Norway introduced changes to existing policies and legislation regulating family reunification. Five Member States (BE, LT, NL, SK, UK) made legislative amendments to set a renewed legal framework for family reunification (NL, UK), tackling marriages of convenience (BE) and measures to improve the transposition of Directive 2004/38/EC<sup>8</sup> (LT, SK). Bulgaria introduced measures to prolong residence permits for certain family members following termination of marriage and in the event of emergency circumstances. Non-legislative measures introduced in Norway included opening for more discretionary exceptions to the income requirements for certain groups. Portugal has introduced greater flexibility in its procedures for assessing proof of subsistence for the purpose of family reunification in light of the economic downturn.

Two Member States (LV, SE) introduced specific measures for the integration of third-country national family members. Latvia launched integration projects for vulnerable groups of third-country nationals such as women with small children, elderly people and the Swedish government proposed to invest over 4,6 million EUR in civic orientation to third-country nationals immigrating for the purpose of international protection and family reunification (see also Section 1.5 below).

In terms of future measures, Belgium plans to develop an Action Plan to tackle the issue of marriages of convenience and the United Kingdom will introduce in 2013 requirements for third-country national applicants for settlement to pass the “Life in the UK” test and present an English language qualification (at B1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). Finland will expand the requirements for levels of subsistence and accommodation. Ireland aims to examine all options for developing a comprehensive policy approach towards family reunification and settlement.

#### **I.5 Integration**<sup>9</sup>

##### ***1.5.1 Promoting integration through participation: socio-economic contribution of migrants***

At national level, the majority of Member States (AT, BE, DE, EE, EL, FI, FR, HU, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK) and Norway reported developments in relation to efforts to promote integration through enhancing the socio-economic contribution of migrants. This included legislative changes (PL, LV, NL, SE, NO) and the introduction of new policy documents (PL) or updates thereof (NL).

---

<sup>7</sup> The EMN Study ‘Misuse of the Right to Family Reunification’ (2012) provides more information on this topic and is available on the EMN website ([www.emn.europa.eu](http://www.emn.europa.eu))

<sup>8</sup> Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States

<sup>9</sup> Please also refer to the European Agenda for the Integration of third-Country nationals, COM(2011)455 final.

The importance of language training in relation to effective integration of third-country nationals, is evidenced by the high number of Member States and Norway reporting new or on-going provision to improve access to language training (AT, BE, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FR, HU, IT, LV, LT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK), using both national funding and funding from the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals (EIF), the European Refugee Fund (ERF) and the European Social Fund (ESF). Member States have aimed to increase accessibility by ensuring the wide availability of facilities for language training through decentralised access (IT, LV, PT, UK), including via language portals (LV) and community centres (UK). In Malta, training to teachers on the teaching of languages to third country nationals was organised by the Ministry of Education. In some Member States, the requirements for language proficiency from third-country nationals was increased; in Poland, for example, the draft Act on Foreigners of 18 October 2012, stipulates that applicants from third countries for a permanent residence permit will have to first prove competence in the Polish language, a measure to further facilitate their integration. In Estonia, language classes in preparation for citizenship tests are offered free of charge.

Several (Member) States have undertaken measures to improve access to social and health services for third-country nationals, and new developments were reported (IT, FR, LV and NO). In Latvia, a draft proposal for amendments to legislation for unemployed people and jobseekers will aim to establish greater equality for third-country nationals who legally reside and work in the Member State with nationals if they become unemployed or are looking for a job, ensuring access rights to state support measures; and in France, an inter-ministerial working group on access to social rights for migrants was established. In Italy, new measures were introduced to gauge uptake of social and health services, in particular, in light of the take up of such provision by migrants who entered as a consequence of the “North Africa Emergency”. In Norway, a White Paper on Integration has announced a national strategy to target the specific health challenges of the immigrant population, planned for 2013.

Other specific integration initiatives recently introduced include measures to enhance the attainment of migrant children in the education system (BE, PT), new support measures and civic integration schemes to improve understanding of the host culture (CZ, LU, MT, NL, SI, UK) and widening the timeframe within which arriving family members may access integration support (SE). In Sweden and Norway, changes in family benefits have been introduced which effectively lower the age of a child for whom benefits can be claimed to encourage the labour market integration of parents, and encourage enrolment of children in kindergarten, to facilitate the integration of immigrant children into the community and their acquisition of Norwegian.

Member States have also demonstrated how various measures can work together to promote effective socio-economic integration. In Germany, for example, the EIF annual programme was expanded and new aspects added to provide a ‘joined-up’ approach to measures for pre-integration, training, enhancing participation in society and promoting openness within society towards other cultures, as well as tools for monitoring and evaluation. Similar four-stage ‘integration pathways’ have been launched in Belgium (in Wallonia and Flanders) consisting of personalised assistance, language training, citizenship and social and professional orientation. Latvia and Portugal have established national centres to support migrants and to assist integration, facilitating access to a range of services in a single office.

In Greece, information and awareness-raising actions took place, aimed at eliminating negative stereotypes, and strengthening interaction between migrants and citizens, as well as showing migrants’ positive impact on Greek society.

For particularly vulnerable groups, in Estonia and Hungary, language courses have been targeted at the most vulnerable third country nationals, including those with disabilities (EE). Italy has adopted a National Strategy for the Inclusion of the Roma, Sinti and Caminanti communities, as a consequence of implementing COM(2011) 173 (final)<sup>10</sup>. In France, new initiatives were launched under the EIF to facilitate access to public services for older migrants. In Greece, a Guide has been developed for disabled persons of migrant origin which consists of a bilingual information guide setting out rights and available support.

In terms of future measures, Sweden will invest significantly over four years (2013-2016) to improve educational performance (including language skills) of both children and adult third-country nationals. Quality will be improved by making language courses more flexible and targeted towards individual needs. In Slovenia, a Regulation on assistance programmes for the integration of third-country nationals was adopted, with new provisions for Slovenian language and society training, which will enter into force on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2013. The United Kingdom plans to set pre-entry English language requirements for immigrants entering to work or study, or for family reasons. Those seeking to live permanently, or take up citizenship, must demonstrate pre-entry knowledge of English language and from October 2013, must pass the 'Life in the UK test' and obtain an English language qualification at B1 on the Common European Framework. These measures aim to ensure that applicants have the necessary knowledge and understanding to integrate with wider society from the outset.

### ***1.5.2 Promoting integration through participation: rights and obligations – achieving equal treatment and belonging***

At national level, (Member) States undertook specific measures to promote the integration of migrants through their active participation in the democratic process, with several specific examples of migrant involvement in the design and implementation of integration policies (BE, CZ, EE, FI, IE and NO). In Estonia, for example, National minorities took an active part in the elaboration of Ida-Virumaa County development plan, which emphasised integration and the situation of migrants. New measures include improving the participation of migrants in advisory boards at local level (BE) and consultative forums (FI, HU, IE, SK), to stimulate their involvement in policy-making at various levels, and one-day "welcome courses" for newly arrived immigrants, setting out their rights and responsibilities designed and delivered in the main by migrants, working also with an NGO (CZ). (Member) States have reported on their work with migrants' associations to improve migrants' participation (DE) specifically in the democratic process (PT, NO). In Germany, migrants' organisations act as dialogue partners, helping to shape social integration approaches, and receive support from the Federal Government; in Norway, national funding has been increased in order to widen participation.

In Italy, the national equality body against discrimination (UNAR) has proposed to the Government to grant third –country nationals the right to work in public administration bodies under the same conditions as EU citizens. Bulgaria and Estonia also reported on initiatives to support the development of equal treatment for migrants. In Estonia for example, this consisted of awareness raising with employers, a survey of perceptions on equal treatment, translation of relevant materials and training to national culture organisations with migrant backgrounds.

---

<sup>10</sup> COM(2011) 173 (final): the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020:

Specific actions were also undertaken to encourage migrant take up of voting rights. These consisted of awareness-raising campaigns to encourage migrants to register on the voters' lists and to exercise their right to vote on the occasion of recent elections (BE, FI, LU, PT, UK and NO). Infrastructural developments in this area include the designation of an Electoral Roll Supporting Office to support the electoral enrolment of migrants, in cooperation with local Parish Councils (PT), and improvements to information provision on the rights and responsibilities of migrants within the democratic process, in the form of new guidance documents (UK). In Italy, where under current legislation third-country nationals do not have the right to vote, even at the administrative level, a number of initiatives were encouraged at the local level to promote the representation of foreign citizens. Indeed, a proposal for a popular initiative law, "Policies on political and administrative participation and on the right to vote free from discriminations based on citizenship or nationality", has now been filed, which aims to extend the right to vote in administrative elections to migrants who have been legally living in Italy for at least 5 years.

### ***1.5.3 Promoting action at local level***

At national level, the critical importance of promoting action at the local level has been reflected in new initiatives in (Member) States with the active involvement of local authorities to address specific integration challenges and to improve multi-level cooperation between the different levels of governance (AT, EL, IT, MT, NL, PT, SE, SK, NO).

To promote action at local level among the various organisations, several (Member) States have reported on the development of new infrastructure: a cooperation platform was established by Netherlands to support the 'Common Integration Agenda' (GIA) which in 2012 focussed on enhancing local and national diversity policy through information exchange and harmonisation; in Portugal, new partnerships between local authorities and local support centres for the integration of migrants were established; and in Slovak Republic, there were new projects to promote social and cultural orientation bringing together representatives from local government, towns and municipalities and representatives of state and public administrations. In Sweden, performance-related funding to stimulate the work of municipalities in urban areas that face problems of extensive exclusion was introduced to improve employment rates, school results and a reduction of dependency on social welfare, and in Norway, new collaborative agreements on integration were established with two municipalities, which will eventually be rolled out to include 15 municipalities in Western Norway, and in Italy held a consultation process involving all relevant stakeholders working to improve integration at local level to identify strategic priorities in the planning framework for EU funding.

Member States have reported a range of local integration initiatives, operating both in rural areas (AT), as well as the residential areas of growing cities (FI). The focus of such initiatives has been varied, for example, supporting migrants during the transition between school, training and work (DE); providing extra-curricular activities for children and young people within localities where there are large numbers of third-country nationals, so to enable their integration with their EU peers (MT); and addressing equality (IE) and discrimination (SE) issues. Methods have included utilising the resources of municipal education and cultural institutions, for example, libraries, museums, cultural centres (LV); and arranging the hosting of migrant families by national families and establishing 'family pairs' (PT). Action at local level has also included awareness-raising initiatives (BG); a new newspaper disseminating practical information for the integration of third-country nationals (LV), a manual 'Living Together Joins/Merges Differences: integration in (fast-track) transition' (NL) and guides to

newly arrived immigrants to facilitate their integration by offering social networking and giving advice on practical issues (SE). Intercultural training of local government staff, police and civil servants working directly with migrants took place in Greece, as well as actions to provide technical support to Councils of Migrants Integration within the country's Municipalities, including training of stakeholders, the facilitation of networking and the exchange of best practices among the networks members.

#### ***1.5.4 Involvement of countries of origin***

At national level, Member States have worked with countries of origin of migrants to play a role in their integration before departure, during stay in the EU, and on return. Recognising that early integration measures can be effective in facilitating integration on arrival, a number of new measures were introduced (AT, BG, CZ, IT, LV, NO).

New pre-departure measures include language training (AT); the provision of information on entry and residence conditions via diplomatic and consular representations abroad as well as on the home pages of relevant national Ministries (AT, LV); plus specific packages of support for labour migrants (IT). In Austria, a learning platform has been launched in five languages offering pre-departure German courses at all levels, as well as literacy courses to assist migrants to meet the requirements of the Austrian Settlement and Residence Act which requires third-country nationals to demonstrate German language skills to level A1 of the Common European Framework when applying for certain residence titles. Special projects have been established by Italy in those countries where bilateral agreements have been signed and in Hungary, a new project was launched that aims to create an Information Point in Subotica, Serbia, in order to support the pre-accession integration programs and provide trainings for third-country nationals from the Western Balkan states.

Initiatives directly involving third countries aimed at improving integration of third country nationals during stay include pre-departure linguistic and civic education training to family members of resident workers from third countries (IT) and supported actions to facilitate the role of third country community organisations in the provision of services to migrants (PL), for example, language courses, career counselling, assistance in finding accommodation.

For migrants from third countries aiming to return to their country of origin, a number of new initiatives and collaborations with third countries were reported to facilitate this (see Section II, Priority VI for details of voluntary return programmes).

#### ***1.5.5 Cooperation, consultation and coordination of stakeholders***

At national level, several Member States (AT, BE, EE, HU, IE, NL, SK) reported on the activities of national mechanisms set up to improve the cooperation, consultation and coordination of stakeholders. In Austria, for example, the Integration Advisory Committee met twice in 2012, to facilitate exchanges of information between the Federal Government, the Federal States, the Association of Towns and Municipalities, the social partners, the Federation of Austrian Industries, and relevant NGOs. Specifically, the Integration Advisory Committee has been involved in developing innovative measures such as the “Red-White-Red Primer” to facilitate the socio-political integration of migrants. In Belgium, the Interdepartmental Commission on Integration Policy prepared an “Integrated Action Plan” coordinating inputs from across a wide stakeholder group, which was approved by government in 2012. In Ireland, the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (OPMI) coordinated activities amongst officials from statutory bodies, embassy officials,

representatives of NGO and civil society groups, researchers, as well as visiting experts and academics from different countries on integration issues. The Central Government in Netherlands organized a series of expert meetings and round-table discussions with stakeholders to explore problems, and identify problem-solving approaches in specific issues and in Hungary, the Budapest Migration Round-table was established as a network of stakeholders to empower relevant NGOs and create more inclusive approaches for migrant inhabitants of Budapest. In Estonia, a trilingual website platform focussing on the national integration strategy was launched, providing information to all stakeholders, as well as the general public.

In relation to European level mechanisms, several Member States reported on their activities in the framework of the European Integration Forum and actions by the National Contact Points on Integration. These included contributions to the European website for integration (AT, BE, EE, LV), and attending meetings of the Integration Forum on Integration (BE, CZ, EE, EL, IE, IT, LV, NL, PL, SE, SK).

Other measures included: an Expert Conference on immigrant integration within the framework of the EU Presidency (CY); engagement in other relevant EU and international activities, such as the network of experts established by the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (LV) and the UNHCR Project Integration Evaluation Tool in Central Europe promoting the integration of third country nationals under international protection (SK), and the publication of a new integration monitoring study 'Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe' (NL).

## **I.6 Managing Migration and Mobility**

### **I.6.1 Key Statistics**

Table 3 in the Statistical Annex gives a provisional overview of the number of visas issued, by type. The three Member States issuing the highest number of visas in total are United Kingdom (1 806 215), France (1 771 290) and Germany (1 523 743). As France and Germany issue mostly Schengen visas (over 90%), they rank also as the Member States issuing most Schengen visas. In comparison, Poland issued a large number and share of national visas (245 178, representing some 22%).

**Comentário [MJ2]:** Once Italy confirms data (early March) this is likely to be >1.8m

### **I.6.2 Visa Policy**

At national level, Member States reported a range of updates in relation to the implementation of the Visa Code (BG, CZ, DE, IE, IT, LV, LT, PL, PT, SK, and SE). In Lithuania, an amendment to the Law on the Legal Status of Aliens, was passed which harmonises the provisions of this Law with the Visa Code<sup>11</sup>. In Bulgaria, the implementation of a visa-free regime for holders of a valid Schengen visa, valid long-stay visas and residence permits issued by Member States which fully apply the Schengen acquis, plus Switzerland and Liechtenstein came into force.

Member States have reported positively on their experiences of rolling out the Visa Information System (VIS) in North Africa following its launch in 2011, and in 2012, in the Middle East (BG, EL, HU, LU, NL, NO). Whilst successfully implemented, Finland has reported that only approximately 1% of visa applications in Finnish Missions are issued with

<sup>11</sup> Regulation No 810/2009 established the Community Code on Visas.

VIS, due to the very high numbers of visa applications from the Russian Federation. In Italy, as a consequence of the national “spending review” a restructuring of the Italian consular network is being implemented, which has resulted in the closure of several consulates. However, a new online platform for managing visa requests was also implemented during the period. Latvia applies the VIS in all regions where national missions are available.

In relation to the processing of biometric data, several Member States (BG, DE, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV and PT) reported recent developments. Germany, for example, aims to further expand the collection of biometric data in its visa procedure, and has carried out verification of visa holders' fingerprints as part of the standard check at some border crossing points since the end of 2011. In Latvia, work has been undertaken to improve the functionality of the national VIS (NVIS), including the improvement of the operation of the NVIS integrated biometrics equipment and in Lithuania, the legal amendments referred to above stipulate that biometric data are to be routinely obtained from third country nationals when national visas are issued. In Portugal, equipment for checking fingerprints (instruments and software) has been installed in Lisbon Airport and will be extended to all border posts. Ireland continued to operate biometric data collection (‘e-Visa’) as part of the visa application process in Nigeria, and has indicated its intention to expand this collection system to include other countries, notably Pakistan.

A number of Member States (BG, CZ, IE, HU, IT, LU, LV, PL, PT, SK, and SE) reported new cooperation initiatives. Bulgaria has developed further dialogue on migration and mobility with Turkey and the Western Balkans, to enhance economic, cultural, commercial and academic relations between the two countries. In this connection, the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria approved Decision № 76 and the Decision № 48 of 27 January 2012, which granted visa-free access for certain categories of Turkish citizens plus holders of diplomatic and official passports.

Ireland introduced new measures to enable the cross-checking of visa application data with the immigration fingerprint database in the UK. With regard to consular activities, new cooperation arrangements have been established: Czech Republic is now representing Slovak Republic in the Philippines, Ghana, Mongolia, Pakistan and Algeria, and a reciprocal arrangement is in place in Kenya. Czech Republic is now represented by Belgium in Burundi, Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Lithuania increased its diplomatic representation in 17 third countries and signed agreements to represent another Member State in a third country with six EU Member States. Hungary signed visa representation agreements with Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Slovenia, Austria, Austria, Latvia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Netherlands, Belgium, plus a number of non-EU Member States. Poland has signed visa representation agreements with Estonia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden and Netherlands and has initiated talks on representation with other Schengen Area countries which remain on-going. Italy has a new agreement on the reciprocal representation for the issuing of Schengen visas (with Estonia in Kosovo<sup>12</sup>) and other pre-existing cooperation frameworks. Amendments to the visa representation agreement between Latvia and Sweden have introduced new measures: in addition to the previous representation in Tbilisi (Georgia), Latvia will now also represent Sweden in Astana (Kazakhstan) and Sweden will represent Latvia in Dhaka (Bangladesh) and Lusaka (Zambia). A new initiative between Portugal and

---

<sup>12</sup> This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence. All subsequent mentions of Kosovo are also understood to be within the context of this statement.

Sweden will now allow Portugal to represent Sweden in the CCV (Common Visa Centre) of Cape Verde. Portugal has also begun to represent Greece in Kenya and Australia, and was, in turn, represented by Spain in Tel Aviv (Israel) for a period of three months.

Greece, Hungary, Lithuania and Poland have reported that they are now working with outsourcing organisations in some third countries. Greece, for example, has established visa centres in collaboration with external providers in Russia, China, India, Kazakhstan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Turkey, and new centres to be established in other geographical areas are in progress, whereas in Lithuania, these were in Russian Federation and Ukraine, in Hungary, India, and in Poland, Kaliningrad Oblast, Russian Federation and Ukraine.

### *1.6.3 Schengen Governance*

At national level, (Member) States reported a range of recent developments. Latvia developed a list of documents necessary for the receipt of Schengen Visas within the framework of local Schengen cooperation in accordance with Article 48 of the Visa Code, aimed at reducing irregular visa applications and facilitating the processing of regular applications in the Schengen area. Norway reported recent developments in its national administrative and operational structure and procedures, in particular, progress in developing a National Coordination Centre (NCC), to assist in preparations for the implementation of EUROSUR from 2013.

Italy and Slovenia undertook actions to review and appraise aspects of Schengen governance. Slovenia began an evaluation of the Schengen system, focussing initially on air and sea borders and an evaluation of performance at the external land border is planned for 2013.

In Poland, a temporary suspension of the internal Schengen border took place at the time of the organisation of the European football championship finals (EURO 2012) by Poland and Ukraine, which involved the temporarily reinstatement of border controls in June 2012 at the sections of the border with Germany, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic and Lithuania. A further development in the field of Schengen governance in Poland was the preparation of an Agreement between the Governments of Poland and Russian Federation on the rules of local border traffic, which entered into force on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

## II. IRREGULAR MIGRATION

This Section reports activities in the Member States that have contributed to combating irregular migration, both in relation to changes in labour market policy and the six Strategic Priority Areas outlined in the Strategic Response to EU Action on Migratory Pressures<sup>13</sup>.

### II.1 Actions to apply measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals

At national level, a number of Member states reported changes in their legislation, policies and practices to implement measures against employers of illegally staying third country nationals in the framework of the transposition of Directive 2009/52/EC<sup>14</sup>.

In Italy, Decree n. 109/2012 introduced more severe sanctions against employers giving work to foreign citizens who do not hold regular permits to stay, and in Poland, the Act (Dz. U. of 2012, item 769) on the effects of employing illegally staying migrants introduced new tasks for both labour inspectors (i.e. controls on employer obligations and prosecution for infringements) and the Chief Labour Inspectorate (reporting obligations). To support this process, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy developed information material (including leaflets and brochures) for employers, which was directly related to the entry into force of the new Act.

### II.2 Strategic Priorities

#### Priority I: Strengthening cooperation with third countries of transit and origin on migration management

##### *I.2. Ensure implementation of all EU readmission agreements to their full effect*

In 2012, several Member States (BE, BG, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FI, FR, HU, LT, LU, LV, NL, AT, PL, PT, SI, NO) implemented protocols in order to support the implementation of EU readmission agreements with third countries. During 2012, the implementing protocol to the EU readmission agreement signed between Austria and Bosnia-Herzegovina entered into force, Hungary, Latvia and Belgium concluded readmission agreements with Bosnia-Herzegovina, and France and Lithuania plan to sign a protocol project with Bosnia-Herzegovina. Proposals to Pakistan were also made by Austria, Belgium and Greece, and a bilateral readmission agreement between Nigeria and Austria became effective. Bulgaria signed implementing protocols on readmission agreements between the EU and Russian Federation, Georgia and Albania, and announced plans for implementing protocols between the EU and Cape Verde, Pakistan and FYROM. Bulgaria also seeks to conclude a readmission agreement with Turkey, in response to migratory pressures arising from the political situation in some countries of the Middle East and North Africa.

Serbia concluded its readmission agreement with Latvia, Poland and Norway and carried out negotiations on the implementing protocol with Belgium and Portugal. Member States worked on negotiations with Kosovo (EE), Moldova (BE, PT), Georgia (BE, EE, LT, PT), Macedonia (LT), Thailand (LT), Egypt (LT), Ukraine (BE, PL) and Cape Verde (BE).

**Comentário [MJ3]:** This subsection is based on material submitted under Section 1 (Legal Migration). EMN NCPs are invited to add additional information into this section where relevant

<sup>13</sup> 8714/1/12 REV 1 <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st08/st08714-re01.en12.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> Directive 2009/52/EC provides for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals

Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg operate within the framework of the Benelux when negotiating readmission agreements. This year, the Benelux countries focused on the implementation of protocols linked to the readmission agreements with the Western Balkan countries.

Several Member States concluded implementing protocols with Montenegro (BE, CZ, DE, NO) and Russian Federation (BE, CZ, LT, SE, SI) while some others undertook technical negotiations with Russian Federation (LV, FI, PT). Implementing protocols were concluded with several Member States and Macedonia (BE, CZ, NO), and Germany initiated a bilateral exchange of notes on EU readmission agreement also with Macedonia. Moreover, Albania concluded its implementing protocol with Belgium.

In the field of cooperation with third countries, Finland focused on improving the efficiency of police operations related to the enforcement of removal decisions and Norway on provisions for assisted voluntary return and for forced return of Ethiopian citizens. Ireland began the process of opting into some 11 EU readmission agreements during 2012, with: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Macao, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Serbia and Sri Lanka. Poland was a representative of Division II in Joint Readmission Committees (Georgia and Pakistan) and participated in a meeting with representatives of the Federal Migration Service of the Russian Federation. Slovak Republic hosted several meetings of border attorneys within the framework of different bilateral readmission agreements. Italy re-launched its bilateral cooperation with Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Tunisia which was interrupted during the political crisis in the Southern Mediterranean.

### ***1.3. Enhance the capacity of countries of origin and transit to manage mixed migration flows***

At Member State level, Italy initiated bilateral dialogue with representatives of the Tunisian and Libyan governments to discuss how to strengthen the level of cooperation achieved on immigration issues, both in relation to mixed (regular and irregular) migration flows.

Member States also implemented actions to support asylum and migration systems in a wide range of countries of first asylum: Turkey (AT, UK, NO), Burundi (BE), Nigeria (IE), Kenya (UK), Libya (IT), Tunisia (IT), Ghana (NL), Moldova (NL, SK), Bosnia (NL), Azerbaijan (NL) and East Timor (PT). The support comprised financial assistance, training/capacity-building and information exchange. In response to the outflows of refugees from Syria to neighbouring countries in 2012, Austria donated €2.93 million to Turkey to support refugee camps at the Turkish-Syrian border and United Kingdom and Norway jointly funded the IOM to implement an Assisted Voluntary Return project in Turkey. Hungary participates in a twinning project with Kosovo to manage return and reintegration.

Several Member States (BE, IE, IT, NL, PT and SK) provided experts to train asylum and migration authorities in third-countries. Training was provided to protection officers and asylum judges in Burundi (BE) and migration authority staff in a range of countries (IE, IT, NL, PT, SK), including Nigeria (IE) and East-Timor (PT). Others implemented actions within the framework of EU level cooperation, such as TAIEX (Technical Assistance and Information Exchange) and MIEUX (Migration EU Expertise) (NL, PT).

***14-7 Prevention of irregular migration from (a) the Southern Mediterranean countries; (b) the Eastern Partners; (c) the Western Balkans; and (d) the Western Mediterranean and the African Atlantic coast***

### *(a) The Southern Mediterranean countries*

Portugal and United Kingdom undertook significant activities aimed at preventing irregular migration flows focusing on the Southern Mediterranean countries. Portugal provided training to MEDA<sup>15</sup> partners (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestinian Authorities and Tunisia), as well on border control themes, including irregular migration, document security and biometrics (Libya and Syria). United Kingdom supported Greece by funding an AVR programme for irregular migrants implemented by IOM. In October, United Kingdom further agreed to fund the provision of an intelligence-gathering tool at the Greece Turkey land border and to provide assistance to Greece in screening potential asylum seekers and identifying victims of trafficking.

Italy's strategy in North Africa was twofold: (i) to train migration authorities (in Algeria) to improve their capacity to manage mixed migration flows; and (ii) to inform potential migrants (in Egypt) about legal migration routes and on the risks and living conditions of unaccompanied minors during migration. In addition, Czech Republic and Finland amongst others reported on their deployment of national experts to participate in European joint actions at the Mediterranean borders. Malta has stepped up its patrol regime, and undertaken actions to improve cooperation between the Armed Forces of Malta and the Maltese Police.

### *(b) The Eastern Partners*

Several Member States (BE, EE, FR, FI, HU, IT, PL, PT, SK) implemented targeted actions on prevention of irregular migration from the Eastern Partnership countries. Belgium and Italy focused on informing third-country nationals from these countries of the dangers of migrating through smugglers/fraudulent networks. Slovak Republic and Moldovan authorities planned joint actions to combat organised crime connected with smuggling and irregular migration. Hungary, Portugal and Finland specifically mentioned that they make use of Immigration Liaison Officers (ILOs) in Moldova (HU), Belorussia and Ukraine (FI) and Russia and Ukraine (PT) for preventing irregular migration. Estonia concluded bilateral agreements with Border Guard Authorities of the Eastern Partners Russian Federation, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Belarus, particularly in relation to sharing of information and intelligence to combat irregular migration and cross-border crime. France focused on combating irregular immigration networks through training missions in Bulgaria, Albania and Belorussia; combating document fraud, in particular in Romania and in Azerbaijan; promoting the European project SCIBM (South Caucasus Integrated Border Management) with missions organised in Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan.

### *(c) The Western Balkans*

Six Member States (AT, BE, CZ, HU, IT, SI, SK), three of which (AT, CZ, IT) are situated close to the Western Balkans, took measures to prevent irregular migration from the region. Following an increased in the trafficking of stolen vehicles from Czech Republic through the Hungarian-Serbian land border, Czech Republic – in response to a Frontex request - deployed two experts for stolen vehicles at the Slovenian-Croatian border. As part of a defined “5-point package of measures”, Hungary and Austria, with Serbia, set up joint investigation teams that detained more than 500 irregular migrants and some 21 smugglers between January and March 2012. Slovak Republic cooperates with Austria, Czech Republic and Hungary, in the field of irregular migration via the ‘Balkan’ route, through a number of projects and meetings.

---

<sup>15</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2009/1264\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2009/1264_docs_en.htm)

In the framework of the Salzburg Forum (SF), Ministers of the SF countries (AT, BG, CZ, Croatia, HU, PL, RO, SI, SK), the Western Balkan countries and Moldova agreed to set up a regional contact list of all relevant authorities, in order to improve practical cooperation and exchange of information to prevent and combat illegal immigration. Austria also hosted inter-ministerial meetings on human smuggling and irregular migration, one in the context of the security partnership “Forum Salzburg”<sup>16</sup> to agree upon the strategic operational framework for July 2012 to December 2013, and two with Hungary and Serbia to draw conclusions on the measures implemented under the “5-point package of measures” as defined in 2011..

Italy trained Albanian migration authorities with a view to preventing irregular migration flows (see above) and have used visa liberalization strategically to encourage legal as opposed to irregular migration. Belgium implemented awareness-raising campaigns in Armenia with regard to the risks and consequences of irregular immigration. Slovenia is actively involved in Western Balkan Risk Analysis Network under the auspices of Frontex.

#### *(d) The Western Mediterranean and the African Atlantic coast*

Member States used multiple tools to prevent irregular migration from this region including information campaigns (BE, FR, IT), capacity-building (IT, PT), technical support and installation of equipment (PT) and readmission agreements (AT).

Belgium launched information campaigns in Guinea and Morocco with a focus on return in the former and on reintegration support for sub-Saharan migrants who returned voluntarily in the latter, and in Cameroon, with a focus on tackling inflows of bogus asylum seekers and abuse of the student route into Europe. France provided training sessions focusing on irregular migration networks and document fraud to the countries of the Western Mediterranean: countries of the African Atlantic Coast were offered repeated training sessions in document fraud (a project aimed at bolstering civil aviation security in Africa (ASACA)) and in combating illegal immigration at the airports. Portugal set up technical equipment for improving border-control (e.g. pre-boarding screening, training on fraud and security) in Bissau and in S. Tome and Príncipe Airports. Within the framework of MIEUX, PT implemented capacity-building missions in the Ivory Coast. PT also made use of ILOs deployed in Angola, Senegal, Cape-Verde and Guinea-Bissau in 2012. In Austria, a readmission agreement with Nigeria entered into force and another readmission agreement was negotiated with Gambia; both concerned information exchange, technical cooperation, establishing identity, and the terms and conditions of return.

### **Priority II: Enhanced border management at the external borders**

#### ***II.2 Preventing and combating irregular immigration by ensuring strong and efficient border control***

##### ***Agreements with third countries***

In order to prevent and combat irregular migration, various agreements between Member State border guards and those of third-countries were signed. For example, Belgium and Slovak Republic adopted / developed Action Plans with Serbia and Ukraine respectively.

---

<sup>16</sup> The „Forum Salzburg“ is a Central European security partnership aiming at coordinating collaboration within the EU, intensifying regional cooperation and at enhancing cooperation with the Western Balkan countries. Member states include Austria, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Slovenia, Slovakia and Croatia.

Specifically, border guard cooperation agreements were planned between Portugal and Moldova, and Portugal and Russian Federation; signed between Latvia and Belarus, Armenia, Tadjikistan, the Ukraine, and Uzbekistan; and entered into force between Lithuania and the Russian Federation on the activities of State Border Representatives. Norway's agreement on local border traffic with the Russian Federation entered into force. Portugal also signed agreements with Cape-Verde and Brazil, and made plans to sign agreements with Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Sao Tome and Principe, aimed at providing technical support to improve the efficiency of border-control systems in the third-countries involved. Italy has signed specific agreements on police cooperation with approximately forty countries, mainly from the African continent.

In Estonia, bilateral Cooperation Agreements were signed with six third countries, Russian Federation, Georgia, Belarus, Moldova, Azerbaijan and Ukraine, plus one trilateral Cooperation Protocol amongst the border guard institutions of Estonia, Finland and Russian federation. All the agreements regulate operational information exchange on both irregular migration and cross-border crime, and create a basis for good practice visits and the exchange of experts. Hungary also concluded a bilateral Cooperation Agreement with Ukraine on border control, which has entered into force in July 2012; a further such agreement with Serbia on border control, will enter into force in January 2013.

Austria hosted the 10th Central Asia Border Security Initiative (CABSI) Conference, which focused on strengthened cooperation in border management measures in Central Asian States. Participants included Ministers of the Interior from the EU, Central Asia, and Afghanistan as well as international partners, such as USA and Russian Federation. Chief border attorneys in Slovak Republic held meetings with equivalents in Ukraine, in order to continue cooperation and coordination of joint efforts in ensuring security at the Slovak-Ukrainian state borders. Italy also held meetings with officials from Tunisia and with Libya (as mentioned above) to talk about a range of migration issues including border control. In Netherlands, the migration authorities (IND) and ILOs provided training courses in third countries as part of the EU MIEUX framework in Ghana, Moldova, Bosnia, Azerbaijan, and Romania.

Future activities include the development of a trilateral Agreement on establishing a contact centre for police and customs cooperation between Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey, and for joint border controls on the Bulgarian-Turkish border that will update a pre-existing agreement between Bulgaria and Turkey, signed in 1967.

### ***Border control developments including Frontex operations***

#### ***a) New Border control developments***

Several Member States (BE, EL, IT, LV, MT, SI, FI) purchased or installed new technological equipment for border controls in 2012.

Belgium, Latvia Finland and Malta installed new equipment in the framework of implementing the Visa Information System (VIS), for example, fingerprints readers. Border guards in Lithuania and Slovak Republic developed surveillance equipment: Lithuania purchased 16 sets of portable sensors to be deployed at green borders and updated integrated sea border surveillance system; Slovak Republic modernised its surveillance equipment at the border with Ukraine. Greece invested significantly in new equipment for use in passport control. Surveillance and communications. Bulgaria and Netherlands initiated the implementation of the European External Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR), as did

Norway, and Slovak Republic continued its testing of the operation of the system. Bulgaria commissioned a National Communications System and invested in new equipment, notably mobile detection systems at the sea border. Hungary procured 80 desktop and 64 mobile document and fingerprint readers, plus three specially equipped mobile controlling vehicles to support border control. The installation of eight mast-mounted thermal camera systems was carried out, with EUROSUR. While United Kingdom will not implement EUROSUR, since it is not part of the Schengen Area, it will be able to enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements with neighbouring Member States for the purposes of exchange of information and cooperation through the relevant EUROSUR designated National Co-ordination Centres in each Member State. Sweden carried out an ex-ante evaluation of the consequences of joining EUROSUR to guide the government's decision-making. Latvia established a National Coordination Centre responsible for implementing EUROSUR in the Member State. Estonia's border surveillance system is under constant development taking into account the situational picture, new technologies and resources available. Since 2010 the border sections at greatest risk have been strengthened by 23 new mobile surveillance complexes. This will continue in 2013, with additional strengthening of the Estonian-Russian border through the acquisition of additional mobile complexes (representing an investment of some 400 000 euros).

Hungary further developed its professional systems supporting the implementation of SIS II and data transfer routes were established at 16 border crossing points to support the implementation of both SIS and VIS. Germany completed data migrations regarding "wanted persons" and "stolen property" categories in SIS II. In France, protocols were introduced to ensure border police customs officials' compliance with Schengen. Netherlands continued to develop processes to make the EU VIS information available for criminal investigation purposes. Malta has installed both hardware and software in preparation for the implementation of SIS II, which will 'go live' in 2013.

Following the launch of the operations centre of land borders in Greece in 2011, this was strengthened in 2012 and serves as the international coordination centre of the Joint Operation POSEIDON. Further local operational centres were established in 2012.

#### ***b. Coordination of different types of border checks***

Poland and United Kingdom hosted major sporting events which attracted large numbers of EU and non-EU visitors to the country and through the borders. Both Member States appointed specific teams to coordinate the management of the borders (e.g. to plan and organise the border controls). Poland established "EURO lanes", "green corridors" and "green borders" for persons having "nothing to declare", and seconded guard officers from training centres to border posts to increase staffing levels. In Italy and Latvia (as mentioned above) National Coordination Centres were opened; in Italy the Centre will coordinate border police activities involved in fighting irregular migration and managing information on irregular migration activities by sea.

Several Member States (AT, BG, CZ, DE, EE, FI, HU, LV, NL, PT) and Norway either updated, implemented or made plans to develop automated border control (ABC) for EU / EEA / Swiss nationals. In Netherlands, passengers were surveyed on their experience of the self-service passport control gates and nearly 90% claim they will use the gates again in the future. Norway developed the national infrastructure to allow for ABC gates to be implemented at some external borders. In Latvia, the possible introduction of ABC gates is under discussion with support from Frontex Task Forces. Estonia and Hungary both plan to introduce ABC gates at their airports in 2013.

United Kingdom announced a new Registered Traveller Scheme for individuals entering four or more times per year. The main benefit of the scheme will be expedited border clearance. Initially, the scheme will be limited to visitors from USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. Slovenia is planning the introduction of “one-stop border checks” at the common border with Croatia.

***c) Control of the external land, sea and air borders,***

Member States undertook a variety of activities to improve the effectiveness of controls at external borders, including reviewing and evaluating current performance, strengthening resourcing, training staff, and introducing national action plans.

In order to improve its border control performance, Austria initiated some activities including the development of a national plan for Integrated Border Management (IBM), revision of the national legal framework for border control, and commissioning evaluations of staffing and technical equipment and on the optimisation of risk assessment. In Finland the Border Guard Department of the Ministry of the Interior assessed the effects of growing border traffic and recommended the up-skilling of human resources as well as the introduction of a new checking process and equipment (such as mobile devices). Italy increased its resources at the border in 2012 and United Kingdom launched the ‘UK Border Force’ (UKBF), under the operational command of its Home Office. Border Guard personnel from Belgium participated in staff exchanges / knowledge transfer with third countries: ILO missions were sent to Bangkok and Rwanda and Bulgaria, Ukraine and Norway sent "second line inspectors" to work at Brussels airport.

A number of Member States (AT, BE, BG, CZ, IE, HU, LT, LV, MT, PL, PT, SI, SK) reported on specific professional and language training given to border personnel in 2012, including training given by Frontex (BE, BG, IE, SK). In Ireland, a pilot project to “civilianise” certain part of entry functions at Dublin Airport continued in 2012, with training provided. Previously, all such functions were undertaken by Immigration Officers as members of An Garda Síochána (Irish Police). As of year-end, proposals were being finalised to extend this new model of border control to all of Dublin Airport and possibly to other ports of entry.

Amongst other training events during the year, Latvia’s State Border Guard also participated in the international training “TRIANGLE”, enhancing information exchange among border protection institutions of Sweden, Finland, Estonia, and Latvia (at a regional level) to combat irregular migration and other cross-border crimes, and the sea operation “Operation Baltic Tracking”. The United Kingdom Embassy in Athens will host a joint Turkey/Greece border police forgery training programme given by RALON Athens and MDO Ankara in Athens in January 2013.

***d) Support with regard to border control and (e) Strengthening of security and preventing irregular migration at the external borders***

In relation to support for border controls, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy and Latvia reported that they had received support from Frontex (and other (Member) States) at their borders in 2012. Frontex Focal Points are permanent platforms for professional assistance, experience exchange and training at the spot.<sup>17</sup> Cyprus and Czech Republic received support from Frontex Focal Points at the Air Border, Bulgaria at the land border and

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.frontex.europa.eu/operations/archive-of-accomplished-operations/41>

Greece at the air and land borders. Italy benefited from joint maritime patrols (HERMES) to control irregular immigration from Tunisia and Libya. Joint operations in Greece in 2012 included the launching of POSEIDON land and marine operations in specific areas of Greece, notably involving the deployment of officers and equipment from across the Member States.

In addition almost all Member States (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, EE, EL, FR, HU, IT, LT, MT, NL, PT, SE, SI, SK, FI, UK) and Norway participated in Frontex operations during the year. Estonia for example, has contributed a number of experts on screening, border surveillance and surveillance equipment, as well as first and second line officers and advanced level document officers. Latvia provided support at the land border with Serbia and Hungary. To strengthen security, Czech Republic now fully operates an automated Advanced Passenger Information (API) system "OBZOR". Additional airlines agreed to participate in Austria's pilot API scheme. In Ireland, a trial API system was established. In Netherlands, a legislative bill which would extend the number of API data sets to be collected was drafted (this is expected to enter into force in January 2013). API systems are also under development in Slovenia and Sweden. In Finland, a pilot project on automated exit checks for third-country nationals was launched and piloted on Japanese citizens with biometric passports. Bulgaria established a working group to prepare a national interface providing advanced passenger information (API) from air carriers.

### **Priority III: Preventing irregular migration via the Greek-Turkish Border**

#### ***III.1 Ensuring effective border controls are in place at the Greek-Turkish border***

In relation to specific actions to prevent irregular migration via the Greek-Turkish border, most Member States (AT, BE, BG, CZ, EE, EL, FI, FR, HU, IT, MT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK) and Norway participated in Frontex operations Attica and/or Poseidon in 2012. The type of assistance provided varied from secondment of personnel, for example, civil servants (AT, NL), technical experts (BE, BG, FR, UK), screening experts (SE, SI), police officers and/or border guards (CZ, FI, HU, IT, NL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK, NO); vehicles (AT, EE, HU, PT, SI, SK); and technical equipment, such as thermal imaging cameras (BG, HU, PT, SI).

An artificial barrier (fence) some 12km in length has been constructed at the border between Greece and Turkey, which is now nearing completion and will be operationalized in 2013. The aim of the barrier is to contribute to the fight against irregular migration.

#### ***III.2 Combating irregular immigration transiting Turkey to EU***

Greece intensified its cooperation with the Turkish competent authorities at the border at Evros, and Greek police are planning to organise training for Turkish police officers on nationality identification to improve identification and facilitate the return process. Bulgaria is also planning further collaboration between its own police and customs officials and those in Turkey and also Greece.

Within the framework of the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange Office (TAIEX), Poland organised study visits to Poland for Turkish Coast Guard and Police. Similarly, Slovenia hosted a study visit for representatives from the Turkish Ministry of Interior on mixed, joint, and synchronised patrols at land borders. Lithuania sent an expert to participate in the "Focal points" operations in Turkey, checking the documents of the persons crossing the border in the first line of control.

United Kingdom provided training on professional standards for staff at the removals centre in Edirne (on the Greek border) and on forged document training project to border gate officers in Turkey, which will continue into 2013. The aim of the latter project is to reduce chances of irregular migrants using forged documents to arrive and leave from Turkey. United Kingdom also provided translator guidance for Turkish National Police Officers dealing with alleged Burmese nationals in order to help them identify true nationalities. United Kingdom and Norway also co-finance an IOM project to support voluntary return (see Section I.3 above) - from April to the end of 2012 it delivered 450 voluntary departures.

#### **Priority IV: Better tackling of abuse of legal migration channels**

##### ***IV.1 Prevent an increase in unfounded asylum applications as a direct consequence of introducing visa free regimes in third countries and decrease the number of over-stayers in the Schengen area***

Several Member States (BE, SE, SI, UK) monitor the effects of visa free regimes – in Belgium and Slovenia this is focussed specifically on data (e.g. first and multiple asylum requests) of Balkan country nationals. In 2012, Hungary introduced thorough border checks on citizens from visa free countries.

Sweden reported increases in the influx of asylum applicants from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia. In United Kingdom entry from Albania also rose sharply in 2012 compared to 2011, and may be due, in part to Schengen liberalisation (though there is no direct evidence at present), with greater mobility opportunities, making it easier for migrants to reach northern France and attempt clandestine entry, although the rising figures may also be attributed in part, to a rise in immigration enforcement activity in United Kingdom which has resulted in increased numbers of arrests by immigration offences. In response to this rise in influx, the UK Border Force has continued to work closely with French and Belgian partners, to detect individuals seeking to evade border checks in ports in Belgium and juxtaposed ports in Northern France.

##### ***IV.2 Combating and preventing irregular migration caused by visa liberalisation***

In order to ensure the swift return of persons from visa-free third countries abusing legal migration channels, Belgium added the Balkans to the list of “safe countries of origin” unlikely to produce refugees and opened up new bus routes between Brussels and Balkan countries to accelerate returns to the region. Hungary’s readmission agreements have been effective in implementing the readmission of people from visa-free third countries. In Netherlands, since 2004, the programme ‘Return and Reintegration Regulation’ has offered financial contribution to support permanent return and reintegration. To limit the numbers of migrants entering solely to benefit from this regulation, all persons who do not require a visa to enter the Netherlands are now no longer eligible for financial contributions or assistance in kind upon return. A further measure was taken in 2012 to also exclude citizens of the Russian Federation making a claim under the Dublin Regulation from the regulation. Similar measures were applied in 2010 and 2011 to exclude citizens from Belarus, Georgia and Macedonians.

United Kingdom and Norway made use of accelerated procedures to process asylum applications of nationals from certain countries considered “safe countries of origin” unlikely to produce refugees. In 2012, Belgium organised information campaigns in cooperation with the authorities of countries of origin in order to dissuade people from making unfounded asylum claims in the Member State. Sweden reported that the introduction and use of re-entry

bans following implementation of the EU Return Directive, has resulted in many applicants deciding to withdraw their applications and return home voluntarily.

### **Priority V: Safeguarding and protecting free movement by prevention of abuse by third-country nationals**

#### ***V.1 Improve the understanding of abuse of free movement rights by third country nationals and organised crime aiming at facilitating irregular immigration***

At national level, the majority of Member States (AT, BE, **BG**, CY, CZ, **FI**, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV, PL, PT, SK, UK) implemented activities to gather, analyse and share information on fraud and misuse of free movement. Some specific issues of concern reported were in relation to family reunification (BE, NL, PT); irregular migration (CZ, IT, LV, NL), organised crime (LV), and the establishment or purchase of fictitious enterprises to gain entry (LT). **Three** Member States (DE, NL, UK) oversee the facilitation and implementation of Strategic Priority V, and in 2012 developed a ‘concept plan’ which sets out how the Member States will take forward the actions set out under the strategic priority, including information exchange.

Some Member states have introduced new approaches to improve their monitoring tools. In Poland, for example, ‘alerts’ have been introduced, these are short notices prepared by experts and specialists that present individual cases of document falsification, including photographs and short descriptions of features that distinguish falsified from model documents. In Czech Republic and Portugal, new training for staff has been introduced in the detection of false documentation and the promotion of document security. In Portugal, this has focused on e-documents, including the Residence Card for EU citizens [permanent], EU Residence Card for family members, and Diplomatic Identification Card. **Bulgaria is centralising its activities for combating document fraud by establishing a National Centre for combating counterfeit and forged documents – specialised equipment was purchased in 2012.**

Several Member States (CZ, HU, SK, UK) reported on collaboration activities to share and exchange information. The Czech Republic, for example, has established bilateral agreements on police information exchange with Slovak Republic, Germany and also in 2012, with Poland. Czech Republic and Slovak Republic have created a joint investigation team between their respective Public Prosecutors Offices. Experts in Hungary have cooperated with experts from United Kingdom in exchanging information on revealing and tackling abuses connected to free movement. Ireland and United Kingdom collaborate by sharing of data related to both visa and (failed) asylum seeker data. Portugal and Spain have exchanged information through various joint cooperation centres located along the Portugal / Spain border.

Member States (BE, CY, CZ, SK ) have reported on their participation in Frontex Risk Analysis Networks in relation to information sharing activities on the abuse of freedom of movement, particularly through the sharing of Daily and Monthly Statistics Reports (DSR / MSR) and also in the FREEMO Expert Group (**EL**, **FI**, HU, IE, PT).

Member States have also reported fruitful cooperation with EUROPOL (IE, LV, PL, PT, SK, UK), both in general, and in relation to specific issues, for example, organised crime groups that have misused the freedom of free movement with an aim to enhance irregular migration (LV), and illegal drugs trafficking (PL). The Netherlands has seconded a staff officer to Europol’s headquarters on a permanent basis to support its actions to address facilitated illegal immigration. Portugal has highlighted formal actions of cooperation through the setting up of

a Joint Investigation Team (JIT), which involved France and the United Kingdom for purposes of investigation of a transnational network of organizers of marriages of convenience. The Netherlands also carried out a successful JIT operation in cooperation with Europol and the United Kingdom.

## ***V.2 Prevent the fraudulent acquisition and use of free movement rights by third-country nationals***

At national level, the majority of Member States (BE, CY, EE, HU, IT, LT, LV, NL, PT, SI, ~~SK~~, UK) and Norway reported new measures to implement enhanced security standards for EU documentation on legal stay. Latvia and Lithuania transposed the provisions of Regulation No. 444/2009 on standards for security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents issued by Member States. A new criminal offence “Abuse by establishing family relationship” was introduced into the Criminal Code of Hungary (Act C of 2012) which will enter into force on 1st July 2013, whereby anyone above the age of eighteen, who, for financial gain, establishes a family relationship or provides an official paternity statement explicitly for acquiring residence status, will be subject to penalties of two years’ imprisonment. United Kingdom considered policy proposals and possible legislation to implement enhanced security standards for EU documentation on legal stay and to enhance the security of issuance processes; its National Document Fraud Unit assessed other Member States’ residence permits to help inform the debate on their acceptability. Norway introduced new standardised Schengen residence cards containing biometric data in May, replacing the previous system of stickers in passports.

In Netherlands, case law was passed in the European Court of Justice to allow the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee to continue using Mobile Security Monitoring (MTV checks) in the border areas with Germany and Belgium, in line with the preconditions of the Aliens’ decree, and not contrary to the Schengen Border Code. The MTV checks are supported by the @migoboras camera system. France continued to develop a database of Passengers Name Record (PNR) data in order to facilitate the passage of travellers not considered to be “risky” after screening. The governments in Netherlands and Norway both considered plans for national databases for the recording of biometric data.

## **Priority VI: Enhancing migration management, including cooperation on return practices**

### **VI.1 Key Statistics**

Table 4 in the Statistical Annex provides a provisional overview of the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave and the numbers returned. The highest numbers of forced return measures were implemented by Italy (11 204) and France (10 305). The numbers of third-country nationals returned through an assisted voluntary return programme were highest in Belgium (4 164) and France (3 250).

**Comentário [MJ4]:** To end of September – new figures to be submitted in March.

### ***VI.2 Ensuring that all Member States have efficient migration management systems in place in order to be prepared for fluctuating migration pressures***

Italy, Latvia and United Kingdom introduced strategies at governmental level for coping with sudden migration flows. In Italy, this followed from the movement of over 62 000 people in 2011, and some 12 500 other migrants in 2012 (to 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012), from North Africa following the political crisis. A technical inter-ministerial working group was established within the Ministry of Interior to improve the *governance* of these exceptional migration

flows, and approved a package of measures designed to address the emergency by 31 December 2012. In UK this was specifically in relation to the conflict in Syria: exceptional arrangements were introduced for Syrian nationals already in the UK to enable them to extend their visa or switch into a different visa category until March 2013; however, no provisions were introduced for newly-entering Syrians. Building on its crisis management strategy launched in 2011, Bulgaria carried out the preparation of temporary accommodation for migrants at the Bulgarian-Turkish border.

Hungary and Serbia adopted an Action Plan on cooperation for combating irregular migration at the Hungarian-Serbian border for 2012. Moreover, in Hungary, the relevant authorities started a common operation called NIMROD in 2012 to address the increased migration flows. In Luxembourg, to tackle the constant flow of migrants since the end of 2010, mainly from Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, the workforce of the Refugee and Return Agencies of the Directorate of Immigration was increased on 2012, and temporary agents were taken on and trained by EASO in order to guarantee the effective processing of international protection files.

### ***VI.3 Maximising the potential of a common EU approach in the field of return, both voluntary and forced in compliance with existing EU acquis***

Member States cooperated in a number of ways to develop a common EU approach for swift, sustainable and effective return. Czech Republic held meetings with the Polish Border Guard to share best practice on so-called "Annex 39" voluntary returns (these are specific types of return by land) with the Polish Border Guard. Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden reported that they had participated in forums to exchange good practice on return. The Contact Committee of the Return Directive, attended by PT amongst other Member States represents a forum for discussion and benchmarking on return practice, with the ultimate goal of harmonising the interpretation and application of EU legislation on return. UK reported that 'debrief sessions' after joint operations were useful tools for feeding back and considering best practice for future operations.

Member States strengthened cooperation on return at different levels. At national level, relevant ministries and implementing organisations (e.g. IOM) in Latvia, national ministries, regional authorities, aviation authorities and the Council for Refugees, amongst others also met to organise practice on return. Czech Republic established the "Return Centre" in 2012 as a common platform for strategic management of voluntary returns, as well as implementation and coordination of voluntary return process activities like the return counselling, dissemination of information on voluntary return programme and the organizing and performance of voluntary returns. The Return Centre will act as a coordination hub for all governmental agencies (e.g. Ministry of the Interior, Directorate of Alien Police Service (DAPS) and the Asylum Facility Administration) involved in return and will be administered by IOM. In Italy, a network of public and private organisations (RIRVA), was launched in order to test, in cooperation with the Ministry of Interior, the functioning and strengthening of the national referral system connected to AVR, also in line with recently approved guidelines for the implementation of voluntary and assisted return programmes.

Austria, Finland, Ireland, Lithuania, and Slovak Republic plus 10 other Member States participated in the "Voluntary Return European Network" (VREN) which is funded by the Return Fund. Lithuania participated in trainings return operations organised by Frontex in Malta and Netherlands. Belgium, Netherlands and Romania participated in EURINT project, which has the aim of improving the process of identification and establishing nationality in

return. In October, Netherlands and Belgium presented a joint proposal to the GDISC Return Conference in Budapest, and separately to Frontex, to start a follow-up project on the basis of the EURINT experiences, in which more countries participate in a network. Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom and Norway also participated in the ERPUM project which is aimed at ensuring adequate reception for unaccompanied minors returned to Afghanistan and Iraq. Belgium, Germany, France and Sweden continued to participate in the Netherlands-led European Reintegration Instrument (ERI), financed by the EU Return Fund, to facilitate permanent reintegration after independent or forced return.

Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, United Kingdom and Norway amongst others participated in Frontex Joint Return Operations. France, Ireland, Lithuania, Poland United Kingdom and Norway participated in joint return operations that were not led by Frontex. Two officials of the Latvian State Border Guard participated as observers in the joint return operation to Kosovo with an aim to obtain experience and best practice in forced return, escorting and handing over of returnees to the representatives of competent institutions after arriving at the country of return.

Many (Member) States continued implementing existing Assisted Voluntary Return and (AVR) programmes. For example, in Austria, the IOM implemented seven country-specific AVR and Reintegration (AVRR) programmes (five of which were with Return Fund co-financing); the AVRR programme in Moldova had an emphasis on the prevention of (re-)trafficking of minors and youth. Finland completed its project to develop an AVR programme and the “Voluntary Return and Return Assistance from Finland” project (funded partly through the Return Fund) started on 1 January 2013. The State Border Guard in Latvia signed cooperation agreements with IOM on the implementation of voluntary return projects, and in Slovak Republic, such projects have been implemented each year with IOM under a cooperation agreement signed in 1996. Austria cooperated with Belgium, France and the Netherlands to implement a project (MAGNET) on Job Placement Assistance for third-country nationals returning voluntarily to the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Portugal added value to its AVR processes by developing various practical guides for returnees, including a brochure on how to set up small businesses in the country of return, and also provided information to those returning to Brazil on partnerships set up by the IOM in to facilitate business development there. Estonia carried out a project on raising the competence of officials involved in return procedures of third country nationals, focusing on cultural differences, psychological behaviour and best practices in return. The project included training and learning based on best practices from other Member States, as well as two study-visits to Hungary and Austria.

The cooperation on return of migrants in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to support effectiveness of Return Operations by land was further developed in 2012 by the creation of the Operational Information Exchange Network on Voluntary Return amongst the migration and Border Guard authorities of the three countries. The network ensures the fast exchange of information on return operations by land in the Baltic region.

### III. INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION INCLUDING ASYLUM

#### III.1 Common European Asylum System

At national level, Member States remained committed to establishing a Common European Asylum System. Two Member States (LU, NL) referred to legislative developments in

relation to the transposition of EU legislative instruments, in particular, the recast Qualification Directive<sup>18</sup> as well as the Long-Term Residents' Directive<sup>19</sup>. Bulgaria established an expert working group within the State Agency for Refugees to support the implementation of the necessary legal amendments resulting from the transposition. Others (CY, CZ, EE, EL, HU, IT, PL, SK) and Norway reported on policy developments for the implementation of measures linked to the requirements of the Common European Asylum System, including projects undertaken with other Member States under the ERF.

In relation to reception, Slovak Republic implemented a project aiming to increase the overall quality of reception conditions for applicants residing in collective centres, whilst Italy aimed to increase reception assistance to applicants in addition to providing support for socio-economic integration with a view to facilitate access to the labour market. Cyprus, following the crisis in North-Africa, increased its reception capacity by utilising hotels as reception centres. In Estonia, a capacity building project for stakeholders in the asylum process took place, funded by ERF, which aimed to support the Estonian reception system, starting with asylum procedures through to decisions on international protection, and included participants from the Police and Border Guards.

In relation to the special needs of vulnerable persons, Italy and Norway implemented a project which aimed to improve reception conditions for vulnerable persons and Norway developed guidelines for the treatment of vulnerable applicants for international protection. Poland participated in a project which aimed to enhance identification of persons with special needs.

On procedures, Italy implemented a project aimed at automatising of all applications for international protection. Poland has taken measures in preparation for an ERF funded project to be implemented in 2013 concerning the method of language analysis. With regard to qualification criteria, Norway developed guidelines which include a non-exhaustive list of elements that could amount to persecution on the basis of gender or sexual orientation.

Finally, the Czech Republic reported on their contribution to the development of the CEAS by the provision of training, having provided several EAC trainings to more than 60 officials and having delivered a training of EAC modules in the Slovak Republic, whilst Hungary emphasized its efforts undertaken in relation to country of origin information, by having implemented a project on quality development of COI

## **III.2 Cooperation with the European Asylum Support Office (EASO)**

### ***III.2.1 Participation in EASO activities***

Almost all Member States have participated in EASO activities (AT, BE, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FI, FR, IE, IT, LV, LT, MT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK, NO) plus Norway. Although Norway is currently negotiating an Association Agreement with EASO, it has also already contributed to several EASO activities.

With regard to secondment of staff, Member States and Norway reported on contributing experts to the Asylum Intervention Pool (AT, BE, CZ, PL, PT, SE, SK), the EAC Trainers Pool (AT, BE, CZ, MT, PL, UK) as well as the Interpreters Pool. Nine Member States (AT, BE, CY, DE, FI, PT, SE, SK, NO) noted that their national experts had been deployed in

<sup>18</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:337:0009:0026:EN:PDF>

<sup>19</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:132:0001:0004:EN:PDF>

Asylum Support Teams to provide assistance in Greece and Luxembourg (BE, UK). Sweden has also contributed to the evaluation of the Asylum Support Teams deployed to Greece. Belgium reported that within the context of EAC, their national experts had provided training courses in Malta. Other Member States (BE, CZ, NL) further reported on having seconded national experts to temporarily work for the agency in Malta.

With regard to participation in meetings, most Member States (AT, BE, BG, CZ, CY, DE, EE, EL, IE, MT, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK, UK) reported on having actively contributed to EASO Management Board Meetings, NCP Meetings as well as several expert meetings on, amongst others, COI, EAC, and age assessment. France, Malta, Poland, and Sweden also noted to have taken part in the Consultative Forum.

Some Member States (BG, CY, IT, SE) referred to having contributed to the EASO early-warning and preparedness system by supplying data on trends and analysis with regard to applications for international protection.

### ***III.2.2 Provision of support by EASO to the Member States***

Asylum Support Teams were deployed to Greece and Luxembourg. Technical assistance in Greece consisted of support in building the Greek asylum system, in particular, the establishment of the First Reception Service, of the Asylum Service, of the Appeals Authority and for the improvement of reception conditions. In Luxembourg, support involved trainings to support staff in processing the high numbers of applications received for international protection.

Moreover, several Member States (CZ, FI, EE, FR, IE, MT, PL, SE) reported benefitting from EAC trainings organised and coordinated by EASO. France and Ireland have each incorporated EASO training materials into the training modules, respectively within the French Office for Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA) and the Irish Immigration Authority (INIS). In Italy, a support plan was drafted by EASO in order to introduce new working procedures in Italy and maximise response capacities for dealing with unexpected mixed migration flows. The United Kingdom noted that EASO had organised a workshop on Syria, which aimed to discuss the situation in Syria and any policy implications

## **III.3 Intra-EU solidarity including Relocation**

### ***III.3.1 Support to national asylum systems***

At national level, many Member States (BE, CY, CZ, NL, PL, SE, SK) and Norway took part in initiatives to support those faced with specific and disproportionate pressures on their national asylum system (see also Section 3.2.1 above).

### ***III.3.2 Relocation***

Some Member States also reported on relocation of refugees: In 2012, seven Member States (BG, HU, LT, PL, RO, SK) pledged to relocate beneficiaries of international protection from Malta through the EUREMA II project. To date, Lithuania relocated four beneficiaries, Portugal six beneficiaries, and Poland 50 beneficiaries from Malta. Other Member States (DE, DK, ES, IE, NL) made pledges to Malta on a bilateral basis. Following such bilateral pledges, Ireland relocated ten beneficiaries of international protection. Norway resettled 31 beneficiaries following a request from the EU to relocate refugees as a result of the Libyan crisis (see also Table 5 in the Statistical Annex).

## III.4 Enhancing the external dimension including Resettlement

### III.4.1 *Cooperation with third countries*

At national level, several Member States (BE, CZ, DE, HU, PL, SE, UK) cooperated with third countries with a view to strengthening their asylum systems. For example, Germany and Sweden have - in close cooperation with EASO and UNHCR - sought to develop the European Asylum Curriculum (EAC) tool in Eastern Partnership countries. Similarly, Belgium also assisted the asylum authority in Burundi by the provision of training on the basis of the EAC learning method, whilst the United Kingdom has shared best practice on asylum processes with Australia and Turkey, including the hosting of an EU-funded study visit for a Turkish delegation to witness UK operations. Furthermore, Sweden and Poland administered a twinning project to improve the management of migration and asylum in Armenia. Germany provided assistance to Turkey and the Republic of Moldova in the context of TAIEX (Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument) activities and Hungary exchanged experiences on capacity building with the National Police of Serbia.

### III.4.2 *Resettlement*

#### III.4.2.1 *Key statistics*

Table 5 provides statistics on third-country nationals resettled to Member States and Norway. In 2012, third-country nationals were primarily resettled to SE (1 853), NO (1 231<sup>20</sup>), FI (750) and Germany (300). Ireland, France and Portugal also reported resettling people from third countries in 2012.

Comentário [MJ5]: TBC

#### III.4.2.2 *Resettlement activities*

Several Member States (BE, CZ, DE, FI, FR, IE, PT, SE, SK<sup>21</sup>, UK) plus Norway resettled refugees from different regions of the world, mainly in cooperation with UNHCR. Some of the resettled refugees came from North Africa, including refugees that have fled the crisis in Tunisia (DE, SE), and Egypt (IE). Other Member States and Norway resettled refugees from Rwanda (FI), Republic of Kenya (SE), Eritrea and Ethiopia (FR, IE, UK), Somalia (FR, UK), Sudan (SE), Djibouti (SE), Congo (FR, IE, UK), as well as refugees from Afghanistan (FI, FR), Afghan nationals from Iran (SE), Iraq (FR, UK), Palestine (FR), Iraqi nationals from Turkey (DE, FI) and Ukraine (HU), Colombian nationals from Ecuador (SE), Burmese refugees from Malaysia (CZ), and Myanmar refugees from Thailand (FI).

Some Member States have set a quota with respect to the number of persons accepted for resettlement. The size of the annual quota varies, from for example 500 in the Netherlands to 1200 in Norway and 1900 in Sweden. Several member States reported on other resettlement-related activities, for example, the undertaking of resettlement missions (NL, SE), as well as conducting cultural orientation programs (SE). Bulgaria adopted a government decision in 2012 to resettle refugees and has set a pilot resettlement quota of some 20 refugees.

---

<sup>20</sup> This figure includes 31 third-country nationals relocated from Malta

<sup>21</sup> In the case of Slovak Republic, this concerned a temporary resettlement (humanitarian transfer) for a maximum 6 month period after resettlement to the final destination.

## IV. UNACCOMPANIED MINORS AND OTHER VULNERABLE GROUPS

### V.1 Key statistics

Table 6 in the Statistical Annex gives an overview of the provisional number of unaccompanied minors including, where possible, a distinction between those who did apply for asylum in 2012 and those who did not apply for asylum. On the basis of these provisional data, Italy (963 asylum applicants, 7 575 non-asylum applicants), Sweden (3 578 asylum applicants), Belgium (1 238 asylum applicants; 1 104 non-asylum applicants), and Greece (1 953 asylum applicants) received the highest numbers overall.

### V.2 Unaccompanied minors

At national level, several Member States (BE, CY, HU, PL, SI, NO) reported on legislative developments, providing greater assistance and protection to unaccompanied minors (UAMs). For example, Belgium developed a new Protocol Agreement which foresees a better monitoring system and further also includes guidelines for identification and age assessment. Other Member States introduced new provisions relating to age determination (SI), legal representatives (CY), and guardianship (PL and NO).

With regard to future legislative developments, Finland is preparing a law amendment to prohibit the detention of unaccompanied minors and Hungary reported that an age assessment protocol is currently under preparation.

Several Member States (CZ, IT, NL, UK) referred to policy developments. The Czech Republic applies a new concept of protection and care for unaccompanied minors, which sets out new rules for dealing with, and outlines the system of care and integration for, this group in the Member State. In Italy, the National Action Plan on Unaccompanied Minors, adopted in October 2012, foresees for the development of an online information system in order to enhance accessibility of relevant information to stakeholders involved in providing assistance to UAMs. The United Kingdom adopted a new strategy on missing children (and adults) which enables regional governments to put better arrangements in place to prevent children going missing.

Furthermore, several Member States (AT, BE, FI, IT, MT, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK, NO) were involved in projects concerning UAMs. For example, Austria, in cooperation with UNHCR, implemented a quality assurance project aiming at assisting authorities in processing asylum procedures from unaccompanied minors. Belgium, in cooperation with IOM, implemented a pilot project on enhanced reintegration assistance for unaccompanied minors voluntarily returning to Morocco. Italy has funded some 440 grant projects aimed at integrating UAMs into national society and where possible, the labour market. Greece has referred to a range of activities to support its work in age determination and the legal processes for unaccompanied minors. In the context of the EU Action Plan on Unaccompanied Minors, Sweden, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Norway continued to implement an EU-funded project which aims for the establishment of a European platform for unaccompanied minors that enables safe return to their countries of origin. Bulgaria and Greece have referred to their participation in EASO expert working meetings on unaccompanied minors.

### V.3 Other vulnerable groups

On developments in relation to other vulnerable groups, some Member States (BE, IE, IT) referred to legislative and policy developments. Belgium, for example, signed the Convention

on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention), and in Ireland, the Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service (INIS) published guidelines for applying for an independent status for legally-resident third country national victims of domestic abuse whose immigration status is derived and/or dependent on that of the perpetrator of domestic violence. In Slovak Republic, the government supported a range of initiatives to raise awareness about migration and asylum and in particular, with regard to work with vulnerable groups, mainly via projects financed from EU funds

## V. ACTIONS AGAINST TRAFFICKING IN HUMAN BEINGS

### V.1 Key statistics

Table 7 in the Statistical Annex provides key statistics on human trafficking. Only **nine** Member States have been able to provide this data. The highest numbers of third-country nationals receiving a residence permit as victims of human trafficking in human beings were reported by Italy (520) and United Kingdom (166) and Norway (33). Other Member States reported issuing very low numbers of such permits; in all other cases where information was available, this was fewer than 25. With regards to arrested traffickers **ten** Member States provided data. France reported the highest number, 3 620 from 1 January to 30 September 2012. Data on convicted traffickers is available for **nine** Member States only. The highest numbers of convictions are reported by Greece (49), Latvia (18) and Slovak Republic (8).

### V.2 Measures to identify, protect and assist victims of trafficking

At national level, following the adoption of Directive 2011/36/EU in 2011, all Member States (AT, BE, **BG**, CY, CZ, DE, **EE**, FI, FR, IE, IT, LT, LV, **MT**, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK) and Norway reported that they had introduced new measures to identify, protect and assist victims of trafficking in human beings in 2012. These have focussed in particular on actions to build capacity to identify and address the issues, and to raise awareness.

In relation to legislative changes, in Cyprus, the Amending Law against Trafficking in Human Beings came into force in March 2012, and in Estonia, trafficking in human beings was criminalized as a separate provision in the Penal Code. In Hungary, the criminal offence of human trafficking was harmonized with the requirements of Directive 2011/36/EU, and Hungary has taken steps to adopt new Victim Support legislation in line with the Directive which will provide the legislative basis for the National Referral Mechanism. In Netherlands, new measures were introduced to tackle trafficking in human beings more forcefully, with new policy approaches and increased penalties for perpetrators of trafficking elaborated in Chapter B9/12 of the Aliens Act Implementation Guidelines.

Two Member States, Austria and Czech Republic launched new national Action Plans for the period 2012-2014/5. In Austria, the new Action Plan includes measures on national coordination, prevention, protection of victims, prosecution and international cooperation, and Czech Republic has adopted an "holistic and multidisciplinary approach" to tackle trafficking in human beings, involving a wide range of stakeholders. Ireland and Norway undertook a review of their national Action Plan; Ireland will launch a new Action Plan in 2013.

A number of Member States (BE, CY, FI, IE, **MT**, NL, PL, PT, **SK**) described developments to build capacity and raise awareness of the issue of trafficking in human beings. New training initiatives introduced included training on identification of victims of trafficking in human beings (**BE**, **MT**), for staff in reception centres for asylum seekers (**BE**); for the

referral of victims (MT), for liaison officers provided by the Police (FI); and for social welfare officers, focussing on providing support to victims to alleviate trauma and behavioural problems (CY). In Ireland, training updates were delivered to Legal Aid Board staff providing legal aid and advice to potential and suspected victims of trafficking in human beings (IE), for the police services (CY, FI) via the national academy (CY). Malta prepared draft National Human Trafficking Indicators which were submitted to the Monitoring Committee for approval following the necessary consultations.

New training and guidance materials were also introduced to assist in the fight against trafficking in human beings (BE, BG, CY, IE). These included a brochure for staff in relevant ministerial departments (Justice, Health, Migration) as well as the Interdepartmental Unit for the Coordination of the fight against trafficking in human beings (BE); common guidelines and procedures for identifying victims of trafficking in human beings (in collaboration with other Member States), a manual based on international good practice to help police officers to identify victims, developed by the anti-trafficking office of the police (CY); and an operational guide to assist police officers to understand the differences between trafficking in human beings and smuggling (CY). In Ireland, Anti-Human Trafficking Guidelines have been made available to all frontline staff, setting out a definition of human trafficking, indicators of human trafficking and what to do in the event of concerns. Two further specialised Guides were also developed in the reference period, the Guide to the Procedures in Place for Supporting and Protecting Victims of Human Trafficking and Services for Victims of Child Trafficking, available also via an on-line portal. Estonia updated its guidelines on the referral and support of victims.

Awareness raising products developed included a multilingual leaflet and website for trafficked persons to inform trafficked persons about their rights as victims at an early stage (NL); a website with information on the various aspects of trafficking in human beings, including how to identify trafficking and protect victims (PT); and an International Film Festival on Human Trafficking within the framework of the 6<sup>th</sup> European Anti-Trafficking Day (PL), to provide information and raise awareness of the issues of potential victims and witnesses, as well as decision-makers and professionals dealing with victims and perpetrators. In Italy, an anti-trafficking telephone number was activated, free of charge to users. Greece also introduced a human trafficking resource line, as part of a package of awareness-raising activities.

Member States launched new projects in 2012 to assist in the fight against trafficking in human beings. These included projects to assist in the voluntary return and reintegration of minors and young adults with emphasis on the prevention of (re-) trafficking (AT), and to work with neighbouring countries to prevent and combat all forms of trafficking in human beings (AT); a project to review the problems and potential deficiencies in national legislation concerning victims of trafficking in human beings, and to recommend proposals for change (FI); and a scoping review on the practical care arrangements for trafficked children (UK), aimed at identifying good practice and areas for improvement.

In terms of future activities, Austria, for example, plans to implement concrete operational actions in cooperation with the 'Forum Salzburg' partners and the Western Balkan countries which are representing countries of departure for traffickers and smugglers of human beings. Belgium will further extend its suite of guidance materials, to include the development of a brochure to inform guardians of UAMs on the problem of trafficking in human beings and Czech Republic will evaluate its projects and programmes of support and protection to victims of trafficking in human beings under its new Action Plan.

### **V.3 Measures to prevent trafficking in human beings, and to increase the prosecution of traffickers**

At national level, the majority of Member States (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, EE, FI, FR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SK, SI, SE, UK) and Norway introduced in 2012 new measures to enhance the prevention of trafficking in human beings.

Legislative changes were reported in several Member States to introduce measures to prevent trafficking in human beings, within the framework of the transposition of Directive 2011/36/EU. Lithuania, for example, also ratified the 2005 Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, and approved a new National Crime Prevention and Control Programme 2013-2015, which has as one of its priority areas of activity, prevention and control of trafficking in human beings. Many (Member) States (AT, PT, SI, UK, NO) have referred also to actions to prevent trafficking in human beings in their national Action Plans. In Malta a new *Prostitution and Trafficking in Human Beings Unit* was been set up within the Police Vice Squad, which had intensified efforts in this sphere and has resulted in increasing numbers of inspections at premises potentially vulnerable to human trafficking. Although this has not always led to the prosecution of human trafficking cases, it has contributed to the detection and prosecution of other offences.

An important tool in preventing trafficking in human beings has been raising awareness of the issues, and (Member) States have introduced a range of new activities (AT, BE, BG, CY, EE, HU, LU, LV, NL, SI, SK, UK). These include public awareness-raising actions amongst national audiences, including young people (BG, EL, HU) Exhibitions (AT, SK), national public events on human trafficking (AT, CY), including on the occasion of the EU-Anti-Trafficking Day on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012 (AT) and information seminars (CY, IE, LV, SE, SK), for example targeting teachers (CY) and stakeholder groups (IE, SE) have been held. In relation to printed media, information booklets, leaflets and brochures (BE, CY, EL, IE, LV, NL, SK) and newsletters (IE) have been developed. Educational films (NL, SK) targeting young people and raising awareness about risks (NL); broadcast media (SK); and the dissemination of information via websites (FI, IE, SI) have also been undertaken. Greece has specifically target young people through awareness raising in schools, universities, sports centres and other public places; in Hungary, through the Sziget Fesztivál, a major cultural event in Europe for young people. Sweden launched an international Action Day in order to prevent trafficking in human beings, and mapped the structure of Nigerian networks involved in this criminality.

As well as general campaigns, some Member States have introduced more targeted measures in relation to human trafficking for labour exploitation, for example by selecting 'high risk' occupational groups (BE, BG, AT, SI, SK), and applicants for work visas in embassies (BE). Hungary plans a new awareness raising campaign targeting males between the ages of 25 and 40 who may be at risk of becoming victims of human trafficking for labour exploitation.

Many Member States also undertook training initiatives to assist in the prevention of trafficking in human beings, for example, with specific target groups: prosecutors and judges (BG, CZ, IE, SK), staff in consular offices (CZ, SK), the police (BG, EL, FI, IE, SK), immigration and liaison officers (FI), ethnic and minorities liaison officers (IE); social workers (BG) border guards (PL, SK) and public sector stakeholders (BG, IE), using a 'train the trainer' model developed with the IOM (IE). Bulgaria has also undertaken specific training with recruitment agencies, working with labour offices. Czech Republic introduced

training which targets specific prevention issues, including Nigerian organised crime with a focus on trafficking in human beings and labour exploitation.

Information sharing and capacity building activities have been implemented with the aim of increasing prosecution rates. In Cyprus, seminars were held for Judges emphasising the importance of expert witnesses during court procedures, and a similar seminar was delivered to the Counsels of the Republic. In Latvia, a seminar focusing on investigation of the cases of trafficking in human beings, prosecution and conviction of criminals has been developed within the framework of regional cooperation with the Nordic countries, Baltic States and Russian Federation. Training of law enforcement authorities was organised also at international level in Czech Republic and Ireland, and an e-learning product on human trafficking for prosecutors has been planned by the United Kingdom for implementation in 2013. Two Member States have set up new contact points within their law enforcement agencies to ultimately increase prosecution rates. In Portugal, this has been to facilitate information exchange, and in the United Kingdom, to establish a police network of single points of contact so that all forces have one identified officer responsible for issues relating to human trafficking. In Bulgaria, eight local committees for combatting trafficking in human beings were established in areas of greatest risk.

#### **V.4 Coordination and cooperation among key actors**

At national level, AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, FI, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, UK, NO all undertook specific actions to enhance the coordination and cooperation amongst key actors to address trafficking in human beings, in recognition of the multifaceted nature of the issue and its impact within a wide range of state and non-state organisations.

In relation to the sharing knowledge and better understanding trends, several Member States have reported on new or on-going actions. Many have established interdepartmental co-ordinations units (BE, CY, IE, IT, LT, LV, NL, PL, PT, UK, NO) which are taking responsibility for co-ordinating actions, generally within the framework of an action plan. A new Stakeholders' Taskforce was established in Malta which enhances coordination and cooperation among key actors, including the Police, Ministry of Home Affairs and NGOs. In Cyprus, the Amending Law against Trafficking in Human Beings (March 2012) has made specific provision to increase the cooperation between government organisations and NGOs, and to allow experts and other bodies to participate in such a co-ordinating group, along with provisions for training and support. Italy's Inter-ministerial Commission for the support of victims of trafficking in human beings chaired by the Department for Equal Opportunities, adopted new guidelines for the introduction of a national and transnational referral system. In Norway, the national co-ordination Unit from 2011 has a permanent mandate and aims to develop research-based knowledge about trafficking (and in particular about child victims of trafficking). In United Kingdom, a new NGO Joint Strategic Group (JSG) is being set up to take forward actions identified in the first report of the Inter-Departmental Ministerial Group (IDMG) on human trafficking to help to assess trends in trafficking and to coordinate anti-trafficking activities. A further mechanism has been the introduction of threat reduction boards to tackle serious and organised crime, including human trafficking, co-ordinating the operational threat reductive activity across partner agencies.

As an international issue, many Member States (AT, BE, CZ, DE, FR, IE, PT, UK) are undertaking cooperation actions, including with third countries where victims of trafficking in human beings and their traffickers may originate or transit. Such third countries include Ukraine (CZ), Argentina, Ecuador, Columbia, Kosovo, Tadjikistan, and Turkmenistan (LV).

Cyprus, Netherlands and Poland are undertaking a joint project 'Putting Rantsev into Practice: strengthening multidisciplinary operational cooperation to fight trafficking in human beings' following the ECHR ruling<sup>22</sup>, and the three Member States will also organise an EU Conference on the multidisciplinary approach to trafficking in human beings in 2013.

A number of joint projects have also been established bringing together several Member States with third countries. Examples include the nine Baltic Sea Region countries of the ADSTRINGO project established to address trafficking for labour exploitation (led by Lithuania). Other projects to address trafficking in human beings also operate in the region, bringing together the Nordic and Baltic countries also with the Russian Federation. The joint project "Enhancing Multi-stakeholder Cooperation to Combat Human Trafficking in Countries of Origin and Countries of Destination" has been implemented in 2012, uniting Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and United Kingdom with Switzerland, and Nigeria (as a country of origin) co-ordinated by IOM. The Community of Portuguese Language Speaking Countries has established a new 'Working Committee Against Human Traffic' which will take charge of collecting information on the measures in force at the national level, in order to assess legislation needs and propose a joint strategy and action plan to fight trafficking in human beings, which will be approved in 2013. Belgium, France Hungary, Italy and United Kingdom are collaborating in an EIF funded EU initiative to share information and support research on how the internet and social networks are (mis)used to attract victims.

## VI. EXTERNAL DIMENSION OF EU MIGRATION POLICY

### VI.1 Mainstreaming of migration in development policies

At national level, several Member States (BE, CZ, DE, EL, IE, IT, LU, LV, PL, SI, SK and SE) and Norway reported on efforts to effectively mainstream migration in development policies.

Specific actions included research (BE, DE, IE), for example, in Germany, focusing on business responsibility and migration, migration and rural development, and successful business models by migrants, and participation in international and high-level conferences on migration and development (BE, DE, EL, AT, SE, NO). In Belgium, for example, the Belgian Development Cooperation organised a high-level national conference entitled "Policy Coherence for Development" which focused on the interdependence of development and other sectorial policies including migration. Greece and Hungary participated in the meetings of the Global Forum on Migration and Development. Greece contributed to the preparation for the Dialogue on Migration and Development in the framework of the 2013 UN General Assembly.

BE, IE, IT, LV and SK reported on efforts to strengthen national inter-institutional cooperation and enhance institutional capacity in the field of migration and development. In Belgium, for example, draft legislation on development cooperation, which incorporates reinforcing policy coherence for development, was approved by the House of Representatives in December 2012, and in the Slovak Republic, in the framework of the mid-term strategy of Official Development Aid 2009–13, the National Programme 2012 has placed a focus on

---

<sup>22</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action;jsessionid=GRvwRP1JyZVyKxGpJpk3X2qNNOzRz5JTg1vcJ1qJb9G5wOlyTncy!106222535?path=Legislation+and+Case+Law%2FCase+Law%2FRantsev+v.+Cyprus+and+Russia>

project proposals will take into consideration the commitment to increase coherence between migration and development policies. This topic is one of the cross-sectional priorities considered in the selection of all development cooperation projects by the government.

Several Member States (CZ, DE, IT, PL, SI) also reported on their participation in a range of solidarity projects, including those combining capacity building and policy making aspects (CZ), for example, a pilot project “Migration and development” within the EC targeted Initiative on implementation of the Prague Process Action Plan, which deals with issues of circular migration; economic development and the role of diasporas, in countries such as Kosovo and Serbia (DE); a project creating social and economic alternatives to the irregular migration of minors from North Africa (IT) and a development programme initiated in 2012 aiming to improve the living conditions and in turn, minimise the massive influx of international protection seekers southern Serbia (LU). In some situations, Member States have worked together, for example, the project “Supporting the State Migration Service for Strengthening of Migration Management in Armenia” is a twinning project implemented by Sweden and Poland.

## **VI.2 Migrants’ Remittances**

At national level, a number of Member States (CY, CZ, DE, IT, LU, NL, SE, UK) and Norway reported on measures with respect to remittances. These ranged from price comparison online portals for remittances (DE, IT, NL) and Norway; research; legislative and policy measures as well as involvement in project initiatives and technical cooperation activities.

In DE, IT, NL and NO online portals for price comparisons of remittances are seen to lead to rising competition among providers for remittances, and hence to faster, cheaper and safer services. In Germany, the remittances price comparison website [www.geldtransfair.de](http://www.geldtransfair.de) is being updated in order to heighten transparency on the market for remittances. In Italy, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs provides an online service to compare the cost of sending remittances ([www.manda.isoldiacasa.it](http://www.manda.isoldiacasa.it)). Netherlands has also taken actions to improve the transparency of the Dutch market for remittances, in particular by supporting the web-site [www.geldnaarhuis.nl](http://www.geldnaarhuis.nl).

In terms of research activities, in Czech Republic, the first outcomes of academic research into the remittances of Ukrainian immigrants were made public; in Germany, the FReDI Handbook (Financial Literacy for Remittances and Diaspora Investment – a Handbook on Methods for Project Design) has been developed in cooperation with the “European Microfinance Platform” NGO; and in Sweden, a study has been conducted to understand how migrants contribute to the development in their countries of origin.

In relation to legislative measures and policy commitments, Italy adopted Law 44/2012 which abolished taxation on the financial transfers made to non-EU countries by foreigners with no national insurance (NI) or National Institute for Social Pensions (INPS) number. The Ministry of Interior in the Czech Republic has launched interagency discussion in order to formulate future policy solutions in how to make services related to remittances transfers more transparent and the environment more competitive. In Norway, regulations for the operation of money transfer agencies have been liberalised, which has led to a proliferation of agencies established in Oslo, offering migrants’ significantly more choice.

A number of other initiatives were reported, including a technical cooperation to increase financial literacy in Uzbekistan for remittance recipients in Germany. Luxembourg has supported a project focusing on mobilizing migrants' savings in order to finance micro financial institutions in Cape Verde. United Kingdom has participated in initiative with CGAP, an independent policy and research centre dedicated to advancing financial access for the world's poor on the Technology and Business Innovation Programme in partnership (with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Master Card Foundation) to explore the use of branchless banking to improve the speed and security of international remittance transfers and reduce their costs through new technologies.

### **VI.3 Working with Diasporas**

At national level, with regard to EU development initiatives, Netherlands has reported on involving diaspora groups in the Joint Africa-EU Strategic Partnership. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs has approved a project proposal from the African Diaspora Policy Centre (ADPC) aimed at capacity-building of newly-formed diaspora-oriented ministries in Africa.

Several Member States (BE, EE, EL, IT, SK, SE, UK) and Norway reported on specific activities in the form of project initiations or financial support for diaspora groups to enhance development in their country of origin as well as cooperation and dialogue with diaspora organisations, in a range of countries.

Belgium, for example, signed a Memorandum of Understanding to contribute funds to a two-year pilot project (MEDMA 2) "Mobilisation of Moroccans residing in Belgium for the Development of Morocco", which aims to provide potential investors with technical, financial and administrative information to access existing mechanisms to facilitate their investment and contribute to the socio-economic development of Morocco. Belgium and Italy continue to support the Migration for Development in Africa (MIDA); Italy will support the MIDA programme targeting Sub-Saharan African diaspora groups living in Italy, and has actively involved diaspora groups in the planning of interventions and investments in their countries of origin. Italy has also launched a 'diaspora bonds' initiative, whereby bonds are issued by countries of origin for migrants living abroad to finance national development projects. In Sweden, a project was initiated to facilitate the involvement of the organised Somali diaspora in the development cooperation with Somalia, and The Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD) has sought to integrate the work of diaspora groups with the work of traditional development organisations and in 2012 has prioritised projects which partner with diaspora organisations.

In relation to capacity building of diaspora organisations, Belgium supports two health-related programmes from migrant associations working with the diaspora community of the Democratic Republic of Congo. In 2012, Estonia provided financial support to different project activities of national minorities' associations. Greece has implemented two actions to support diaspora organisation. In addition, Immigrant Integration Councils (SEM), which include representatives of immigrant organisations, were set up in the municipalities that had not yet formed these bodies (EL). In Germany, a new programme has been initiated whereby migrants can apply for advisory support and funding for specific project ideas, and Germany also promotes migrants' private economic commitment in their countries of origin with the programme "Migrants as entrepreneurs". In the United Kingdom, a new government funded initiative has been dedicated to enhancing the contribution of diaspora groups to Africa's development and fostering greater dialogue and engagement between UK-based Africans and policy makers.

With regard to cooperation and dialogue with diaspora organisations, representatives of the Ministry of Interior in Czech Republic and the Vietnamese diaspora met several times in 2012 to discuss direct support of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of Vietnamese in the Czech Republic, and in the Slovak Republic, cooperation with migrants' communities and civic associations takes place through a formal mechanism of the Inter-Ministerial Commission for Migration and Integration of Foreigners.

In relation to engaging national diaspora, EL and LT reported on on-going activities to establish relations with nationals living abroad. In Greece, the draft law on the "Organization of World Council of Hellenes Abroad" (SAE) came to public consultation, which defines the future role for the organisation. Furthermore, a working group in the Minister of Interior is drafting a law on vote rights of expatriates. A conference "Moving Forward" was also organised which focused on national diaspora's contribution to overcome the current crisis. Lithuania adopted the implementation plan of the "Global Lithuania" strategy which proposes concrete measure for engaging Lithuanians living abroad to participate in state life.

#### **VI.4 Efforts to mitigate 'brain drain'.**

At national level, many Member States (BE, DE, IE, IT, LU, SI, SK, SE, UK) reported on on-going actions to prevent brain drain from countries of origin. These included projects to encourage diasporas to bring their qualifications and skills back into the mainstream of development of their countries of origin (BE, LU, SI); a project for returning professionals offering advice on return and career planning (DE); setting up an online platform to facilitate the mutual exchange of researchers (IT) and proposals for legislative changes to facilitate circular migration (SE).

Ireland and United Kingdom, have devoted efforts to prevent brain drain specifically in the health sector. Ireland has cooperated with the Global Health Workforce Alliance, which was instrumental in adopting the Code of Conduct for International Recruitment of Health Workers. The UK formalised a Code of Practice for the International Recruitment of Healthcare Professionals which is concerned with the protection of developing countries and seeks to prevent active recruitment from developing countries unless there is an explicit bilateral agreement to support recruitment activities.

### **VII. PROVISION AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION TO SUPPORT POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

#### **VII.1 Exchange of Information at EU level**

Essentially all Member States (AT, BG, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FR, IE, IT, LU, LV, LT, MT, NL, PL, PT, SK, FI, SE, UK) and Norway reported on actions to provide and exchange information to support policy development at EU level. Many Member States referred to the European Migration Network as a method of sharing and dissemination information. CZ, IT, LT and SI emphasised the added-value of the EMN Ad-Hoc Queries as a way of obtaining information in a relatively short period. Several Member States also reported their use of other EU entities, platforms and networks, such as FRAN (CZ, SK), GDISC (CZ, UK, NO, SK), ICMPD (CZ, EE), IDG (CZ, NO), Eurostat (CZ), NCPIs (EL, IT, FI, UK, SK) and VREN (LT, SK). Greece, Netherlands and Portugal highlighted the importance of the MIM in their work.

Other mechanisms highlighted as effective for information exchange to assist in policy development, included the European Integration Forum (FI), in particular, the technical

seminars related to the development of EU indicators as well as expert conferences; the work of expert groups (NL), for example, on family reunification and on the free movement of persons (FREEMO). Several Member States highlighted the importance of their participation in EASO meetings (EL, LT, PL, SK). NO highlighted its participation in the European Platform of Reception Agencies (EPRA), a network for sharing and exchanging information about state practice in the field of reception centres.

In Greece, two actions were implemented under the Integration Fund that promote the exchange of information at European level in 2012: 1) creating a network of cooperation at local level between EU Member States and 2) creating a collaborative network of representatives of migrant associations at European level.

Bulgaria was active in promoting the Working Group for the Black Sea Region and hosted a meeting to exchange information about both legal and irregular migration in the region, inviting for the first time, delegates from Afghanistan, Pakistan and Uzbekistan to attend.

## **7.2 Exchange of Information at Regional and National levels**

A number of Member States (CZ, EE, EL, FI, FR, IT, LT, LU, NL, PL, SE, SK, UK) and Norway have referred to the importance of information exchanges, at regional level, bilaterally with other Member States, and at the national level.

With regard to regional cooperation, Member States have utilised existing channels of cooperation including the Nordic Joint Advisory Group on Refugee Policy (NSHF) which addresses issues common to all Nordic Countries and where cooperation and information exchange have increased (FI), the network of contact points addressing issues of transit irregular migration established under the Salzburg Forum (CZ, HU), the Development of Operational Cooperation for Return in the Baltic States (EE) and the Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (SE). After taking over the presidency of the Salzburg Forum on 1 July 2012, Hungary has set up a regional contact list among the relevant authorities, in order to improve the practical cooperation and exchange of information to prevent and combat illegal migration. In Poland, the Polish Border Guard undertook cooperation activities with Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Lithuania within the framework of the Border Delegate System, which is an important channel of the exchange of information between border services of neighbouring countries. Member States have also referred to regional collaborations facilitated by IOM, for example, IOM's Special Coordination Office for the Mediterranean (IT) and regional conferences, for example, to discuss issues such as voluntary return and ensuring transit across the territory of states in the Schengen Area (EE, LT, LV, PL).

In relation to information exchange on a bilateral basis, Ireland reported that sharing immigration data with the UK continued and cooperation with the UK on initiatives such as a Common Travel Area visa will be prioritised in 2013. Italy reported on bilateral high-level meetings on migration issues with FI and MT. Estonia has reported on a number of bilateral and multilateral cooperation initiatives with other Baltic Member States involving third countries (Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova) in the area of border surveillance. All Member States and Norway have engaged in information exchange and dissemination with national stakeholders through their EMN NCP national networks and disseminated (translated) studies and other information through their national websites and through publications, such as national newsletters and the EMN Bulletin. Some examples included events to facilitate the exchange of information and good practices amongst relevant actors, to address issues such as the implementation of the Common European Asylum System (FR), and on topics addressed

through EMN studies, for example, international students (AT, EE, IT, SE, SK, UK) and training for migration services on marriages of convenience (LT). Greece published a call for proposals for actions related to the training of the parties involved in the Immigrant Integration Councils. United Kingdom continued its support for the Strategic Migration Partnership, a network of 12 regions across the UK which looks at specific migration-related issues that might directly affect the regions.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VIII. STATISTICAL ANNEX

**Table 1 First residence permits, by reason, 2012**

	Total	Family reasons	Education reasons	Remunerated activities	Other reasons
BE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
BG	6 467	2 311	1 394	333	2 429
CZ	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
DK	-	-	-	-	-
DE (a)	10 544	2 216	4 216	2 843	1 269
EE	3 108	1 166	496	780	666
IE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
EL	8 740	6 072	706	822	1 140
ES	-	-	-	-	-
FR (a)	101 410	53 480	13 410	15 090	19 425
IT	246 740	119 745	30 361	66 742	29 662
CY	6 928	314	864	4 600	1 150
LV	4 579	2 025	528	597	1 429
LT	4 338	888	296	3 091	63
LU	4 359	1 018	388	630	2 323
HU	18 112	2 246	5 536	6 376	3 954
MT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NL	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
AT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
PL	16 874	2 481	1 770	5 834	6 789
PT	27 467	13 446	7 500	5 612	909
RO	-	-	-	-	-
SI	11 690	3 759	1 067	6 772	92
SK (a)	4 506	1 223	617	1 914	752
FI (a)	17 157	5 788	5 519	5 062	788
SE	85 589	41 156	7 092	19 936	17 405
UK	701 820	118 700	247 045	108 190	227 885
NO	33 040	12 250	7 346	8 230	5 214

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.
2. "-" means no report received from EMN NCP
3. (a) means data does not cover the full year. The following periods are covered in the respective countries:  
 DE: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2012  
 FI: January to December 2012 but figures are provisional  
 SK: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012  
 FR: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012
4. LV: statistics in this table are provisional.

**Table 2 Unemployment rate of third-country nationals 2012**

	<b>Total unemployment</b>	<b>TCN unemployment</b>
BE	NA	NA
BG	NA	NA
CZ	NA	NA
DK	-	-
DE	NA	NA
EE	NA	18.9%
IE	14.5%	19.0%
EL	22.7%	34.8%
ES	-	-
FR	9.2%	25.3%
IT	NA	NA
CY	NA	NA
LV	11%	NA
LT	NA	NA
LU	6.4%	15.7%
HU	NA	10.5%
MT	NA	NA
NL	NA	NA
AT	NA	NA
PL	NA	NA
PT	14.9%	28.3%
RO	-	-
SI	NA	NA
SK	NA	NA
FI	7.9%	24.7%
SE	6.5%	29.9%
UK	8.0%	11.0%
NO	2.0%	9.7%

**Comentário [MJ6]:** To EE EMN NCP – the figure provided is not the total unemployment rate and is not comparable.

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.
2. "-" means no report received from EMN NCP
3. Data as of:
  - EE: statistics for first three quarters of 2012.
  - IE: s measured by the Quarterly National Household Survey in the third quarter 2012. See Central Statistics Office (November 2012). Quarterly National Household Survey Quarter 3 2012. Available at [www.cso.ie](http://www.cso.ie)
  - IT: November data
  - LU: March data
  - PT: averages of Quarters 1, 2 and 3
  - FR: until 30 September
  - NO: to August 2012
4. HU: 50.5% 2011 non-EU born
5. SE: Eurostat, Unemployment rates by sex, age and nationality (%), figures for 3rd quarter 2012, last update 20<sup>th</sup> December 2012, extracted on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

**Table 3 Number of visas issued, by type 2012**

**Comentário [MJ7]:** NL data not latest – check resubmission.

	Total visa	Schengen visa	National visa
BE	NA	NA	NA
BG	818 775	0	818 775
CZ	NA	NA	NA
DK	-	-	-
DE	1 523 743	1 386 946	136 797
EE	119 702	118 911	791
IE	132 410	Not applicable	132 410
EL	1 020 895	1 009 961	10 934
ES	-	-	-
FR	1 771 290	1 641 995	129 295
IT	NA	NA	NA
CY	NA	NA	NA
LV	188 087	178 671	9 416
LT	302 900	299 160	3 740
LU	18 104	11 833	6 271
HU	309 156	303 185	5 971
MT	NA	NA	NA
NL	354 094	328 559	25 535
AT	NA	NA	NA
PL	1 132 834	887 656	245 178
PT	152 295	136 842	15 453
RO	-	-	-
SI	1 259	1 259	
SK	75 836	74 661	1 175
FI	1 376 425	1 376 425	NA
SE	220 165	191 236	3 537
SE	165 275	162 415	2 860
UK	1 806 215	Not applicable	1 806 215
NO	162 289	142 778	19 511

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were 'not available' at the time this report was published.

2. "" means no report received from NCP

3. Data cover:

IT: only 2011

NL: only 2 out of 3 authorities responsible. Data for Seaport police missing

PT: provisional data

FR: until 30 September 2012

**Table 4 Third-country nationals ordered to leave and returned 2012**

	Returned as part of forced return measures	Returned voluntarily	Among those returned voluntarily, returned through an Assisted Voluntary Return Programme
BE	1 981	5 108	4 164
BG	837(a)	76	51
CZ	NA	NA	NA
DK	-	-	-
DE	NA	NA	NA
EE	112	100	29
IE	NA	NA	NA
EL	6 827	8 966	6 324
ES	-	-	-
FR	10 305	3 250	3 250
IT	11 204	431	0
CY	3 192	1 135	49
LV	51	2 019	89
LT	160	1 000	50
LU	NA	NA	NA
HU	1 011	NA	393
MT	266	39	39
NL	NA	NA	NA
AT	NA	NA	NA
PL	1 377	4 870	764
PT	1 234	870	562
RO	-	-	-
SI	80		
SK	273	72	54
FI	NA	NA	NA
SE	2 893	12 988	614
UK	NA	NA	NA
NO	1 397	NA	1 750

**Comentário [MJ8]:** To GR EMN NCP: The table you have provided is not structured in the common format. Please confirm that the numbers you have provided have been accurately classified in this table to allow for comparison.

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.

2. "-" means no report received from NCP

3. Data cover:

HU: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012

LT: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012

PT: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2012

FR and IT: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012

4a BG: statistics include 103 persons from Syria who were returned by their own wish to a safe third country rather than their country of origin, following UNHCR recommendations.

**Table 5 The number of third-country nationals relocated and resettled 2012**

	TCNs relocated	TCNs resettled
BE	0	0
BG	NA	NA
CZ	NA	NA
DK	-	-
DE	0?	300
EE	0	0
IE	10	39
EL	0	0
ES	-	-
FR	NA	40
IT	0	0
CY	0	0
LV	0	0
LT	4	0
LU	0	0
HU	0	1
MT	NA	NA
NL	NA	NA
AT	0	0
PL	50	NA
PT	6 (a)	30
RO	-	-
SI	NA	NA
SK	0	0
FI	NA	750
SE	0	1 853
UK	NA	NA
NO	31	1 231(a)

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.
2. "-" means no report received from NCP
3. (a) PT: subsidiary protection
4. (a) NO: includes 31 persons relocated from Malta

**Table 6 Unaccompanied minors 2012**

	unaccompanied minors (total or not specified)	unaccompanied minors <u>not</u> applying for asylum	unaccompanied minor asylum applicants
BE	2,342	1 104	1 238
BG	64	0	64
CZ	NA	NA	NA
DK	-	-	-
DE	1,630	NA	1 630
EE	12	12	0
IE	92	68	24
EL	1 953	NA	98
ES	-	-	-
FR	NA	NA	410
IT	*	7 575	963
CY	20	NA	20
LV	1	NA	1
LT	59	56	3
LU	16	NA	16
HU	94	NA	94
MT	86	0	86
NL	NA	NA	NA
AT	1 630	NA	1 630
PL	206	NA	206
PT	8	NA	8
RO	-	-	-
SI	30	11	19
SK	146	NA	31
FI	155	NA	155
SE	3 578	NA	3 578
UK	825	NA	825
NO	986	NA	986

*Notes:*

- "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.
- "-" means no report received from NCP
- Data cover:
  - HU: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012
  - FR: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012.
  - GR: Total is from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 – 31<sup>st</sup> May 2012; Unaccompanied minors applying for asylum: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012
- On unaccompanied minors not applying for asylum
  - BE: Note: This concerns the number of apprehensions of UAMs. It is possible that the same person was apprehended several times using a different identity.
  - IE: 1<sup>st</sup> January to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2012.
- On unaccompanied minor asylum applicant
  - "BE\*": 1.238 persons applied for asylum during the first nine months of 2012 and declared themselves as an unaccompanied minor. After age testing, the number decreased to 833. (first 9 months)"
  - IE: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012
  - FR: Figure includes asylum applications submitted by UAMs inside FR territory (355) and at the borders (55)
- IT: the figure for unaccompanied minors not applying for asylum refers to the stocks; the figure for unaccompanied minors applying for international protection refers to flow data regarding applications received during the course of the year. They derive from different administrative sources and are not comparable.

**Table 7 Data on trafficking in human beings 2012**

	TCNs receiving a residence permit as victims of human trafficking	Arrested traffickers	Convicted traffickers
BE	NA	NA	NA
BG	1	101	112
CZ	NA	NA	NA
DK	-	-	-
DE	NA	NA	NA
EE	NA	NA	NA
IE	NA	NA	NA
EL	7	302	49
ES	-	-	-
FR	25	3 620	NA
IT	520	380	0
CY	NA	NA	NA
LV	NA	17	18
LT	NA	NA	NA
LU	NA	4	2
HU	NA	NA	NA
MT	0	2	1 (a)
NL	NA	NA	NA
AT	NA	NA	NA
PL	NA	26	1
PT	NA	NA	NA
RO	-	-	-
SI	2	NA	NA
SK	NA	16	7 (b)
FI	NA	12	5
SE	7	59	5
UK	166	NA	NA
NO	33	NA	NA

*Notes:*

1. "NA" means statistics were not available at the time this report was published.

2. "-" means no report received from NCP

3. Data cover:

IE: statistics only available between 2009 and 2012

IT: 392 (humanitarian reasons Art. 18 D.L. 286/98) + 74 (exploitation in the workplace Art. 18 D.L. 286/98)

PL: data until April

SK: data available from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 – 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012

FR and UK: data available from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012 30<sup>th</sup> September 2012

4. (a) MT: sentence subject to appeal

4. (b) SK: 7 cases remain pending

**Comentário [MJ9]:** Note to IE: EMN NCP please clarify – is it not possible to disaggregate the figures?