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Since 2009:

12 EU Member States decided to participate in EUREMA pilot project (phase I and II)

8 EU Member States and Associated Countries decided to make bilateral arrangements with Malta.

10 EU Member States did not participate in any relocation arrangements.
Fact finding exercise, why?

March 2012
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Conclusions

in close cooperation
with the European Commission

EASO conducted

A fact finding exercise on the intra-EU relocation pilot project with Malta (EUREMA) and bilateral arrangements
THE FACT FINDING PROCESS

- EU MS
- Associated Countries
- relevant stakeholders

Questionnaire

Interviews

EASO

Results

By end of JULY 2012

European Commision
**Figures: EUREMA – phase 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Places pledged</th>
<th>Number relocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>253-5</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Figures: EUREMA – phase 2 and bilateral relocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Places pledged</th>
<th>Places filled so far</th>
<th>Bilateral/Co-funded project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Selection mission for 6 persons ongoing</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Process rescinded</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 individuals referred but became ineligible as RO informed that only Geneva Convention refugees are eligible</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No cases referred</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No cases referred</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selection mission conducted, 7 persons interviewed</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 persons selected, currently awaiting departure</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No cases referred</td>
<td>EUREMA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>356</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of information

- All EU Member States/Permanent Representations to the EU
- Participating States
- Handbook on lessons learned from EUREMA published by IOM
- Questionnaires sent to relevant stakeholders;
- Interviews (face-to-face, phone) with certain stakeholders;
- Facts and figures presented by relevant stakeholders (Maltese Government and other States, IOM and UNHCR)
Replies received (32/32 = 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number Replied</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating states (19)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participating states (10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project leaders (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues that have been evaluated

- Scope of participation
- Choice of relocation measure
- The selection process
- Information sharing

Facts and figures presented by relevant stakeholders (Maltese Government and other States, IOM and UNHCR)

- Choice of receiving country
- Reception conditions
- Integration
- Funding
Scope of participation

The majority of EU Member States and Associated Countries stated that their decision to participate in relocation activities was a **political decision of solidarity towards Malta**, in line with the EU spirit of solidarity and burden sharing enshrined in the Stockholm programme and the European Pact for Immigration and Asylum.
Why EUREMA?

- Willingness to support and participate in the pilot project;
- ERF funding;
- Gaining experience with relocation;
- Possibility of benefiting from the available expertise of UNHCR and IOM;
- EUREMA project was broadly seen as a tool to facilitate the relocation process and share experience and best practice between project partners.
Challenges identified by respondents (1)

- **Time constraints** relating to identification of candidates, in particular as some required several rounds of counselling before confirming their interest in relocation;
- Limitations and constraints of the participating States' **selection criteria**, in order to match the profile of beneficiaries of international protection in Malta;
- In some cases, **late submission of referral dossiers** to participating States;
- Some dossiers did not contain **sufficient information** allowing detailed pre-selection;
- **Limited involvement** of participating States in the selection process;
Challenges identified by respondents (2)

• Limited number of dossiers submitted to participating States for screening;
• Assessing the willingness and suitability of potential beneficiaries to being relocated;
• Transferring protection within a reasonable timeframe;
• Target group composition (refugees, subsidiary protection, asylum seekers);
• Lack of educational and vocational background of potential beneficiaries;
• Setting up a clear criteria concerning relatives, especially considering family reunification;
Challenges identified by respondents (3)

• Avoiding any risk to present selection as a “à la carte” chance among EU countries;
• Distinction between relocation and resettlement;
• Lack of will by some candidates to commit to relocation offers by 'new' EU Member States where there are few African communities.
Suggestions made by respondents

- To streamline communication amongst the project partners;
- **Wider choice of candidates** for participating States and more information about candidates;
- More time should be dedicated to the **pre-selection process**;
- Family links in relocating countries, education and vocational skills and language skills as advantageous criteria;
- More frequent and accurate cultural orientation sessions;
- **Stricter deadlines** for submission and acceptance of dossiers.
Choice of receiving country

- family links
- presence of communities of the same origin
- labour market
- favourable reception conditions
- general living conditions, social benefits/welfare guarantees
- language
- asylum status (refugee, subsidiary)
- family reunification prospects
- prospects for citizenship
Reasons for decision

- lack of a community of the same origin (hence a perceived lack of social safety net);
- perception that living conditions in the proposed relocating country are difficult and prospects for regular work limited;
- poor social welfare systems (in some cases no guaranteed support after initial phase);
- less favourable integration prospects;
- language barriers;
- the perception that there are other options (US, onward movement in Europe, settlement in Malta).
Integration measures offered by MS

• **Initial accommodation** in reception centres varying from 8 weeks to 6 months;
• **Language classes**, which in some states, was a requirement for citizenship application and employment;
• **Integration courses**;
• **Schooling** for children;
• **Free access to health services**;
• **Social benefits and financial allowances** before finding employment;
• **Temporary residence permits**

*In a number of participating States, social workers, local NGOs, private and church-based organisations were actively involved in the integration process.*
Key challenges

- Funding and administrative requirements;
- Legislative obstacles to relocation;
- Lack of migrants knowledge of ‘new’ participating States;
- National administrative procedures;
- More time for project implementation;
- Lack of central coordinating entity;
- Selection criteria.
Final remarks

- Mixed views about the use of relocation;
- Relocation as a concrete tool for demonstrating intra-EU solidarity;
- Concerns on possible implications of relocation on resettlement quotas in EU;
- Lack of harmonisation of the different aspects of relocation;
- Need for prompt and flexible financing;
- Relocation as part of a range of intra-EU solidarity measures;
- Participant in relocation as voluntary and based on a political decision.