

**Integration as a Two-Way Process in the EU?**  
***Enhancing EU support to a process of mutual  
accommodation between Migrants and the Receiving Society  
with the EIF.***  
**Conference Report**

6<sup>th</sup> July 2011, EESC, Room VM3, rue Van Maerlant 2, b-1040 Brussels  
(Jointly organised by European Economic and Social Committee and Committee of the Regions)

This conference examined the added value of the EU Framework on Integration by assessing the extent to which the European Integration Fund (henceforth known as EIF) had so far served to support and develop national actions, programmes and projects putting into practice the European understanding of integration as a two way process. Welcome remarks were made by Sergio Carrera, Head of Section and Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for European Policy Studies. Carrera pointed out how the events in North Africa and the Mediterranean since the beginning of 2011 have led to a prioritization of security-related and anti-immigration debates and policies across various EU Member States and the Union. I Carrera started by giving a general overview of the project commissioned by the European Programme for Integration and Migration (EPIM) of the Network of European Foundations (NEF). Introducing the first panel of speakers, Carrera highlighted how timely this phase is to discuss about the current configurations and future policy steps of the EU Framework on Integration and the European Integration Fund. He also expressed the fundamental role played by local and regional authorities, social partners and civil society at large at times of understanding and putting into practice effective integration policies, and expressed his gratitude to the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee for jointly organising the event with the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS).

The speakers:

<b>First Panel:</b>
<b>THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION FUND AND THE COMMON BASIC PRINCIPLES</b>
<b>Ms. Amandine Bach</b> , Policy Officer / Project Coordinator – <i>European Women’s Lobby</i>
<b>Ms. Anne Bathily</b> , Project Manager – <i>European Council for Refugees and Exiles</i>
<b>Ms. Anna Maria Darmanin</b> , Vice President – <i>European Economic and Social Committee</i>
<b>Ms. Ana Feder</b> , Project Officer – <i>Eurocities</i>
<b>Ms. Anaïs Faure Atger</b> , Researcher – <i>Centre for European Policy Studies</i>
<b>Ms. Shannon Pfohman</b> , Policy Manager – <i>European Network Against Racism</i>
<b>Chair: Mr. Sergio Carrera</b> , Head of Section and Senior Research Fellow – <i>Centre for European Policy Studies</i>

**Second Panel:  
THE FUTURE OF THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION FUND AND THE EU  
FRAMEWORK ON INTEGRATION**

**Mr. Sergio Carrera**, Head of Section and Senior Research Fellow – *Centre for European Policy Studies*

**Mr. Thomas Huddleston**, Policy Analyst – *Migration Policy Group*

**Mr. Stefano Signore**, Head of Unit – *European Commission – DG Home Affairs*

**Mr. Gerhard Stahl**, Secretary General – *Committee of the Regions*

**Chair: Ms. Debora Guidetti**, Programme Manager – *European Programme for Integration and Migration*

**Panel 1: THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION FUND AND THE COMMON BASIC  
PRINCIPLES**

Chair: Sergio Carrera (CEPS)

**Ms. Anna Maria Darmanin (EESC):** *European Economic and Social Committee contributes to strengthening the democratic legitimacy and effectiveness of the European Union by enabling civil society organisations from the Member States to express their views at European level. Darmanin is the Vice President in charge of Communications.*

Having agreed an agenda within the EESC of ‘engaging people for a sustainable Europe’<sup>1</sup>, Darmanin reiterated the impacts felt due to what she entitled a “Social and Political Crisis”: that immigrants have become the “scapegoat... subjected to discriminatory policies”. The fear of xenophobia creeping into policy, according to Darmanin- is real, and that the consequence is a political crisis, to add to the social, economical and financial crisis occurring currently. Immigration has thus manifested within this political crisis, making the involvement of civil society in initiatives such as the [Integration Forum](#) integral. Darmanin stated that the sentiment of civil society at the last Integration Forum<sup>2</sup> was “a cry out” for change. She recommended that the results of the EIF could benefit with the inclusion of Refugees and Irregular Migrants. As well as this she highlighted that there should be more support for migrant associations, an exchange of national-international partners, more independent evaluations and that the share of co-financing is an issue of concern which should be further examined.

In her concluding remarks, Darmanin shared that in the 473<sup>rd</sup> Plenary Discussion of the EESC, the findings of the CEPS study will be discussed and voted on<sup>3</sup>. With this in mind the Commission should, according to Darmanin, manage 20% of the EIF with a focus on actions with high added value. Rather than financing large organisations, consideration should be given to the fact that integration is a social process- it is reliant on national, regional and local levels cooperation – from the family, schools and neighbourhoods. The

<sup>1</sup> Nilsson, Staffan (2010) Engaging People for a Sustainable Europe – A role for civil society : President’s Work Programme and Priorities for 2010-2013 <[http://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/cese\\_programme-nilsson\\_en.pdf](http://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/cese_programme-nilsson_en.pdf) >

<sup>2</sup> The Fifth European Integration Forum took place on 23<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> May 2011, Agenda: <[http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/static\\_38\\_496554183.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/static_38_496554183.pdf)>

<sup>3</sup> The results of this Plenary Discussion can be found here: <http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.press-releases.19292>

priority is thus to incorporate Article 10<sup>4</sup> on Partnership into the agenda. Other concerns refer to the fact that procedures and rules are often too specific and the questions whether the integration supported to date is really a two way process remains open.

Reacting to Darmanin intervention, Carrera stressed that whilst mindful of the non discrimination principle, it should be the EU role to determine what is acceptable or not within the EIF.

**Ms. Anaïs Faure Atger (CEPS):** *CEPS is an independent Brussels based research centre focussing on nine policy areas of the European Union. Faure-Atger is a researcher in the Justice and Home Affairs CEPs Research Area.*

After a presentation on the background, objectives and methodologies of the report entitled “Integration as a Two-Way Process in the EU? Enhancing EU support to a process of mutual accommodation between Migrants and the Receiving Society with the EIF” Faure-Atger gave an account of how the [European Integration Fund](#) has been used, the typology of actions and finally the recommendations associated with the research.

Particularly, Faure Atger highlighted the obstacles met by NGOs and LRAs (Local and Regional Authorities) when applying for and implementing the EIF 93% of which is administered at national level, mainly by Interior and Migration Ministries. While practices at national level showed different trends, she highlighted similarities and particularly comparable difficulties existed. Several practical and administrative obstacles were presented including administrative requirements, the limitations applicable to the eligible target group, co-financing aspects and absence of publicity. The lack of adequate information activities in the scope of the EIF contributes to a lack of transparency in the allocation and evaluation of projects which undermines the overall value of the EIF.

She stressed that few MS had implemented the partnership principle according to which MS shall work together with other bodies and authorities which are involved in the implementation of the national strategy on integration.

As to the key findings of the research Faure Atger selected four including:

First, the fact that several EU Member States have largely allocated EIF funding to implementing CBP<sup>4</sup>, through the development, with the support of the EIF, of obligatory language and civic courses and programs on knowledge of national culture and ‘society’ as conditions for having access to rights. This, she stressed, had been to the expense of the materialization of the two-way process.

Second, in several MS, national governments/bodies appear to receive the largest share of Community contributions at the expense of others, mainly ‘integration actors’, such as NGOs and LRAs.

Third, the interpretation of the personal scope of activities under the EIF rather than promoting inclusion of all into society triggers a strategy of differentiation which supports differential treatment depending on the legal status of the individual.

<sup>4</sup> Article 10 of the Council of the European Union, Decision 2007/435/EC of 25 June 2007 establishing the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals for the Period 2007 to 2013 a part of the General Programme “Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows”. OJ L 168/18, 28.6.2007 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:168:0018:0036:EN:PDF>

<sup>5</sup> Common Basic Principle 4: Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.

Fourth, that current usages of the EIF show clear tensions with the two-way process of mutual accommodation which however represent the added value of EU involvement on matters of integration

She concluded by stressing that EU support to the integration process and to key integration actors was central and addressed ways for ensuring that the EIF supports an understanding of integration as a two-way process. Faure Atger then briefly presented the 9 policy recommendations put forward in the report.

## **Discussants:**

**Ms. Ana Feder (Eurocities):** *Eurocities works towards reinforcing the role and place that local governments should have in a multi-level governance structure. Feder is currently working in the area of Inclusion, one of the three Eurocities policy principles together with climate and recovery.*

By highlighting firstly that the report adds vital independent research evidence to the collective debate begun within the European Integration Forum, Feder emphasized the symbolic value of the EIF as a fund for integration at a moment when Member States are cutting domestic integration funding. Secondly, the importance of improving the fund is thought by Feder to be a way of investing for the [EU2020 Strategy](#). Proceeding these comments, three problem areas were highlighted.

### 1. Personal Scope

The reality is not as clearly presented as the theory. For example, as a city implements a project with EIF, there are many common problems that arise not only for regularly residing Third Country Nationals, but also for asylum seekers, refugees and undocumented migrants, which can highlight the difficulties with implementing through rigid structures. Therefore the idea to merge the EIF and the European Refugee Fund into one larger fund seems a step in the right direction. Considering the different interpretations among the MS, the focus should be more on the impact rather than on the pre-conditions and the members of the receiving society should be included too.

### 2. Co-Financing

There is a need for clear priorities based on real needs rather than on interpretation. These can be identified during the European Integration Forum as most attendees work “on the ground” and thus can bring valuable experience to the forefront. Furthermore, the results of the projects funded should be used to inform integration policies at the EU and national levels.

### 3. Access

Procedural and administrative barriers could be easily overcome if regulations are simplified. The second problem is associated with content and interpretation which can vary “widely” from a MS to another. More coherence is needed in the implementation of the EIF: the guidelines of the Common Basic Principles<sup>6</sup> (CBPs) the Modules and the benchmarks currently developed together with the Integration Forum can be of help

**Ms. Shannon Pfohman (ENAR):** *The European Network Against Racism works to promote equality of treatment between European Union citizens and third country nationals, and to link*

---

<sup>6</sup> Council of the European Union, 2618th Meeting of the Justice and Home Affairs Council, Common Basic Principles on Immigrants Integration, 14615/04, Brussels, 19th November 2004

*local/regional/national initiatives with European Union initiatives. ENAR has a specific policy area entitled Migration and Integration.*

From the experience of ENAR's 700 members working at the grass-roots level, Pfohman was able to explain that some of the most vulnerable groups had been excluded from the funding which focuses only on new comers, while integration is an on-going long term process. As many as 60% of people from a survey ENAR had carried out stated that further integration would not be happening without additional support. Pfohman concluded that the emphasis on integration as disproportionately placed on migrants (e.g. the fact that the main bulk of funds goes to actions linked to CBP 4) has only worsened things.

**Ms. Anne Bathily (ECRE):** *The European Council on Refugees and Exiles is a pan-European alliance of different organisations in 30 countries, working to protect and promote respect of all individuals seeking asylum in Europe. Bathily is responsible for coordinating ECRE's work on integration, her ultimate aim is to set up a pan-European network of refugees involved with ECRE's work.*

Bathily was able to convey the anger felt from the findings of the report through 6 key points.

1. The idea of merging the European Refugee Fund with the European Integration Fund has more benefits than not.
2. The lack of clear definition in the guidance of the Fund resulted in CBP4 being a primary beneficiary – Bathily alluded that this disproportionate emphasis on civic integration highlights the misguidance of Member States. Moreover, more importance rests on people's ability to demonstrate the acquisition of a technical knowledge rather than access and facilitation of services- which in turn has negative impacts on people's chances to integrate.
3. Furthermore, the lack of clarity led the Fund to be used as a tool for national politics and policy which has a focus on security. The findings of the INTEC (Integration and Naturalisation Tests, the New Way to European Citizenship<sup>7</sup>) study in the Netherlands show the negative impact of "integration" programs for the security of the legal status of a person or the possibilities of family reunification.
4. Further to this, Bathily retorted that the necessary acquisition of language does not automatically imply integration: the key for efficiency is to ensure access and participation also for non newcomers.
5. The compulsory requirements of integration tests affect more directly the most vulnerable groups such as the Elderly, Refugees and Women.
6. There are worrying signs in the soon to be published new Agenda for Integration which is expected to focus also on "the external dimension of integration". Bathily suggests that there is something unsettling in the process of pre-departure measures for integration in sending countries which are supposed to ensure the integration of TCNs into European societies before their departure.

The consequences of all these points are two-fold. The impact upon status is more prominent, insofar that the legal status of a migrant is the key factor for the possibility to integrate. The second consequence is the lack of coherence between the different European Union instruments regarding migration and the implementation of the EIF. In fact, integration is not

---

<sup>7</sup> See: <<http://www.ru.nl/law/cmr/projects/overview/intec/>>

only about harmonisation and soft law: many directives mention integration or impact on it (for example, the Family Reunification Directive<sup>8</sup>, and the Long Term Residents Directive<sup>9</sup>) and speaking about this is an issue when we know that 2/3 of the EIF are used to develop these civic and integration programs. On the one hand the directives can secure migrants' status, and on the other hand the Fund has been used to develop obstacles to reach the objectives of those directives- the example of how compulsory integration exams are limiting the scope of Family Reunification Directive is used here.

**Ms. Amandine Bach (EWL):** *European Women's Lobby has been running a project for and with migrant women's organisations across Europe that aims to actively involve migrant women in the development, monitoring and implementation of policies at the European level. Bach has been a main coordinator in this project which led to the creation of the European Network of Migrant Women (ENoMW)*

Following on from Bathily, Bach stressed the anger felt by civil society, regarding the implementation of the fund as following "a political agenda, rather than on evaluation". While it is hoped that the results of this report will complement those of the INTI study and input on post 2013 funding. However, the value of the fund itself was underlined especially in light of integration funding cuts at a national level. The failure of the Partnership Principle was articulated: even though participatory mechanisms have been developed at local or national level these are not used for the EIF as there is little incentive when the onus is on the MS. The definition of a "good/best practice" from the view point of some MS like the Netherlands or Denmark varies a lot from the interpretation of the CSOs. As a result, the best practise gathered cannot be considered, and does not represent 'Best Practice'.

Bach provided a small list of outcomes which highlights this:

1. Consultations arranged by the MS with the civil society often happen too late and rarely lead to policy impact. This can frustrate NGOs, particularly those overwhelmed ones which are also direct service providers, and lead to a reluctance in taking part in the same consultative processes.
2. Development of Projects needs to involve all the different stakeholders: Migrants, Academics, NGOs, Government, etc. otherwise they will be ineffective. While the very large organisations usually supported by the EIF generally opt for a go alone strategy.
3. The Fund has granted many large organisations which go into national policies on civic integration rather than on more pressing integration needs.
4. There appears to be little or no obligation to have civil society, or migrant lead organisations as partners or leaders. In The INTI<sup>10</sup> programme migrants were normally seen as mere beneficiaries and only 2% of the organisations funded were migrant NGOs participating as partners to disseminate the information.
5. Due to its lack of flexibility many NGOs have "given up" trying to access the Fund and particularly at the European level the fund gets bigger but so does the co-financing obligation which has meant that many were unable to be eligible. The in

<sup>8</sup> Council Directive [2003/86/EC](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:251:0012:0018:EN:PDF) of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification < <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:251:0012:0018:EN:PDF>>

<sup>9</sup> Council Directive [2003/109/EC](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:016:0044:0053:EN:PDF) of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents < <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:016:0044:0053:EN:PDF>>

<sup>10</sup> For more information see: < [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/report\\_2005\\_2006\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/report_2005_2006_en.pdf)>

kind contribution such as the staff time brought in by the NGOs should be considered as co-financing.

Bach, similar to Bathily, concludes that the potential future funding of pre-departure measures is a concern, and such methods need rigorous evaluation. Taking the cue from the INTEC study, Bach reiterates the message that these pre-departure methods are used and conceived as a form of migration control and not as tools for integration and social inclusion. Hence, she calls for a serious evaluation of such measures. Moreover, the distinction between Citizen and Non-Citizen is stressed, potentially affecting the access to healthcare, employment and education. Finally, she encourages the institutions to take advantage of the post Lisbon changes in a more progressive way both leveraging the increased role of the EP and exploiting the fact that the unanimity is no more required in the Council.

An issue which arose during the debate following the speakers' intervention revolved around the reason why some national integration policies with a focus on integration were funded through the EIF. Beyond a context of negative debate on integration and the crisis effect on shrinking funds for integration, an explanation worth further exploration proposed that this also could have been a strategy to implement restrictive policies without the national parliamentary control which wouldn't have allowed governments to fund similar initiatives in such a sensible domain.

## **Panel 2: THE FUTURE OF THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION FUND AND OF THE EU FRAMEWORK ON INTEGRATION**

Chair: Debora Guidetti (EPIM)

**Mr. Gerhard Stahl (CoR):** *Committee of the Regions involve regional and local authorities in the European decision-making process at the earliest stage through mandatory consultation by the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers on key policy areas of regional concern.*

With Europe containing more than 40 million people with foreign born backgrounds<sup>11</sup> Stahl posed the question "what is a migrant?" Eluding to the fact that Europe has only 7% of world population, which by 2050 it will be 5%, Stahl confirmed that Europe cannot deny the need for migrants. The discourse of populism has been to follow an agenda of assimilation, which according to Stahl has been made more vocal in the mainstream, making the climate for local decision making harder. The need for a factual debate (such as the one started by the CoR in 2009 around the role of 'Local and Regional Authorities for Integration Policy'<sup>12</sup>) and multi-

<sup>11</sup> Vasileva, Katya (2011) Eurostat – Statistics in Focus 34/2011 'Population and Social Conditions' – European Commission <[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY\\_OFFPUB/KS-SF-11-034/EN/KS-SF-11-034-EN.PDF](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-11-034/EN/KS-SF-11-034-EN.PDF)>

<sup>12</sup> See: Carrera, Sergio (2009) 'The role and potential of local and regional authorities in the EU framework for the integration of immigrants', Centre for European Studies, <<http://www.ceps.eu/system/files/article/2009/12/The%20role%20and%20potential%20of%20local%20and%20regional%20authorities%20in%20the%20EU%20framework%20for%20the%20integration%20of%20immigrants.071009.pdf>> and the CoR, Final report on the consultation on the upcoming second European agenda on integration, 5.05.2011 <http://portal.cor.europa.eu/europe2020/news/Pages/ReportontheCoRconsultationontheupcomingSecondEuropeanAgendaonIntegration.aspx>

level governance is ever-present. Stahl shared the potential of the [October open day](#)<sup>13</sup> in which local authorities were able attend different workshops on themes such as Integration Policies, to gain a wider breadth of knowledge. Yet he presented fears that in some cases there was still a concentration on education of skills such as language. Theoretically asking what changes is the receiving society ready to take to adapt and ensure the integration of migrants, Stahl made the important recognition that such a change must happen at every level for our societies to be attractive also to highly skilled migrants. For instance the Civil Service should be more open to employ migrants, voting rights at the administrative level should be granted and openness to double nationality ensured. In such a context, beyond sharing good practices and positive experiences, the EU can play its role and orient national debates also through funding the right priorities.

**Mr. Stefano Signore (EC):** *Signore is the Head of Unit of Financial Support for Immigration and Asylum in the Directorate General of Home Affairs of the European Commission*

Signore based its presentation on the findings of the mid-term evaluation of the Fund which is currently being finalized and which focused not on the relevance and effectiveness of the EIF, but on the MS experience and on its impact on the 27 MS.

- Overall in three years the Fund has had 5300 proposals of which 2000 projects were supported
- Annually the fund has had (so far) 2000 proposals, of which 800 projects have been chosen

Signore maintained that the Fund is relevant for needs of those Member States who lack integration policies. Reacting to some points raised in the previous panel, Signore stressed that the additionality principle is not a legal obligation and that often the fund enabled the continuity of national initiatives in a context of crisis. Moreover, the MS co-financed 25% to 50% of the EIF actions with matching funds being asked to the beneficiaries. The need for simplification of the process and procedures was acknowledged, with 75% of the funding given as pre- financing also for advanced funding. The personal scope of the fund will be enlarged to include also 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> generation migrants among the possible project beneficiaries. The EIF gained acceptance by the MS which used it for issues which otherwise couldn't be tackled.

Regarding the future, and based on the EC proposal of the 29<sup>th</sup> June, Signore underscored that specific instruments such as the EIF have been deemed relevant for continuation until 2014.

Signore went on to describe how less than 1% of EU budget is for the management of 6 funds within DG Home. In the future, DG Home funding will be organised around two main pillars: one focusing on Internal Security and migration management/control and the other will be dealing with the migration cycle and asylum. The latter is 4% of the Home Affairs Budget and covers:

- Relocation,
- Return Management,
- Asylum and Migration (With part of the Fund for I.T projects)

---

<sup>13</sup> Committee of the Regions 'European Week of Regions Cities' Open Days <  
[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/conferences/od2011/index.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/conferences/od2011/index.cfm)> see for past open days: <  
[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/conferences/od2011/archive.cfm?nmenu=8&sub=800](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/conferences/od2011/archive.cfm?nmenu=8&sub=800)>

Aspirations:

Signore presented a particular model in which the Fund could be simplified into a multi-annual programme which would allow the EC to concentrate on substance and be more assertive with MS. To follow, the Fund would align its methodologies with those of the structural funds facilitating the life of beneficiaries, and to prioritize activities at the local and regional levels. The focus on content would derive from CBP<sup>14</sup>, integration as a two-way process, availing itself to more of a “targeted approach rather than a shopping list “of objectives by means of providing access to local services and addressing vulnerable groups such as the elderly, or women. The emphasis will be less on procedures and more on a shared management.

**Mr. Thomas Huddleston (MPG):** *Migration Policy Group is an independent non-profit European organisation committed to contributing to lasting and positive change. Huddleston is working in the Diversity and Integration Programme, one of three focus areas within MPG.*

Beginning with the Lisbon Treaty<sup>15</sup> and the Stockholm Programme<sup>16</sup>, Huddleston identified three possible scenarios resulting from the discussions regarding the EIF:

- a. maintain the status quo or
  - b. open/restrict elements of the Fund for adaptation
  - c. make the EIF an integral part of a coordinated policy on integration
- a. Maintaining the Status Quo: Huddleston recognised that the Fund (and the CBPs) was an accomplishment in themselves (as they were introduced before the Treaty of Lisbon). By sheer fact of its creation, Huddleston credits the Fund with obliging MS to acknowledge integration as an issue, and to place it on the agenda. It is in Huddleston’s opinion essential funding. However, post the Treaty of Lisbon Huddleston more needs to be done:, despite providing an incentive to do “something”, the themes of the EIF are too wide and too unbalanced, the agendas are set at the national level making whatever is done an automatic ‘best practice’.
  - b. Adapting the fund: having said that adapting the EIF would be a possibility, but that it wouldn’t be enough; Huddleston explores different modifications of the Fund, such as enlarging the personal scope even beyond the beneficiaries of international protection to include 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> generation, students, or even those who stay less than one year. He goes on suggesting looking at how other funds such as the structural funds addressed similar problems. He concludes by commenting that merging EIF and ERF should still ensure the coverage of the costs related to reception and processing of claims, while some funds should anyhow go to implementing integration policy.
  - c. Using the EIF as coordinated mechanism on integration: Huddleston advocates for this last option and urges for a coherent use of all the tools available for EU institutions in the integration policies toolbox in line with the standards set by the relevant directives (anti-

<sup>14</sup> Common Basic Principle 1: Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.

<sup>15</sup> Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, Official Journal of the European Union  
<<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML> >

<sup>16</sup> The Stockholm Programme — An Open and Secure Europe Serving and Protecting Citizens, Official Journal of the European Union (2010/C 115/01)  
<<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:en:PDF>>

discrimination<sup>17</sup>, family reunification etc.) whose transposition and implementation has to be monitored; the infringement procedures; and the decisions of the European Court of Justice. More emphasis is needed on coordination (e.g. the NCPIs are not meeting with the Integration Forum yet) and more support by the EU level for a wider coherence. By asserting that it is important for migrants to learn the host language, Huddleston emphasized how specific integration measure can be seen as only one approach to the issue, not forgetting mainstreamed approaches in education, and employment. Finally, mapping exercises should be done to ensure that policies have the most effective outcomes and the expected impact, that information can be exchanged, and that, most importantly, the EU instruments are in line with the policies.

**Mr. Sergio Carrera (CEPS):** *CEPS is an independent Brussels based research centre focussing on nine policy areas of the European Union. Carrera is the Head of the Justice and Home Affairs Programme*

Entitled “Ways forward? Lessons learned?” Carrera reflected on whether the Fund was really related to the priorities, whilst identifying the gaps with the priorities and what had actually been funded.

Lessons learned: By questioning the concept of integration, and its evolution from the 1970s, Carerra highlighted the shift from integration as a socio-economic process based on access to rights towards a securitising approach. The latter made the compliance with integration tests an instrument used by immigration law to acquire or conserve a status. Hence, integration rationale moved from a purpose of inclusion to a reflection around how the receiving society can exclude those who don’t adapt to its “way of life” By questioning the trend to conceive civic integration tests as a precondition for integration and the ability to speak the language as a requirement to access basic rights, Carerra develops the argument that integration need not be assimilation, and that by making the Fund criteria less specific, the European Union allowed a venue for MS to put only CBP2<sup>18</sup> and CBP4 into popular discourse. In fact, it’s not clear in virtue of which subjacent criteria or benchmarking mechanism a determined national practice could be labelled as good or bad. Research such as the INTEC study has shown that:

- The effect of mandatory integration tests has led to a decrease in the number of permanent residence permits being given (e.g. de facto these tests have been used to limit family reunification); and
- that the burden of integration lies only on the migrant and that it is conceived as his/her responsibility to integrate. Even more so when the emphasis is put on a legal requirement to perform integration tests abroad

This is problematic from the viewpoint of the fundamental rights, particularly so at a moment when the EU is accessing the ECHR.

The Way forward: From Carerra’s apprehension, policies that continue to contradict CBP1 are of a dubious legal nature and should not be supported at EU level. The EU institutions have achieved a lot, but they are now witnessing a misuse of the EIF by certain EU Member States. Conceiving integration as a two-way process of mutual accommodation has the potential to condemn national practises which conflict with integration. Should the EU fund

<sup>17</sup> COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin

< <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2000:180:0022:0026:EN:PDF>>

<sup>18</sup> Common Basic Principle 2: Integration implies respect for the basic values of the European Union

policies/projects which could be deemed illegal? Why, under the banner of integration, are border technologies advanced using the EIF? Why is integration abroad supported when those measures are not used to facilitate integration, but misused as a tool for policing at a distance? If Integration is truly a two way process, then where are the safe guards to protect the principles of diversity, non-discrimination and fundamental rights? A major step towards this would be to strengthen the role of the EU institutions insofar that the Fund is used to its capacity, and to serve CBP1 in its fullest.