
EPC Policy Update for the European Programme for Integration and Migration¹

June 2014

Andreia Ghimis, Yves Pascouau and Alex Lazarowicz

Highlights

The European Parliament elections of May 2014 have redistributed the political cards within the assembly. While the number of Eurosceptic – some of which are also anti-immigration – Members of the European Parliament has increased, there are concerns about the impact of this change on the evolution of EU's immigration and asylum policies in the next political cycle. This policy update includes a **special focus** on these political changes and their possible implications.

On the legislative side, two crucial texts have been adopted: the **Intra-Corporate Transferees Directive** and the new **Frontex Regulation**. In addition, the European Commission published its **annual report on immigration and asylum** highlighting the major trends in these policy areas. Two other Commission reports have been issued: one in the field of legal migration, evaluating the impact of the **Blue Card Directive** and one in the field of irregular migration evaluating the **Employers' Sanctions Directive**.

Upcoming on the agenda: the **new strategic guidelines in the areas of freedom, justice and security** to be adopted by the European Council on 26 and 27 June replacing the Stockholm Programme (2009-2014) - see previous EPIM update. These guidelines should define the legislative and operational planning for the years to come in the area of freedom, security and justice. While highly important to pave the way for immigration and asylum policies in the future, there are still some strong divergences among Member States regarding several topics such as: legal migration, burden sharing mechanisms and smart borders. In order to prepare the strategic guidelines, discussions have been held in the Justice and Home Affairs Council (5-6 June) and COREPER II meetings.

¹ This document provides a focused analysis of recent EU-level policy-making, legislation and jurisprudence relevant to EPIM's three focus areas – (1) asylum seekers; (2) undocumented migrants; and (3) equality, integration and social inclusion of vulnerable migrants and it covers the period from 1 April 2014 to 31 May 2014.

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

For more information on EPIM, please visit www.epim.info.

General Developments

Legal Migration

Intra-corporate transferees

Despite EP Employment Committee's reluctance (see previous [EPIM update](#)) towards the inter-institutional compromise reached on the [Intra-corporate transferees Directive](#), the European Parliament has [adopted](#) it by 358 votes in favour, 278 against, and 39 abstentions. Following the Parliament's vote, the Council [backed](#) the compromise on 13 May.

This Directive ([2014/66/EU](#)) is expected to set the framework for the admission of approximately 15 000 to 20 000 intra-corporate transferees (third country nationals transferred from one undertaking to another one belonging to the same group) annually and contribute to the EU's competitiveness and economic growth.

According to the [Commission](#), the Directive ensures that, when employed, intra-corporate transferees (ICTs) benefit from conditions equal to the ones under which EU posted workers are hired. Furthermore, equal treatment with nationals is ensured with respect to some protective rights and social security provisions such as: freedom of association and affiliation, recognition of diplomas, certificates and professional qualifications, access to goods and services.

One difficult point in the negotiations concerned mobility rights. As noted by Alex Lazarowicz (EPC) in this [policy brief](#), while the EP would have wanted short term mobility (90 days in any 180 days) to be expedient, the Council introduced several safeguards that Member States can include in their national legislation (notification, required documents, possibility to object to the mobility of the ICT). The EP was concerned that this could lead to a form of re-examination by the second Member State, and these provisions remain in the final text. Lazarowicz explained that this shows a lack of trust between Member States related to the checks they have to carry out, as some were worried ICTs would be able to enter their country via more lenient Member States. Although the final provisions on short-term mobility are more complex, it is possible for mobility to be made more expedient when it is foreseen in the original application for an ICT permit to the first Member State. In such a case mobility may be initiated immediately, according to Article 21.5.

Report on the implementation of the Blue Card Directive

This [report](#) presents statistics related to the impact of the Blue Card Directive. In 2012, 3 664 Blue Cards were granted and 1 107 family members were admitted. The Member States which issued the highest numbers of Blue Cards were: Germany (2584), Spain (461) and Luxembourg (183). The top countries of origin in 2012 were India, China and Russia.

The Commission concludes that the Directive has set minimal standards and left wide margins of maneuver for Member States. As a consequence, national schemes for attracting highly qualified migrants are competing against each other. Furthermore, the Commission is concerned about the flaws in transposition, the low level of coherence and the barriers to intra-EU mobility for this category of third country nationals coming to one EU Member State.

Post-Stockholm process – the future of justice and home affairs policies

The European Council will define the strategic guidelines at its 26-27 June meeting. This will represent the final step of a long process in which several stakeholders have been involved to different extents (see previous [EPIM update](#)).

A leaked [Council document](#) presents the outcomes of the discussions between national governments and the possible content of the future guidelines. The discussions have crystallised around three main chapters: (1) **Freedom, Security and Justice in a changing and challenging world**, (2) **protecting citizens and societies**, (3) **justice and home affairs policies (JHA) for more dynamic societies**. The issues related to immigration and asylum are dealt with in the first and third sections.

While the document addresses several issues related *inter alia* to the external dimension, the need to implement the Common European Asylum System, border management and return policies, it represents a summary of Member States' positions and draws some possible ways forward. The Council's document portrays a continuation of the security-oriented approach that currently defines the EU's immigration policy. At this stage, it does not preclude what the strategic guidelines will look like.

It can however be underlined that there are still some divergences between Member States regarding critical issues such as: burden sharing mechanisms, the way international protection applications should be treated, the costs of the Smart Borders project and the issue of legal migration of third country nationals.

As the European Policy Centre highlighted in this [discussion paper](#), academics have [raised concerns](#) about the timing of adoption of these strategic guidelines. The new Commission and European Parliament will not have had the chance to contribute to their formulation, which could create further problems in the implementation of the legislative and operational planning deriving from the guidelines.

In addition, and as already underlined in several papers, abovementioned academics underline several issues that need to be tackled at EU level: non-financial solidarity, the lack of consensus on the issue of legal migration, the [worries expressed](#) related to [EU's ageing population](#), the potential of legal migration to contribute to [EU's economic growth](#) and innovation boost, so on and so forth.

However, final decisions have not yet been taken. Further discussions will be held at Coreper II (4 June, 11 June, 16-17 June) and JHA Council (5-6 June) levels before the final strategic guidelines are adopted by the Heads of State and Government at the end of June.

Annual report on immigration and asylum

This fifth [annual report](#) ([Commission staff working document](#)) on immigration and asylum published by the Commission includes some interesting key figures:

- At the beginning of 2013, the EU population was 503 million, of which 20.4 million (4%) were third country nationals;
- In 2012, 2.1 million first residence permits were issued to third country nationals (32% for family reasons, 23% for remunerated activities, 22% for study and 23% for other reasons including international protection);
- The countries whose nationals were given the highest number of first residence permits are: USA, Ukraine, China, and India.
- The total number of asylum applications in 2013 was 434 160, approximately 100 000 more than in 2012. Most applicants came from: Syria, Russia, Afghanistan, Serbia, Pakistan and Kosovo.
- In 2013, 317 840 were refused entry to the EU and 166 470 non-EU citizens were returned to third countries.

One important issue raised by the report is the need to find solutions to the problem of people dying at the EU's external borders. The European Commission highlights – as the EPC made clear in several [papers](#) – that one important way to ensure the safety of Europe's borders would be to create appropriate channels for legal entry into the EU. Furthermore, the European Commission sees legal migration as a tool for growth and, in this vein, encourages dialogue among Member States in order to identify the best practices in terms of migrants' labour market integration.

UK opt in/opt out

In June this year, the UK must decide whether it wants to opt out (with the possibility to opt in on a case-by-case basis) of 130 police and judicial cooperation measures which, starting in December 2014, will be subject to the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice ([Article 10, Protocol 36, TEU](#)). Although not directly linked to immigration and asylum, these measures are meant to combat crime, racism and xenophobia.

In October 2013, the Home Affairs and Justice Committees of the House of Commons published two reports analysing the 35 measures for which the UK Government decided to opt back into (see [EPIM update](#) December 2013).

Discussions are ongoing between the EU and UK. The [Friends of Presidency Group](#) (which aims to reflect and provide guidance and input on the application of the provisions related to the British opt out) met several times: 18 March, 31 March, 15 April, 30 April and 15 May 2014. Several key issues have been discussed: the procedure for re-opting in which will be different for non-Schengen measures and

Schengen measures; and others will need to be tackled under the upcoming Italian Presidency: the possible need for transitional measures, the financial implications.

Asylum seekers

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 1

Syrian asylum seekers in the European Union

The European Commission's DG Humanitarian aid and civil protection (DG ECHO) published a [factsheet](#) on the Syrian crisis. The findings put forward by DG ECHO portray the intensity of a multidimensional crisis and the political efforts made at global level in order to minimise its effects.

In May 2014, 9.3 million Syrians (out of the total population of 23 million) were in need of humanitarian assistance inside Syria. The number of refugees (registered and awaiting registration) outside of Syria reached approximately 2 700 000 (among which 1 059 000 in Lebanon, 740 000 in Turkey and 590 000 in Turkey). Amnesty International published a report "[Agonizing choices: Syrian refugees in need of health care in Lebanon](#)", recognising the high pressure on infrastructure and services (shelter, education, health care) that Lebanon is facing. The number of Syrian refugees in this country is extremely high in contrast to its small population of approximately 4 million people. As the UNHCR [underlines](#), that would be the equivalent of 19 million refugees in Germany and over 73 million refugees in the USA.

The financial aid provided up to now by the EU inside Syria and in the region is approximately € 2.8 billion, whereas Member States pledged an additional humanitarian and development aid of € 358 million.

Several EU Member States [offered](#) to receive refugees on humanitarian admission or resettlement, with Germany pledging the highest number of places (10 000). However, the EU is not taking responsibility in terms of resettlement capacity. According to François Crépeau, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants, Europe is perfectly [capable of absorbing](#) 250,000 Syrian refugees per year. But fourteen EU Member States refused to resettle any Syrian refugee. At the beginning of May, the German Parliament called for an EU conference on resettlement of refugees from Syria. ECRE strongly [supports](#) the initiative of the German Parliament. The EPC shares this view. As Yves Pascouau highlighted in a [Commentary](#) (October 2013), "*the same old recipe: targeted and usual financial and practical support, good intentions and grand rhetoric recalling EU solidarity without committing anyone to action*" is no longer working. It is time for concrete actions, and the first steps that would need to be taken at EU level are the engagement into more resettlement programmes and granting protection to refugees outside the EU territory.

Implementation and Interpretation of Existing Legislation

European Court of Justice (ECJ) case law

Case C-604/12, H.N., 8 May 2014

The H.N. [judgment](#) concerns a Pakistani who entered Ireland on a student visa in 2003. After marrying an Irish national, he was granted the permission to remain in Ireland until end of 2005. In 2006, his residence permit was not renewed as he was no longer living with his wife. Consequently, Mr. N. applied for subsidiary protection without having applied previously for asylum. Because he had not applied for refugee status before, the Irish Minister for Justice refused to consider his application for subsidiary protection.

The ECJ explains that Article 2(e) of [Directive 2004/83](#) indicates that the persons eligible for subsidiary protection are third country nationals who do not qualify as refugee. Furthermore, it is for the competent authorities to determine the most appropriate status for the applicant's situation. Therefore, the Irish legislation requiring seekers of international protection to follow two separate procedural stages (application for refugee status, and only in case of refusal, application for subsidiary protection) is not contrary to EU law if the two applications can be introduced at the same time and if the application for subsidiary protection is considered within a reasonable period of time. With respect to the right to good administration, it includes the right of any person to have his or her affairs handled impartially and within a reasonable period of time.

As Steve Peers (University of Essex) [comments](#), the second generation qualification [Directive 2011/95/EU](#) includes this two-step approach to international protection in EU law by stating that “*person eligible for subsidiary protection means a third-country national or a stateless person who does not qualify as a refugee*”.

Reports regarding the implementation of EU rules in the Member States



Greece – Amnesty International

With this report “[Greece: frontier of hope and fear](#)”, Amnesty International shows that push backs of migrants – some fleeing violence and persecution, others in search of a better life – happen recurrently both at Greek land and sea borders. The report suggests that Greek authorities should immediately stop push backs at the land border and ensure that migrants intercepted in the Aegean Sea have access to individual procedures in order to claim international protection needs. Amnesty International also recommends that the European Commission use infringement procedures against Greece and the other EU Member States to stop transfers of immigrants to Greece.



Bulgaria – Human Rights Watch

In April 2014, Human Rights Watch published the report “[Containment plan: Bulgaria's push backs and detention of Syrian and other asylum seekers and migrants](#)”. Between 2000 and 2010 Bulgaria received approximately 1 000 asylum applications per year, while in 2013 alone, as a consequence of the Syrian conflict, Bulgaria saw its asylum applications number rise up to 11 000. However, national authorities

were not ready for this. To prevent migrants from reaching the Bulgarian territory, in November 2013, 1 500 extra police officers were deployed and a 33-kilometer fence was built at the Turkish border.

Among the recommendations made to the Bulgarian authorities, HRW underlines that: detention should not be used as a deterrent measure for migrants, the use of violence by officials should be investigated and punished and the detention of children and families with children should be stopped. As in the Greek case, HRW claims that Member States should stop transfers to Bulgaria until it complies with EU standards on human rights and reception conditions.

Undocumented Migrants

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 2

Lampedusa tragedy – Mediterranean task force

Following the December 2013 [Commission's communication on the Task Force for the Mediterranean](#), a staff working document has been published summarising the actions implemented so far in the five targeted areas:

- **Actions in cooperation with third countries:** signature of a readmission agreement with Turkey; preparation – together with the upcoming Italian Presidency – of a regional dialogue process with countries along the East African migratory route; information campaigns; the establishment of the European Migration Network Return and Integration experts' group; training courses and capacity building activities in countries such as: Congo, Burundi, Niger, etc.;
- **Reinforced protection programmes, resettlement and reinforced legal ways to access Europe:** establishment of a regional development and protection programme aiming to improve the situation of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq; commitment of the EU for the resettlement and the humanitarian admission of 15 000 refugees; adoption of the [Seasonal Workers Directive](#) and [Intra-Corporate Transferees Directive](#);
- **Fight against trafficking, smuggling and organised crime:** the Commission initiated a comprehensive review of the existing legislation on smuggling; two European multidisciplinary platform against criminal threats (EMPACT) action plans have been adopted in December 2013.
- **Reinforced border surveillance:** the Italian Mare Nostrum operation contributed to saving many lives since October 2013; the new Frontex regulation was adopted (see below); EUROSUR is operational in the Mediterranean Member States;
- **Assistance and solidarity among Member States:** emergency funding to Italy, Bulgaria, Malta, Germany, France, Hungary, Cyprus and the Netherlands; EASO support programmes for Greece, Italy and Bulgaria; a pilot project for the supported processing of asylum applications.

These actions will be presented to the Justice and Home Affairs Council (5 June 2014) in order to discuss their effectiveness.

Meeting of the Mediterranean Group

On 15-16 April 2014, the Foreign Ministers of Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain met informally in Alicante to discuss the role of the [Union for the Mediterranean](#) and the issue of migratory flows in the Mediterranean. As a result of their meeting, a [declaration](#) has been published in which the seven Member States call for: more intra-EU solidarity with the Mediterranean countries which should include efficient financial support from the European Union; maintaining tight controls at EU borders; capacity building to reinforce border control of countries of origin and transit; conclusion of readmission agreements and, also, the integration of EU's migration policy into its external action policy. The signatory countries consider that these elements need to be taken into consideration by the European Council when defining the future strategic guidelines in the areas of freedom, justice and security.

External borders

Frontex

Search and rescue

Following the LIBE committee's [endorsement](#) of the new Frontex Regulation on 20 February, the European Parliament approved it by 528 votes to 46, and 88 abstentions.

As mentioned in our [previous EPIM update](#) (April 2014), the new Regulation contains mandatory rules on search and rescue, as well as provisions on identifying intercepted migrants, solidarity and responsibility-sharing mechanisms, and interdiction of push backs on high seas. It also establishes rules on the protection of migrants' fundamental rights and the non-refoulement principle.

A short summary of the new Regulation's most important provisions has been [drafted](#) by the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). Steve Peers (University of Essex) analysed these provisions in his article "[New EU rules on maritime surveillance: will they stop the deaths and push-packs in the Mediterranean?](#)". The scholar noted the complex interplay between the Regulation and EU asylum law (see previous [EPIM update](#)). In addition, despite all the positive advancements, Migreurop [notes](#) that these new rules do not represent a change of paradigm in Frontex' mandate which focuses on intercepting migrants and not saving lives.

Frontex quarterly

Frontex published its [fourth risk analysis report](#) for the period October-December 2013. The report indicates that the last quarter of 2013 has seen the highest number of irregular border crossings since 2009. Like in the third semester of 2013, Syrians were the most detected nationality both at the sea and

at the land border of the EU. Overall, the number of asylum applications in the EU has steadily increased throughout 2013.

Frontex annual risk analysis

The [annual risk](#) report published by Frontex shows that passenger flows have increased more rapidly at the land border than at the air border between 2009 and 2013, one of the factors contributing to this phenomenon being the visa liberalisation process for the Western Balkan countries. At the EU level, Russians ranked first for refusals of entry, followed by Ukrainians and Albanians. In 2013, approximately 9 800 migrants used fake documents to enter the Schengen area illegally. Furthermore, detections of illegal border-crossing at EU borders increased by 4% between 2012 and 2013 (from 72 500 to 107 000) with Syrians, Eritreans, Afghans and Albanians together accounting for 52% of the total detections.

Visa policy

Visa Exemption

The [Regulation 539/2001](#) concerning the list of third countries whose nationals must be in possession of a visa when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempted for that requirement has been amended by Regulation 509/2014, which has been published in the [Official Journal of the EU](#).

The list of countries exempted from visa requirement for short stays (no longer than three months) has been extended to the following 19 countries: 5 Caribbean Island Nations (Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago), 10 Pacific Island Nations (Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu), Timor-Leste, the United Arab Emirates, Peru and Colombia. Conversely, South Sudan has been included on the list of third countries whose nationals are required to have a visa.

Nevertheless, the lifting of visa requirements still needs to be negotiated on a country by country basis. Therefore, the amended regulation states that the exemption of visa requirement for the 19 abovementioned countries will apply only from the date of entry into force of an agreement on visa exemption to be concluded with the EU. The Commission estimates that the necessary procedures will be concluded in 2015 at the earliest.

Visa liberalisation agreements

Azerbaijan

The EU-Azerbaijan [visa facilitation agreement](#) was published in the Official Journal of the EU. This agreement applies to the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan who intend to stay in the EU no more than 90 days per period of 180 days and has been concluded on the basis of reciprocity.

Ukraine

Commissioner Malmström [welcomed](#) the [efforts](#) and the political commitment of the Ukrainian government in the path towards visa liberalisation. The Commissioner highlights that Ukraine has taken important steps in the field of document security, asylum, anti-corruption, anti-discrimination and data protection. In the second phase of the visa liberalisation dialogue, Ukraine will need to demonstrate that these rules are being implemented effectively.

Readmission agreements

Azerbaijan and Turkey

The readmission agreements concluded with [Azerbaijan](#) and [Turkey](#) have been published in the Official Journal of the EU.

Extension to Ireland

Ireland was not previously bound by readmission agreements because of its special position (opt out) with respect to the area of freedom, justice and security. Nevertheless, in May, the European Commission published a [decision](#) according to which the readmission agreements concluded between the EU and China, Albania, Sri Lanka, Russia, Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Moldova, Pakistan and Georgia are now also applicable to Ireland.

Schengen Area

European Commission bi-annual report

The European Commission published its fifth [bi-annual report](#) on the functioning of the Schengen area for the period November 2013-April 2014.

During these months, there were two cases when Member States temporarily reintroduced border controls – Poland (8-23 November 2013) and the Netherlands (14-28 March 2014) – on the occasion of high level international conferences. According to the data published by Poland, 38 491 persons were checked, out of which 65 were refused entry and 54 apprehended.

In relation to border controls at EU's external borders, the report underlines that they must be conducted in compliance with the Charter for Fundamental Rights and relevant international law. In this vein, the Commission started an inquiry regarding Greece's push back practices in December 2013 and entered into contact with Bulgaria to assess the allegations of push back practices in Bulgaria.

Furthermore, the Commission continues to support Romania's and Bulgaria's accession to the Schengen area.

EU's Return policy – Commission's Communication

In March, the European Commission published a [Communication on EU's return policy](#) acknowledging that there is room for improvement in this area, especially in terms of detention conditions and legal remedies (see previous [EPIM update](#)). Pascal Schumacher (JHA Counsellor at the Permanent Representation of Luxembourg to the EU) [analysed](#) the content of this communication and insists on the importance of striking a balance between an effective return policy and strengthening the respect of the returned persons' fundamental rights. Schumacher states that the two objectives are not conflicting and can be envisaged together. In this vein, the reaction of the other EU institutions to this Communication will be essential, particularly the Council and the European Parliament.

[Employers' Sanctions Directive](#) – Report on the implementation of the Directive in the Member States

This [report](#) reviews the implementation of this Directive in Member States following transposition which was meant to be in place by July 2011. Despite delays in some countries the Commission has found that transposition has been completed in all Member States.

However, the report shows that the severity of sanctions against employers varies widely, and that there is much room for improvement in the area of protection of migrants. This is particularly the case regarding the lack of an explicit right to make a claim against an employer in many Member States. The Commission has also expressed the need for better reporting of inspections (both in terms of the obligation to do so and providing for adequate/comparable statistics) and more adequate and effective inspections themselves. The Commission has concluded that it will tackle particular provisions as well as engage bilaterally with Member States to help improve the implementation of the Directive. With this in mind, and the new reports on inspections due in July, the Commission will not be proposing any amendments to the Directive at this moment in time.

Equality, Integration and Social Inclusion of Vulnerable Migrants

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 3

Studies on integration

The Migration Policy Institute published a report "[Supporting Immigrant Integration in Europe? Developing the Governance for Diaspora Engagement](#)". It aims to examine how origin countries perceive the integration of their nationals into the society of the host country and what are the benefits of this integration for the origin country. The study shows that a multitude of actors are involved in the integration process of immigrants both in the origin and in the destination country. Nevertheless, the cooperation between these stakeholders is not optimal as it is very often difficult to identify the relevant institution, agency or body that deals with a particular aspect of the integration policy. The report also

highlights that the European Commission's DG Home Affairs has a relatively limited competence in terms of immigrants' integration. Therefore, one of the recommendations put forward is to include objectives targeting the integration of migrants in the Post Stockholm strategic guidelines in order to stimulate dialogue on this issue among Member States.

Special Focus

Immigration and freedom of movement before and after the EP elections

The EPC published a [policy brief](#) in which it analyses how immigration and freedom of movement have been debated during the EP campaign in France, Germany and the United Kingdom and, at EU level, among the top candidates for the Presidency of the European Commission: Jean-Claude Juncker (EPP), Ska Keller (Greens), Martin Schulz (PES) and Guy Verhofstadt (ALDE).

On the one hand, in the three abovementioned countries, the two policies have been at the centre of the ideological confrontation between the national parties. This has brought forward an unbalanced debate between arguments depicting migrants as a burden for the host society and a reluctance to highlight the benefits of migration. On the other hand, the top four Commission Presidency candidates have been less controversial on immigration and freedom of movement. The programmes put forward by the top candidates had two common elements (although with different nuances): the advocacy for more legal channels for migration and more intra-EU solidarity in the field of immigration.

The elections led to an unprecedented rise in the number of Eurosceptic populist Members of the European Parliament (MEPs). But how will this influence the development of immigration and freedom of movement policies in the next five years?

At the level of the EP, the EPC believes that their impact will be minimal in the decision making process because mainstream (traditionally pro-EU) political groups can still build a majority together and design legislation. Furthermore, as Yves Bertocini (Notre Europe) [noted](#), Eurosceptic MEPs have limited internal cohesion and it is not yet clear whether they will be able to create a political group in the EP. Corina Stratulat and Janis Emmanouilidis also [highlight](#) that it is unlikely that populist parties will move away from their intention to gain media attention and start creating legislation. Nevertheless, their increased number will most likely have an influence on the frequency with which anti-immigration rhetoric will be heard in the EP, as this policy is at the core of their political agendas.

At the level of the European Commission (EC), there is no certainty that Jean-Claude Juncker will become President of the European Commission, even though the EPP group won the elections. If Juncker is nominated by the European Council, he will need to find the support of the European socialists and immigration related issues may play a significant role in these negotiations, as the

socialists have already expressed their ambition for a global EU immigration policy (not focused on irregular migration). Furthermore, if Juncker becomes Commission President, his capacity to stick to the agenda he promoted during the campaign will be framed, or even limited, by several factors: the future strategic guidelines to be defined by the European Council; the multi-annual financial framework 2014-2020; the two Communications published by the EC in March (see [previous EPIM update](#)) and the ambitions of the next Commissioner in charge of immigration and/or freedom of movement.

EU Calendar

Upcoming events



European Council

26-27 June: The European Council will define the strategic guidelines in the areas of freedom, justice and security and is likely to nominate the future Commission President.



Council

1 July 2014: Italy takes over the Presidency of the Council.

In terms of immigration, Italy wants to build on the work done by the Greek Presidency and create a genuine common European migration policy with an emphasis on burden sharing between the EU Member States most exposed to migratory pressures and the other EU Member States. Furthermore, Italy wants to strengthen Frontex.



European Parliament

The first plenary session of the new European Parliament will take place on **1-3 July 2014**.

The first LIBE committee meeting of the new legislature term will take place on **10 July 2014**.



Other Events

European Migration Network (EMN) is organising:

12 June 2014: [Conference](#) “Irregular migration and return: challenges and practices”, in Athens.

European Policy Centre (EPC) is organising:

30 June 2014: [Post-summit briefing](#): Post-European Council briefing discussing *inter alia* the strategic guidelines in the areas of freedom justice and security, in Brussels.

Eurocities is organising:

18 June 2014: [Conference](#) “ImpleMentoring, City-to-City Support for Integration”, in Brussels.