
EPC Policy Update for the European Programme for Integration and Migration¹

July 2015

Andreia Ghimis and Yves Pascouau

Highlights

During the last couple of months several significant developments took place at EU level in the areas of migration and integration. In May, the European Commission published its new Agenda on Migration. While generally perceived as an encouraging initiative, the Agenda sparked some animated debates among Member States concerning the so-called quotas of resettled and relocated persons in need of protection. Following the intense discussions at the European Council on 25-26 June, the heads of state and government agreed to relocate 40,000 asylum seekers and resettle 20,000 refugees. However, they did not agree on a distribution key and thus charged the Interior Ministers to come to an agreement on the figures by the end of July.

This [EPIM Policy Update's Special Focus](#) analyses the content of the new Migration Agenda and summarises the evolution of the different initiatives that have been taken since its adoption.

[Alarming trends in terms of forced displacement](#) have been presented by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): 13.9 million new individuals have been displaced in 2014, bringing their total number to 59.5 million – an unprecedented level. Unsurprisingly, the top origin countries of forcibly displaced persons are: Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia.


14 June 2015 marked the [thirtieth anniversary of the Schengen agreement](#), abolishing controls at common borders. In a European Union that is facing multiple profound crises, it is important to celebrate and raise awareness about its extraordinary achievements that have contributed to significantly improving the everyday life of European citizens.

Several interesting rulings have been issued by the European Court of Justice (ECJ), interpreting the provisions of the [EU Return Directive](#). Furthermore, in the area of migrants' integration, the ECJ examined whether [integration tests for migrants](#) already in possession of a long-term residence permit are compatible with EU legislation.

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 covers the period from 15 April 2015 until 30 June 2015.

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). 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

Luxembourgish Presidency of the Council of the EU

From 1 July to 31 December 2015, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg will occupy the rotating [Presidency](#) of the Council of the EU. This is the twelfth time that Luxembourg holds the Presidency of the Council. One of the [priorities](#) of the Presidency is to manage migration, and connect freedom, justice and security. Speaking at an EPC breakfast policy briefing on 9 June, Christian Braun, Permanent Representative of Luxembourg to the EU, confirmed that the Luxembourgish Presidency will focus on implementing the new EU Migration Agenda (see more details below). Although the task will be difficult, the Luxembourgish representatives are well-known for their strong commitment to European integration and their negotiation qualities.

The [eighteen-month programme](#) of the Italian (second semester 2014), Latvian (first semester 2015) and Luxembourgish Presidencies (second semester 2015) is analysed in the [September 2014 EPIM Policy Update](#).



Special Focus

The new EU Migration Agenda: content, stakeholder views and developments

Content

On 13 May the European Commission presented its new Agenda on Migration. In the context of a need for a swift and determined action, the Agenda on Migration aims to reduce the number of deaths in the Mediterranean and to propose some actions for the medium and longer term.

Immediate actions

In terms of immediate actions, the Commission put forward several initiatives (reinforcing Triton, setting up a military operation in the Southern Central Mediterranean, relocation of asylum seekers from Italy and Greece and resettlement of persons from conflict areas):

- A. Stepping up the level of intervention provided under the Frontex joint operations Triton and Poseidon.** At the end of May Fabrice Leggeri, the Frontex Executive Director, signed the amended Triton operational plan which expands its operational area and brings in a number of additional experts, vessels and aircraft. In addition, Triton's financial capacities have been increased by €26.25 million between June 2015 and the end of the year. In 2016, Triton and Poseidon will be provided with an additional €45 million.
- B. Targeting criminal smuggling networks.** On 18 May, the Council adopted a [decision](#) on a European Union military operation in the Southern Central Mediterranean (EUNAVFOR). The operation as described in the abovementioned decision is intended to be composed of three phases: (1)

intelligence gathering; (2) search, seizure and diversion on the high seas and (3) taking all necessary measures against a vessel and related assets, including through disposing of them or rendering them inoperable. While the first phase has already been launched at the end of June 2015, the second and third phases require a Security Council resolution or Libyan consent. According to an EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) [briefing](#), several UNSC members have raised concerns about several aspects of the EU CSDP operation. Furthermore, obtaining Libyan consent is also problematic in the absence of a united Libyan government.

- C. Relocation of persons in clear need of international protection.** On 27 May, the Commission published a [proposal](#) for a temporary relocation emergency mechanism (under [Article 78\(3\) TFEU](#)). The aim is to relocate 40,000 asylum seekers who arrived in Italy or Greece after 15 April 2015 to other Member States over the next two years. According to the Commission proposal, these asylum seekers would be redistributed among Member States taking into consideration the following criteria: size of population, unemployment rate, GDP, the number of asylum requests received and accepted in the past four years. Member States would receive €6000 for each relocated person.
- D. Resettlement of 20,000 vulnerable persons from conflict areas.** The Commission issued a [recommendation](#) on a European resettlement scheme proposing the same criteria as above in order to determine how many people should be taken in by each Member State. An extra envelope of 50 million € would be allocated to support this scheme in 2015/2016.

Medium term measures

Concerning the medium term measures, the Commission concentrated its proposal around four pillars:

- 1. Reducing incentives for irregular migration:** address the root causes of irregular migration and forced displacement in origin countries; fight against smugglers and traffickers; increase the enforcement rate of return decisions.
- 2. Border management:** strengthening Frontex' role and capacity; a revised proposal on smart borders; strengthening the capacity of third countries to manage their borders.
- 3. A strong common asylum policy:** coherent implementation of the Common European Asylum System; a more equitable share of responsibilities between Member States via the Dublin system.
- 4. A new policy on legal migration:** modernisation of the Blue Card Directive; better integration policies; stronger action to link migration and development policies.

Moving beyond

The Commission's Agenda also looks further in the future and puts forward three areas of focus for the years to come: the completion of the Common European Asylum System, a shared management of the European border and a new model of legal migration. Although there is no political momentum to discuss these issues at present, the European Commission is planning to put them back on the table to develop a more comprehensive European migration policy.

Stakeholder views

Generally speaking, the Commission's Agenda has been positively received. IOM [insisted](#) that increasing the budget of lifesaving missions such as Triton is a very encouraging signal from the EU. Amnesty International also [endorsed](#) the Agenda by highlighting that it represents a first sign of a shifting attitude, from the so-called *Fortress Europe* to a Europe that tries to respond to the current global refugee crisis. Antonio Vitorino (Jacques Delors Institute) and Yves Pascouau (European Policy Centre) also [insisted](#) on the innovative component of the agenda, which brings about a new form of solidarity among Member States with the relocation and resettlement measures it announced.

However, some concerns were raised: military advisors [warned](#) about the possible negative effects of the EU military mission in the Mediterranean UNAVFOR which could cause deaths and even more dangerous journeys for migrants. UNHCR [pointed out](#) that, for integration purposes, family reunification rules need to be taken into consideration in the design of the EU relocation mechanism while François Crépeau (United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants) [highlighted](#) the low number of people in need of protection that would benefit from resettlement.

Negotiations between Member States on the redistribution of asylum seekers

There have been heated debates among Member States concerning the criteria chosen by the European Commission to establish the redistribution of asylum seekers among Member States. At the Justice and Home Affairs Council of 15-16 June, the national delegations confirmed that on the basis of the principle of solidarity they were all ready to make an effort to help Member States under a particularly heavy migratory pressure. However, several delegations stressed the necessity to strike the right balance between solidarity and responsibility.

Unprecedented tense discussions also took place between the heads of state and government at the European Council (25-26 June). While they agreed on relocating 40,000 persons in clear need of international protection from Greece and Italy and on resettling 20,000 people from third countries, they decided to do so on a voluntary basis and therefore chose not to follow the quotas proposed by the European Commission. The Interior Ministers are now in charge of setting up a temporary and exceptional mechanism to this effect by the end of July.

Furthermore, the European Council agreed on working to enhance the effectiveness of the EU's return policy considering that this would be a way to discourage migrants from risking their lives. The main actions foreseen in this sense are: the effective implementation and negotiation of further readmission agreements as well as the better enforcement of return decisions.

EPC analysts argue that the EU has sent out a positive signal at a global level when the Member States succeeded in agreeing over the total numbers of asylum seekers proposed by the European Commission. Although small, this first step represents a change in EU policy. However, as Yves Pascouau (EPC) puts it in his commentary '[Solidarity and asylum seekers: Member States agreed to disagree](#)' the criteria set in place by the European Commission have most probably been rejected because of the forthcoming discussions regarding the modification of the Dublin III Regulation (which could be on the agenda in 2016).

The tough negotiations that took and will take place in the next few weeks show how fragile this compromise is and how solidarity among EU Member States is not yet an automatic reflex but rather an expression of an intensively negotiated concession.



Asylum seekers

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 1

UNHCR – Forced displacement in 2014 (global trends)

According to the UNCHR [report](#), the number of displaced people has reached unprecedented levels in 2014. 59.5 million individuals were forcibly displaced worldwide as a result of persecution, conflict, generalised violence, or human rights violations. There has been an increase of 8.3 million people compared to 2013. Other alarming findings of the report are:

- the number of newly displaced persons due to conflict or persecution in 2014 reached 13.9 million;
- 42,500 individuals are forced to leave their homes per day due to conflict and persecution;
- developing regions hosted 86% of the world's refugees. Lebanon hosted the largest number of refugees in relation to its national population, with 232 refugees per 1000 inhabitants;
- the top origin countries are: Syria (3.88 million), Afghanistan (2.59 million) and Somalia (1.11 million).

Eurostat statistics - asylum seekers (first quarter of 2015)

185,000 asylum seekers applied for protection in the EU during the first three months of 2015. This number is consistent with the amount of applications in the last trimester of 2014, but 86% higher than the number of applications received in the first trimester of 2014. Several interesting trends can be discerned:

- during the first three months of 2015 **the highest number of first time applicants** were registered in **Germany (73,100)** and **Hungary (32,800)**;
- compared with the population of each country, the highest rates of registered first time applicants were recorded in **Hungary** (3,322 applicants per million inhabitants), **Sweden** (1,184), **Austria** (1,141) and **Germany** (905);
- the lowest rates (below 50 applicants per million inhabitants) were observed in: Croatia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Latvia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland and Spain;
- **26%** of the total number of first time applicants in this period come from **Kosovo**. **16%** are **Syrians** and **7%** come from **Afghanistan**;

EASO Report – Eritrea

The European Asylum Support Office issued a country of origin report entitled "[Eritrea Country Focus](#)". This report provides relevant information on a selection of topics relevant for international protection status determination with respect to Eritreans. Between 2013 and 2014 the number of Eritrean applicants in the EU+ countries (EU28 plus Norway and Switzerland) more than doubled, rising from 20,295 applicants registered in 2013 to about 47,125 in 2014. The most frequent reasons invoked by Eritrean asylum seekers relate to open-ended national service (which keeps Eritreans captive in a situation of despair); fear of persecution on the

basis of religion (e.g. of Jehovah's witnesses, Pentecostals, etc.); consequences of illegal departure in case of return; and harsh treatment during detention.

Unaccompanied minors

In May 2015, the European Migration Network (EMN) released a synthesis report "[Policies, practices and data on unaccompanied minors](#)". The report was prepared on the basis of National Contributions from 27 EMN National Contact Points. The following key points can be highlighted:

- the number of unaccompanied minors seeking asylum in the EU has increased steadily since 2010 reaching **24,075** in **2014** (4% of the total number of applicants in 2014);
- most of the migrants (65%) are between **16 and 18 years** old;
- the main countries of origin of these minors are **Afghanistan, Eritrea, Syria, Somalia, Gambia** and **Morocco**;
- the number of unaccompanied minors who arrive in the EU and are not seeking asylum is unknown and only a few Member States can provide data on minors in this situation.

In terms of policies and practices, it is interesting to underline that Member States grant different types of permits depending on whether the minor is applying for asylum or not. Generally, the national authorities of EU Member States offer a permanent or long-term residence permit to asylum-seeking UAMs and temporary residence permits to non-asylum seeking UAMs, such as individual protection or permits based on humanitarian or compassionate grounds.

Concerning the reception conditions available for unaccompanied minors, the report shows that most Member States apply a similar reception system for all minors. Therefore, they host asylum and non-asylum seeking minors in similar facilities. A few States have different reception systems and allocate asylum and non-asylum seeking UAMs to different facilities. Most States accommodate asylum-seeking UAMs in separate reception facilities specifically designed to host minors and families, or in designated areas for minors within the mainstream reception facility.



Undocumented Migrants

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 2

Visa policy

Visa waiver agreements

United Arab Emirates and Timor Leste

The European Union signed visa waiver agreements with the [United Arab Emirates](#) and [Timor Leste](#). This new visa regime enables citizens from these countries to travel to the EU without a visa for a short period; up to 90 days in any given 180 days. The same rights apply to EU citizens travelling to these countries. However, the visa waiver does not apply to the United Kingdom and Ireland, which are not part of the Schengen area.

Peru and Colombia

On 10 June, the European Commission initialled the reciprocal bilateral visa waiver agreements between the EU and Peru and Colombia. The initialing of international agreements takes place once both sides have agreed on the content of the agreements. However, the agreements will enter into force only once they have been formally signed. From that date onwards, similarly to the citizens of the UAE and Timor Leste, the citizens of the two Latin-American countries will be able to travel without a visa to the EU for stays of up to 90 days (within any 180-day period).

Visa liberalisation – progress reports: Ukraine and Georgia

The third ([Georgia](#)) and fifth ([Ukraine](#)) progress reports on the implementation of the action plans for visa liberalisation have been published by the European Commission. Commissioner Avramopoulos stated that both countries show significant progress and that it is very important that their level of commitment remains unchanged. The key priority now is the sustainable implementation of the legal and institutional framework in the areas of asylum, anti-corruption, organised crime, trafficking in human beings and anti-discrimination (Ukraine) and in the areas of asylum, anti-corruption, trafficking in human beings and drugs (Georgia).

Border control

Frontex

Frontex published its [Annual Risk Analysis](#) Report. According to Frontex' analysis:

- in 2014, the number of irregular border crossings reached a new record: there were 280,000 detections;
- most of the detections were Syrians fleeing the conflict in their country, who subsequently introduced asylum demands;
- in 2014, there were 161,309 third-country nationals effectively returned to countries outside the EU;
- the situation in Syria and the continued volatility in North Africa (for instance, Libya) will continue to influence the tragic situation at EU's external borders. The ongoing crisis in Ukraine will also have an impact on the movement of populations, although for the time being this crisis has not brought about significant changes in irregular migration towards the EU.

Two other risk analysis reports have been issued by Frontex in May: the [Western Balkans Annual Risk Analysis](#) (showing that the Western Balkan countries have increased their importance as source countries) and the [Eastern European Borders Annual Analysis](#) (emphasising that the number of detections of illegal border-crossing remained at a low level in 2014).

Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) Report

In June 2015, FRA issued a report entitled: "[Fundamental rights at land borders: findings from selected European Union border crossing points](#)" aiming to inform policy-makers in the EU and its Member States about fundamental rights challenges that can emerge at land borders. The report concludes that although in general border controls take place without incidents, there are a few challenges that might lead to the violation of

travellers' fundamental rights, such as disrespectful treatment, abuse and non-identification of persons in need of protection. Consequently, FRA puts forward several recommendations:

- Frontex is encouraged to draw up specific guidance for land border crossing points to assist staff working in these points in addressing the challenges they encounter while performing their job;
- the European Commission is encouraged to make full use of FRA's expertise in order to mainstream fundamental rights into the Schengen evaluation process;
- Member States should offer advanced foreign language trainings to their staff and take effective disciplinary measures to address forms of disrespectful conduct;
- Member States should ensure that holding rooms at border crossing points provide humane conditions and meet the basic needs of the travellers.

Schengen Area

Anniversary of the Schengen agreement

14 June 2015 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the Schengen agreement. At his visit to Schengen in commemoration of this event, Commission President Juncker highlighted the significance of this European achievement: *"We often criticise Schengen, because of superficial analysis. We live in times of political illiteracy. We have to block the road to those who say Schengen should be reviewed"*.

Here is a [special EPC collection](#) with papers on Schengen-related issues and a [link](#) to a Euradionantes radio program dedicated to Schengen moderated by Yves Pascouau.

Report on the functioning of the Schengen Area

The European Commission published the [seventh bi-annual report](#) on the functioning of the Schengen Area (November 2014 – April 2015). While the situation at the EU's external borders reiterates the findings presented in the Frontex Annual Risk Analysis (here above), the elements depicting the situation within the Schengen Area are worth mentioning:

- in 2014 the level of detections of irregular stay increased by 28% compared to the year before (up to almost 426,000 detections. According to an EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service) [briefing](#), most citizens found to be irregularly present on EU territory are from Syria, Eritrea and Afghanistan.
- in the period between 1 November 2014 and 30 April 2015, the Commission continued its investigation into four cases (Austria, Belgium, Italy and Slovenia) concerning possible violations of the abolition of internal border controls, in particular the removal of obstacles to fluid traffic flow.

Relevant studies and reports

Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)

In April 2015, PICUM published a position paper on the EU Return [Directive 2008/115/EC](#). This paper raises concerns about human rights violations in the context of removal procedures: detention of children, violation of the non-refoulement principle, lack of access to justice and redress mechanisms, etc. In this context, PICUM put forward seven policy recommendations for EU and national policy makers:

- return policies should be focused on ensuring migrants' fundamental rights through independent and systematic monitoring of return procedures;
- viable alternatives to detention should be promoted;
- children should never be detained;
- procedural safeguards and access to justice shall be granted to all migrants in detention or within the return procedure;
- unremovable migrants should not be detained and should be granted leave to remain;
- a clear firewall should be established in the process of detection and apprehension of undocumented migrants;
- ensure the suspensive effect against the removal of complaints challenging a detention decision.

ECJ Case law

Subdelegacion des Gobierno en gipuzkoa – Extranjeria v Samir Zaizoune, C-38/14, 23 April 2015

This ruling concerns Mr Zaizoune, a Moroccan national who was arrested in 2011 by the Spanish authorities. He was unable to present his identity documents and, thus, a procedure to remove him from the Spanish territory was commenced. The removal decision was taken based on the fact that Mr Zaizoune was staying irregularly in Spain. The applicant brought an action against that decision. As a consequence, the removal decision was annulled and replaced by a fine. According to the Spanish legislation, expulsion was only possible when aggravating circumstances besides the irregular stay existed. The Spanish authorities appealed against this new decision.

In this context, the Supreme Court of the Basque Country asked the European Court of Justice (ECJ) whether the Spanish legislation was compatible with the EU Return [Directive 2008/115/EC](#). The ECJ stated that taking into consideration that the Spanish legislation provides for an alternative to expulsion, it is likely to jeopardise the objectives pursued by the Directive and deprive it from its effectiveness.

Diego Acosta Arcarazo and Andrea Romano [commented](#) on this case law underlining that whereas the Court is frequently asked to rule on more restrictive national measures, this is a situation in which it is asked to analyse the compatibility of a more favourable national provision with EU law. According to the two scholars there is a lack of consistency in the Court's case law in these kinds of situations. They also highlight that the ECJ avoids mentioning that the Return Directive also aims at ensuring the fundamental rights of migrants.

Z. Zh. v Staatssecretaris voor Veiligheid en Justitie and Staatssecretaris voor Veiligheid en Justitie v I. O., C-554/13, 11 June 2015

This case is about two third country nationals who were ordered to leave the Netherlands without being granted a period for voluntary return on the basis that they constituted a risk to public policy (one of them because he was travelling with a document he knew to be false and the other because he was suspected of domestic abuse of a woman).

According to Article 7(4) of the EU Return Directive 2008/115/EC, “if the person concerned poses a risk to public policy, public security or national security, Member States may refrain from granting a period for voluntary departure, or may grant a period shorter than seven days”. The request for a preliminary ruling concerns the interpretation of the concept of threat to public policy. The ECJ starts by explaining that the voluntary departure rule aims at protecting the fundamental rights of the person to be returned and that as the threat to public policy is an exception, it has to be interpreted narrowly. Furthermore, the Court explains that whereas Member States retain the freedom to determine what the concept of public policy means at national level, there needs to be a uniform interpretation of EU law among Member States, therefore, they cannot unilaterally determine an interpretation without any control by EU institutions.

The ECJ states that the interpretation needs to be done on a case by case basis and a person being suspected of a criminal offence is not sufficient to justify a threat to public policy. When a third country national has been criminally convicted other factors need to be taken into consideration in order to evaluate whether he is a threat to public policy or not: nature and seriousness of the act, the time elapsed since it was committed, etc.

Steve Peers (University of Essex) underlines that this ruling shows that by expressly linking the opportunity for voluntary departure with the protection of human rights, the ECJ judges demonstrate that they take into consideration the negative impact of forced returns on third country nationals.



Equality, Integration and Social Inclusion of Vulnerable Migrants

Policy developments relevant to EPIM focus area 3

Reasoned opinions against Belgium, Spain and Slovenia – Single Permit Directive

EU Member States had to transpose the Single Permit Directive 2011/98/EU by December 2013. This Directive enables third country nationals to obtain both a work permit and a residence permit via a single application procedure. However, the Single Permit Directive does not affect the Member States’ capacity to decide who is granted this permit and how many third country nationals are admitted through this procedure.

In January 2014 (Spain and Slovenia) and March 2014 (Belgium) the three countries received letters of formal notice from the European Commission (first step of an infringement procedure). In the absence of a response from the Member States, the European Commission addressed the national authorities reasoned opinions. If within two months the Member States do not align their legislation with the EU law, the Commission may decide to refer them to the European Court of Justice.

ECJ – Opinion of Advocate General Wathelet

Vestische Arbeit Jobcenter Kreis Recklinghausen v Jovanna García-Nieto, Joel Peña Cuevas, Jovanlis Peña García, Joel Luis Peña Cruz, [C-299/14](#), 4 June 2015

This case concerns an EU citizen, a Spanish national (Joel Pena Cuevas) who during his first months of his residence in Germany was neither a worker nor self-employed person. As a consequence, according to the German legislation he was not entitled to German basic benefits during that period. Mr Cuevas opposed this decision and the German jurisdiction asked the ECJ whether the German law is compatible with EU legislation.

AG Wathelet considers that the German provision *is* compatible with EU law. He argues that this safeguard enables Member States to maintain the financial equilibrium of their social security systems. As they cannot require EU citizens to have sufficient means of subsistence and personal medical coverage for a period of three months (short stay), it is legitimate not to require Member States to cover these gaps.

This judgement is consistent with the [Dano ruling](#) (see [EPC Commentary](#) – January 2015) and confirms once more the fact that the “benefits tourism” phenomenon is just a myth.

ECJ – Case law

P and S. v Commissie Sociale Zekerheid Breda, College van Burgemeester en Wethouders van de gemeente Amstelveen, [C-579/13](#), 4 June 2015

P and S are third country nationals who are in possession of long-term residence permits of indefinite duration ([Directive 2003/109/EC](#)). Despite this, the Dutch authorities require them to pass a civic integration requirement in order to demonstrate that they are proficient (orally and in written) in Dutch and that they acquired sufficient knowledge of the Dutch society. The two applicants brought actions against the decisions obliging them to pass this examination.

The ECJ was therefore brought to analyse if the Dutch legislation is in line with the European Directive. On this point, the Court held that the national law is not violating EU rules provided that the means of implementing the obligation to pass this integration test does not jeopardise the achievement of the objectives pursued by the EU Directive. More precisely, the passing of this examination must have as primary purpose the integration of the third country national in the host society and not be a condition for acquiring or conserving the long-term resident status. Furthermore, the Court lets the national jurisdiction analyse whether the amount of money the migrants need to pay in order to take the exam (€230) and the fine that is imposed on them if they do not pass in the period established by the Dutch authorities are not likely to deprive the EU Directive of its effectiveness.

[According to](#) Steve Peers (University of Essex), on this occasion the ECJ struck a good balance between ensuring that immigrants fit into society and the need to prevent integration tests forming a disguised means of excluding migrants from ever really fitting in despite their genuine efforts.



EU Calendar

Upcoming events



Council

The Justice and Home Affairs Council will meet on **8 and 9 October** in **Luxembourg**.



European Parliament

Next LIBE Committee meetings will take place on **15 July 2015 and 3 September 2015**.

Next EP Plenaries will take place between **6-9 July** and **7-10 September 2015**.



Other Events

6-8 July 2015

European Social Network is organising:

[Conference](#): 'European Social Services Conference', in Lisbon.

8 July 2015

MPI is organising:

Teleconference: 'Addressing crisis at Europe's Borders: Are policymakers moving in the right direction?'.

9 July 2015

AIRE Centre is organising:

[Free training](#), 'EU Law Rights & Advocacy – free movement of EU citizens', in Brussels.

9 July 2015

Committee of the Regions is organising:

[Conference](#), 'Immigration, Social Policies and Human Rights', in Brussels.

21 September 2015

Eurocities is organising:

[Conference](#), 'Urban dialogues: migration and asylum in Europe's cities', in Brussels.

22 September 2015

ICMDP is organising:

MIEUX conference: 'Advancing Migration Cooperation through Demand-Driven Capacity Building: MIEUX's Peer-to-Peer Approach' in Brussels.