In a bid to enforce member states’ compliance with the EU relocation decisions, the European Commission has initiated infringement procedures against the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland for continuously refusing to take part in the scheme. The move came ahead of a European Court of Justice Judgement on the issue after Hungary and Poland sued the Commission over the obligatory nature of the relocation scheme, citing national security concerns.

With an expected increase in the number of people trying to cross to Europe via the Mediterranean routes during the summer, tensions are rising between the various actors that are involved in search and rescue operations at sea. NGOs that are active near the North African coast have come into confrontational situations with the Libyan Coast Guard while far-right groups have attempted to prevent NGO ships from leaving port.

Further straining this already challenging environment, Italy announced that it will not continue to serve as the primary point of entry for rescued migrants, and may deny access to Italian ports for non-Italian vessels if other EU member states do not show more solidarity.

The European Council of 22-23 June 2017 adopted conclusions including migration. In line with the prevailing political climate, the conclusions focus on external cooperation to reduce migratory flows and step up returns, and highlight the need to agree on a common list of safe third countries. The conclusions also emphasise the need for the right balance between responsibility and solidarity among member states. The importance of a Union-wide response to the current influx was also voiced at a high-level conference on migration management on 21 June at the European Parliament in Brussels, where officials reinforced their commitment to responsibility-sharing and solidarity between member states.
SPECIAL FOCUS

Rising tensions over search and rescue operations in the Central Med

While irregular migration along the Eastern Mediterranean route has slowed significantly in the wake of the EU-Turkey statement concluded in March 2016, migratory pressure in the Central Mediterranean has continued to increase. More than 84,879 migrants have arrived in Italy and the death toll already stands at over 2,257 as of late June 2017, compared to 70,222 migrants that arrived during the same timeframe last year. This summer is expected
to see a further increase in the number of deaths at sea as many hope for more favourable weather and calmer seas during the warmest months of the year.

NGOs are currently reported to be responsible for around half of all rescue missions in the Central Mediterranean. Moreover, and in accordance with international maritime law, commercial vessels have also operated around 12% of rescue missions of migrants at sea despite their crews not being trained or equipped to handle large-scale rescue operations.

![Graph showing number of rescued persons over time](image)

Source: [Italian Coast Guard, Rome Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre](http://www.guardiacostiera.gov.it/it/it/itners/itners)

As the typical summer peak of maritime arrivals approaches, NGOs face more challenging conditions than last year not only because of the number of migrants in need of assistance, but because of the political environment they find themselves operating in. Politicians of various affiliations are increasingly questioning whether the NGOs’ operations actually constitute a pull factor for potential migrants, an accusation NGOs have repeatedly dismissed.

In an incident earlier this year, a vessel belonging to Sea-Watch was intercepted by a Libyan Coast Guard ship, which almost collided with the Sea Watch vessel while preventing the NGO from rescuing migrants in distress at sea. According to Sea-Watch, the Libyan Coast Guard was acting in cooperation with Italy’s Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre in Rome to intercept a migrant boat and return its occupants to Libya. NGOs’ work could be further complicated by activists from far-right groups, as members of the anti-immigration “Identitarian” movement are reportedly raising funds to acquire boats that would target and intercept NGO vessels providing SAR operations in the Mediterranean. In May 2017, a French right-wing group managed to disrupt a SAR vessel’s departure from the port of Catania, Sicily after having collected funds to do so.

“[If we are not there to save these people and offer them a helping hand, then they will have no chance to survive]("Ricardo Gatti, Field coordinator Golfo Azzurro")

These incidents point to a growing divergence between the actors responsible for executing SAR operations in the Mediterranean and the motivations driving their actions. In the case...
of disruptions by far-right groups, it also highlights the potential for direct confrontation at sea between actors with completely opposing objectives. The expected large numbers of migrants trying to reach European shores this summer will likely exacerbate these tensions further, with even more human suffering and loss of life as a likely result.

Italy threatened on 28 June 2017 to deny port access to SAR vessels that fly foreign flags and are not part of EU missions, a move that would primarily affect NGO ships operating off the coast of Libya. This could potentially further complicate SAR efforts in the Central Mediterranean. Italy justified the move by citing the unsustainability of the overall situation and lacking EU solidarity, but refrained from acting on the statement immediately. The interior ministers of Italy, France and Germany subsequently met with European Commissioner for Migration and Home Affairs Dimitris Avramopoulos on 2 July to discuss options and issued a joint communication containing a list of measures. Most items reiterate previous proposals made in the Malta Declaration of February 2017, but the communication also includes a code of conduct for NGOs operating in the Mediterranean. It remains to be seen what this code of conduct will entail and how it will impact the work of NGOs.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Commission opens infringement procedures

After repeated refusals by the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to participate in the EU relocation decisions for refugees, the European Commission decided to launch infringement procedures against the three countries on 14 June 2017. The Commission is taking action on the basis of Article 5.2 of the Council Decision establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy and Greece. Whereas Hungary has not taken any action at all since the relocation scheme started, Poland hasn’t relocated anyone, nor has it pledged to do so since December 2015. The Czech Republic has only relocated 12 refugees from Greece since August 2016 and has not made any new pledges for over a year.

As of mid-May, the total number of relocations stood at 18,418 (12,707 from Greece and 5,711 from Italy) out of an initial pledge to relocate 160,000 people, as decided in the Council Decisions of September and October 2015. With the exception of Malta and Liechtenstein, all member states are still trailing behind their commitments in terms of actual numbers relocated. Apart from the three Visegrad countries, neither Austria nor Denmark have relocated any refugees. However, Austria has in the meantime committed to relocating 50 persons from Italy, while Denmark has an opt-out under the Treaty.
Progress on relocation is further complicated by a reported lack of candidates that qualify for the scheme, as these individuals have to come from a country of origin of which more than 75% of asylum seekers are successful with their applications, a condition which excludes potential candidates from Iraq or Afghanistan. Moreover, the candidates need to have arrived in Italy or Greece after 24 March 2015 in order to be eligible for relocation. Both criteria reduce the pool of potential candidates significantly and pose difficulties for the overall feasibility of the scheme.

Migrant children come into greater focus

In the context of the increased numbers of migrant children seeking protection in Europe (up to 30% of EU asylum applications in 2015 and 2016), the topic has come into greater focus. In mid-May, the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers introduced an Action Plan on Protecting Refugee and Migrant Children in Europe. It focuses on three main pillars: (1) ensuring access to rights and child-friendly procedures; (2) providing effective protection; (3) enhancing the integration of children who will remain in Europe.

Similarly, the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) Council of 8/9 June reaffirmed its commitment to guarding the right of children in migration to be protected, as stipulated by various provisions of international and EU law such as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. The adopted JHA Council conclusions on the protection of children in migration recognise the high risks of violence, trafficking or exploitation experienced by children, many of whom are unaccompanied.

Justice and Home Affairs Council of 8-9 June

The latest JHA Council discussed the situation in the Mediterranean and the implementation of the Malta Declaration of February 2017. In this context, the Council also adopted conclusions on enhancing return and readmission policy based on stronger coordination between the policy areas of return and visa. Furthermore, a general approach on the proposal for a European travel information and authorisation system (ETIAS) was agreed upon, allowing for advance checks and potentially denying travel authorisation to visa-exempt third-country nationals travelling to the Schengen area. Similarly, the last Foreign Affairs Council discussed migration in preparation of the European Council Summit of 22-23 June. In particular, ministers took stock of the progress made under the Partnership Framework and argued for a strengthening of cooperation with partner countries to fight trafficking, reduce the numbers of arrivals of irregular migrants and to ensure returns and readmission.
2018 EU budget focuses on migration

At the end of May, the European Commission proposed a draft budget for 2018 totaling €161 billion, with a significant focus on migration and geopolitical challenges. For the coming year, the Commission calculates a draft budget of €4.1 billion for the areas of migration and security, raising overall EU funding for this field to €22 billion in the 2015-2018 period. Focal areas within the budget will include providing humanitarian assistance, reinforcing external border management and supporting the member states most affected by increased migration numbers. Additionally, funds will be made available for external assistance to non-EU countries such as Lebanon and Jordan that have been taking in a large proportion of refugees from Syria.

Brexit talks start

On 19 June 2017, only two weeks after the snap general elections in the UK that saw Prime Minister Theresa May’s Tory majority reduced to a minority government propped up by the Northern Irish Democratic Unionist Party, Brexit talks officially started. One of the primary matters that are expected to be discussed early on in the negotiations concern the rights of EU citizens in the UK and UK citizens in EU member states. Due to the insecurity surrounding EU nationals’ rights, it is expected that many high-skilled EU migrants will leave the UK. Especially the British healthcare, technology, media, telecommunications and financial services are likely to suffer from a considerable brain drain. At the European Council Summit on 23 June, however, May offered EU citizens already in the UK a transition period of five years in which they could regularise their status of residence. Moreover, on 26 June the UK government published a policy paper stipulating that EU citizens residing in the UK will have to apply for inclusion on a “settled status” register should they want to stay in the country after Brexit. Within the wider context of negotiations, the UK has seemingly accepted the EU’s sequencing proposal for the timeline of negotiations, namely that the rights of EU nationals and of Ireland should be discussed before talks on a future trade deal commence.
Parliament continues CEAS reform talks

The European Parliament’s Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) has recently published three so-called amending reports that contain its position on major elements of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) reform package: the proposed recast of the Eurodac regulation (for the comparison of fingerprints to establish the member state responsible for examining an application for international protection); the proposed recast of the reception conditions directive as well as on the Commission’s proposal to replace the qualification directive with a regulation. The amendments will be submitted to the EP plenary after trilogue consultations with the other institutions.

However, progress on the reform of the Dublin regulation, which establishes rules to determine the member state responsible for an asylum claim, remains slow, with talks practically frozen between the legislators.

When it comes to the regulation establishing a European Union Agency for Asylum, talks between various stakeholders are nearing completion but appear to include several cross-references to the legislative instruments in the asylum package. These cross-references complicate further advancing on this particular piece of legislation, as they necessitate progress on all other fronts. With the summer break now upon us and the presidency of the Council changing as well, the timeline for progress on the reforms is unclear.

Temporary border controls to be phased out

At the beginning of May 2017, the European Commission issued a recommendation to the Council to prolong border controls for a final time for a further six months. Similarly, the Commission recommended that Austria, Denmark, Germany, Norway and Sweden phase out their temporary controls of some of their internal Schengen borders within the next six months. The Council took the Commission’s recommendation and extended the timeframe.
In the interest of security and to prevent irregular secondary movement, the Commission further advised Schengen states to make more effective use of proportionate police checks in border areas, and to strengthen their cross-border police cooperation.

**EU to join Istanbul Convention**

In mid-May, the Council adopted two decisions with regard to the signature of the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention, also called the Istanbul Convention, on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. This means that after already having all EU member states as signatories to the Convention, the EU itself will join the Convention as well to strengthen its role in combating violence against women and sex and gender-based violence (SGBV).

The Istanbul Convention is the most comprehensive international treaty on combating SGBV and includes measures to prevent violence, protect victims, and prosecute perpetrators. In particular, it introduces provisions on gender-based asylum claims and calls on signatories to recognise SGBV as a form of persecution within the meaning of the 1951 Refugee Convention. Moreover, the Convention underlines the importance of a gender-sensitive interpretation of the Convention grounds and gender-sensitive reception procedures, support services for asylum seekers as well as gender guidelines and gender-sensitive asylum procedures.

**Other developments**

**Commission communication on the protection of children in migration**

Alongside an increased focus by the Council of Europe on the vulnerabilities and protection needs of migrant and refugee children in its recently adopted Action Plan, the European Commission also issued a communication to the Parliament and the Council on the protection of children in migration. The Communication builds on relevant EU initiatives to address current migratory challenges with the aim of providing coordinated actions to protection gaps faced by migrant children once they have reached Europe. Among other things, it addresses the EU’s external action in tackling root causes and protecting children along migratory routes, comprehensive identification, providing adequate reception facilities in the EU, ensuring access to status determination procedures and establishing durable solutions. Within this context, the Commission also announced the establishment of a European guardianship network to exchange good practices and effectively strengthen the role of guardians in supporting and guiding unaccompanied and separated children and youth.
ECJ Case C-133/15 Chávez-Vilchez and Others v Raad van bestuur van de Sociale verzekeringbank and Others

10 May 2017

This case concerned a Venezuelan national who entered the Netherlands on a tourist visa and subsequently had a child with a Dutch national. Ms Chávez-Vilchez and her partner’s relationship ended and Ms Chávez-Vilchez subsequently applied for social assistance and child benefit but was rejected on the basis of not having a right of residence. Ms Chávez-Vilchez brought proceedings before the Dutch Higher Administrative Court with regard to this rejection. That Court asked the ECJ whether Ms Chávez-Vilchez, and several other parents in broadly similar circumstances, could gain a derived right of residence under Article 20 TFEU.

The Grand Chamber of the Court found that a third country national may, as the parent of an EU citizen minor, rely on a derived right of residence in the EU. The Court found that in deciding to compel a third country national parent to leave the EU, the member state must have reference to any relationship of dependency that exists between that parent and the EU citizen child. The fact that the other parent, an EU citizen, could assume sole responsibility for the primary day-to-day care of the child is a relevant factor. However, this is not in itself a sufficient ground to refuse a derived right of residence to the third country national parent. It must be determined that there is not, between the child and the third country national parent, such a relationship of dependency that a decision to refuse a derived right of residence to that parent would compel the child to leave the EU, thereby depriving that child of the genuine enjoyment of the substance of the rights attached to their status as an EU citizen. When assessing the relationship, authorities must take into account the right to respect for family life and the best interests of the child.

ECJ Case C-9/16 A v Staatsanwaltschaft Offenburg

21 June 2017

The case concerned A, who was observed crossing the border from France to Germany by two officers of the German Federal Police who decided to carry out an identity check on A. A forcibly resisted that check and was thus charged with the offence of resisting an enforcement officer.
The local German court found that the offence of resisting an enforcement officer had been established and that A was guilty of it. However, that court referred questions to the ECJ on the basis of the case of Melki and Abdelli (C-188/10 and C-189/10), which created doubt in the mind of the Court as to the compatibility of the German criminal code with EU law. In particular, the Court asked whether Article 67(2) TFEU and Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 (the Schengen Borders Code) could be interpreted as precluding certain national provisions on police checks at the internal Schengen borders.

The ECJ found that provision of the TFEU and Article 20 and 21 of Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 should be interpreted as precluding national law, which grants the police authorities of the member state in question the power to check the identity of any person within an area of up to 30 kilometres from the land border of that member state with a view to preventing or terminating unlawful entry into the territory of that member state or in preventing certain criminal offences unless that legislation ensures that the practical exercise of that power cannot have an effect equivalent to that of border checks.

The Court also found that those same provisions could not be interpreted as precluding national laws, which grant the police authorities of the member state in question the power to stop and question any person on a train or on the premises of the railways of that member state, with a view to preventing or terminating unlawful entry into the territory of that member state, and request that person to offer up their identity documents or border crossing documents for inspection or can briefly stop and question any person for that purpose, if those checks are based on knowledge of the situation or border police experience, provided that the exercise of those checks is subject under national law to detailed rules and limitations determining the intensity, frequency and selectivity of such checks.

**ECJ Case C-528/15 Kerly Del Rosario Martinez Silva v Istituto nazionale della previdenza sociale (INPS) and Comune di Genova**

21 June 2017

The case concerned a third country national, Mrs Martinez Silva, who lives in Italy with her three children and holds a single work permit valid for longer than six months. Mrs Martinez Silva applied for social benefits but was rejected on the basis that Italian law excluded certain categories of third country nationals holding a single work permit from consideration of that particular benefit. She appealed that decision and upon hearing her appeal, the local Court of Appeal referred questions to the ECJ which primarily sought an interpretation of Directive 2011/98/EU (single residence and work permit for non-EU workers).

The Court explored whether a member state can exclude third country nationals who hold a single work permit from a family benefit as such a benefit has been defined by Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 (coordination of social security systems). The Court stated that Directive 2011/98/EU establishes that third country nationals that have been allowed to enter a member state in accordance with the law have the right to the same treatment as nationals of that member state. The Court found that Mrs Martinez Silva, holder of a work permit, was thus entitled to such equal treatment. Therefore, Directive 2011/98/EU precludes national legislation under which a third country national cannot qualify for social benefits which are regarded as a family benefit under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.
In 2015, the Future Worlds Center (FWC) approached the issue of Alternatives to Detention (AtDs) through its EPIM-funded project ‘Promoting and Establishing Alternatives to Immigration Detention in Cyprus’ (2015-2016). During the project’s implementation, extensive research was conducted on AtDs in Cyprus. The findings were published and disseminated in a comprehensive report. The summary can be found in English here.

As the report indicates, the situation on the ground is quite unique. On the one hand, there have been several positive developments in the last few years, such as the de facto termination of the detention of children or mothers with children, the reduction of instances in which asylum seekers can be detained, and the period of time which asylum seekers may be detained.

On the other hand, even though these policies establish a positive ground for improving the system, they have not been officially published and therefore remain at risk of being retracted. Additionally, they have not contributed to the effective implementation of AtDs for other groups.

Currently, the national law, which falls in line with the relevant European Directive 2008/115/EC dictates that detention should only be used as a last resort if less coercive measures to detention are not possible. However, there is no legal provision for AtDs with the exception of cases involving asylum seekers, yet even in those cases it remains unused. There is currently one detention center in operation in Cyprus, with the capacity to accommodate 186 individuals. In 2016, 187 people were detained there, while around 80 detainees are held there now. However, there are much higher numbers of persons at risk of detention living in the community.

The situation on the ground indicates that Cyprus has the potential to promote, support and establish a framework for AtDs, as well as to develop good practices in order to set an example both on a European and international level.
To this end, a more holistic approach is required. With the financial support of EPIM (since March 2017), FWC is implementing a two-year project entitled ‘Pilot Implementation of AtDs of Third Country Nationals in Cyprus’, which is supported by the UNHCR Representative in Cyprus, the Commissioner for Children’s Rights and the Commissioner for Administration and Human Rights. The project focuses on three main areas: individual case management, capacity building and advocacy.

The pilot programme uses the Revised CAP model proposed by the International Detention Coalition (IDC) and the Vulnerability Screening Tool produced by UNHCR and IDC. It aims to engage with, support and provide case management for individuals in the community (such as asylum seekers, failed asylum seekers, unreturnable and other irregular third country nationals that are either detained or at risk of being detained). Moreover, it illustrates that through the use of individual case management in the community, governmental migration policy objectives can be met without the extensive use of detention. This approach will be coupled with capacity building activities such as trainings of first-line state officials (in departments responsible for deciding and executing detention orders and AtDs) and other NGOs on the ground, as well advocating at a policymaking level for the adoption and implementation of the model by state authorities.

Through the implementation of the pilot programme in Cyprus, FWC aims to create an effective way of establishing alternative measures built on the foundation of individual assessment of cases, which will offer more humane and affordable options that also have a higher possibility of case resolution.

FACTS & FIGURES

More than 5,500 unaccompanied minors have reached Italian shores in the first quarter of this year.

Source: EU Agency for Fundamental Rights, May 2017

UNHCR statistics on arrivals

Recent data by the UNHCR reveals the following trends:

- 98,185 sea arrivals have been recorded since the beginning of the year. 84,879 have arrived in Italy, while 9,461 have arrived in Greece;
- So far, 2,257 have been dead or missing in 2017;
- In Italy, the majority of refugees come from Guinea, Nigeria and Bangladesh, while more than a third of refugees arriving in Greece originate from Syria (36,7%).
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On 16 May, the European Commission published its 12th report on relocation and resettlement:

- As of 13 June, 21,136 relocations have taken place (14,240 from Greece and 6,896 from Italy);
- With regard to resettlement, as of 12 May, 16,163 people have been resettled out of the agreed 22,504, mainly from Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. Out of these, 5,695 Syrians have been resettled from Turkey within the 1:1 mechanism set out in the EU-Turkey Statement;

Source: EuropeanMigrationLaw.eu

Relevant reports

EU Agency for Fundamental Rights: Fundamental Rights Report 2017

Coinciding with its 10th anniversary in 2017, the Agency reviews major developments in the field of human rights protection in 2017, identifying both achievements and areas of concern. Topics covered include the application of the EU Charter for Fundamental Rights by Member States, equality and non-discrimination, racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, Roma integration, asylum and integration, rights of the child and more.

EU Agency for Fundamental Rights: Report on LGBTI asylum-seekers in the EU

With this report, the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights recognises the special reception needs of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) persons and/or grounds for international protection that are related to distinct vulnerabilities. Moreover, the report reviews how asylum claims based on sexual orientation and gender identity are assessed and analyses the existence of specific reception measures for LGBTI persons.

The 2016 Annual Report on the Situation of Asylum in the European Union aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the number and nature of applications for international protection made in the EU+. It examines how those applications were processed and indicates important developments at EU+ and national level in order to describe the functioning of the Common European Asylum System in each of its key aspects.

Court of Auditors: Special Report on the EU’s ‘hotspot’ approach

The European Court of Auditors has published a Special Report titled ‘EU response to the refugee crisis: the ‘hotspot’ approach’, in which it analyses the ‘hotspots’ as a particular part of the migration management chain. It found that, overall, the ‘hotspot’ approach had helped improve migration management in Italy and Greece through an increase in reception capacities, an improvement of registration procedures and by strengthening the coordination of support efforts.

Hungarian Helsinki Committee: Report on the treatment of asylum seeking children in Hungary

The report mainly focuses on Hungary’s reception infrastructure, the country’s asylum procedure with a focus on asylum seeking children, and whether the Hungarian system deprives children, both unaccompanied and separated children and those travelling with their families, of their liberty during asylum proceedings. Additionally, it highlights the situation at a children’s home in Fót and in the pre-transit area at the Serbian-Hungarian border.

UN Women: Technical Report on the legal rights of women and girls asylum seekers in the EU

In a context of restrictive interpretations of existing national and international refugee law and the lack of a Union-wide definition of gender-based persecution and gender guidelines on refugee status, asylum and reception, this report analyses how women and girls access asylum in the EU. It states that the member states’ fragmented responses are resulting in sub-optimal solutions and exacerbate the difficulties that refugees and asylum seekers face.

Frontex Consultative Forum on Fundamental Rights: Annual Report

The report highlights fundamental rights matters connected to the agency’s activities, with a particular focus on the development and implementation of the new European Border and Coast Guard regulation. It calls for ensuring accessible, impartial, transparent and independent complaints mechanisms that refugees and migrants can use to receive effective remedy with regard to Frontex fundamental rights obligations.
Calls for proposals

The European Commission has published the following calls for proposals:

- **REC-RRAC-RACI-AG-2017**: Projects to prevent and combat racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance
  - call out on 31.03.2017 - Deadline: 07.11.2017

- **REC-RDAP-GBV-AG-2017**: Projects to prevent and combat gender-based violence and violence against children
  - call out on 27.06.2017 – Deadline: 14.11.2017

**EU CALENDAR: UP COMING EVENTS**

**European Council and Council of the European Union**

- 14 September: JHA Council
- 12-13 October: JHA Council
- 19-20 October: European Council

**European Parliament**

- 10-12 July: LIBE Committee Meeting
- 31 August: LIBE Committee Meeting
- 4 September: LIBE Committee Meeting
- 7 September: LIBE Committee Meeting

**Other events**

- 2-14 July: [International Summer School in Forced Migration](#), University of Oxford, Oxford
- 10-14 July: [Summer School on Refugee and Migrant Health](#), WHO, Syracuse, Italy
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