



ECONOMIC  
AND SOCIAL  
COUNCIL  
OF GREECE

**IMMIGRATION AND COOPERATION IN THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN  
REGION**

**Monitoring Report**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The intensity and duration of the current economic crisis had a serious impact on economic growth and on labor market. Restrictive policies on financial affairs and a sharp rise in unemployment have put in second place initiatives and actions for “open” migration policies.

The most intensive pressures regarding the issue of immigration are observed in southern Europe, where crisis management policies have led economies to a deep recession. Southern countries show a rapid increase in unemployment rates and a significant decrease in their productive activities. Under these conditions, the need for imported unskilled labor force has almost reduced to zero and phenomena of social and economic marginalization of migrants, racism and xenophobia have become frequent. Fear is the natural result of feeling that something is out of control and the continuous waves of migrants, for which there is neither information nor control, are treated with hostility by European citizens and are perceived as a threat to existing jobs.

In any case, and regardless of the endurance and tolerance of the European society, the uncontrolled migratory flows that are not consistent with the needs of host countries is extremely likely to disrupt the social cohesion and the adequacy of social services. In the present conditions of recession, the inability of "economic absorption" of migrants has intensified. From the beginning of the crisis<sup>1</sup>, 50% of migrants in the EU became unemployed, while remittances to their countries of origin fell by 10%. This has serious implications on social cohesion, thus significantly increasing the risk of poverty and ghettoization of different regions. But what it makes the whole situation particularly serious is that racism and xenophobia in Europe have not only emerged from the current economic crisis, but are the result of a longstanding inability of European governments to address the immigration issue uniformly and rationally.

More specifically in the Euro-Mediterranean region stands the intensity of immigration and its social, political, economic and cultural impact has increasingly

---

<sup>1</sup> FREE SUNDAY , 1.8.2009

been drawing the attention of governments, institutions, social partners and civil society associations, in terms of the cooperation policies associated with it. At the same time, the importance of immigration and cooperation policies has been acknowledged by the Economic and Social Councils of the Euro-Mediterranean region who have paid great attention to the analysis and study of this issue.

Recently, during the Euro-Med Summit of Economic and Social Councils in Istanbul in November 2011 the *Report on Immigration and Cooperation in the Euro-Mediterranean Region*<sup>2</sup> was presented and it was agreed that the migratory situation and immigration and cooperation policies in the region should be monitored. To this end, the Final Declaration of the Summit included the establishment of a working group under the leadership of the Economic and Social Council of Greece in collaboration with the Economic and Social Council of Spain, the National Council of Economy and Labor of Italy, the Economic and Social Council of Algeria, the Economic and Social Council of Morocco and the Economic and Social Council of Jordan. The first monitoring report of this working group will be presented at the Euro-Med Summit of Economic and Social Councils to be held this year in Barcelona.

The main purpose of this report is to provide an updated view of the situation and of the migration and cooperation policies in the Euro-Med Region, in order to formulate conclusions and contribute to the policy goals expressed through consensus by the Social and Economic organizations that are represented here.

## 2. ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT SOCIOECONOMIC SITUATION

### 2.1. Main socio - demographic, economic and labour data

The Mediterranean Partner Countries (MPC's) in the southern shores have been experiencing considerable growth in recent years, which has resulted in higher GDP growth rates than those recorded globally and within the European Union. During the period of the economic crisis, the MPC's economies continue to grow at higher rates than the EU countries' (2011- 3% compared to 1.4% in the EU-27). This needs to be viewed in the light of more sustained growth in the face of external macroeconomic conditions, with an average annual rate of growth of 4.6 %, compared to 1.3% in the EU-27, between 2001 and 2011 (

table 1).

Global crisis' effects in the MPC's economies have been worsened by the recent political conflicts. Political instability in the region has generated the uncertainty in the economic environment. These conflicts have had, at least in the short term, a negative economic impact both in the affected countries and, in general, across the southern Mediterranean which has been indirectly affected by the instability in the region. That means decrease in economic growth, which has been deeper in the directly affected countries, largely due to the decrease in trade, FDI and tourism<sup>3</sup>, with negative consequences on employment and an increase in the fiscal deficit.

Concerning the structure of MPC's economies, the weight of the agriculture has been gradually reduced in the overall GDP, compared to an increase in the industry and services sectors (

table 1). Unfortunately, these changes must confront the low degree of skilled employment and in any case they didn't improve the socio-economic gap between the EU and the MPC's. The recent economic progress has proven insufficient to improve the living standards of the MPC's population. The per capita gross national income of the MPC's and the quality of life, as measured by the Human Development Index (HDI), are still bellow those recorded in most European countries (Table 3).

---

<sup>3</sup> Thus, for instance, in Egypt, Syria and Tunisia, where tourism is a key economic sector, its share of GDP dropped by 13, 15 and 20 per cent respectively in 2011. This is also the case in countries such as Jordan, where it fell more than 12 per cent.

Despite the positive growth rate, the unemployment in MPC's is still very high. The latest available figures show that the overall unemployment rate is 12.1%<sup>4</sup>, mainly between young people and women (Table 2). In addition, there is also a significant rate of underemployment among MPC's, and a high portion of "vulnerable employment"<sup>5</sup> or people who are self-employed and work on an occasional basis or irregularly. Consequently the highly increasing population, among other factors, is largely responsible for preventing economic growth from having greater social impact and from creating jobs at a suitable rate (Table 3). In view of these data, considering the behavior of the total and active population, it is estimated that for 2020, around 22 million jobs should be created in the region, enough just to stop the unemployment rate from growing. As a result it is expected that the immigration rate will further increase.

## **2.2. Euro-Med's migratory situation: main figures, features and trends**

According to the United Nations' *World Migration Report 2011*, there has been a significant loss of employment among migrant populations worldwide, but this has not led to a general decline in the number of migrants<sup>6</sup>. Within this context, net migration in the European Union was 7.9 million for the period 2005-2010<sup>7</sup>, of which two thirds were related to only three member states: Spain, Italy and the UK (Table 4). This net migration balance is below the record for the previous period, 2000-2005, by approximately 500,000 people, which could be starting to reflect the impact of the economic crisis. For example in Spain, in 2011 and especially in 2012, outflows have exceeded inflows of migrants, with the net migration balance becoming negative.

Specifically MPC's net migration shows a deficit of 934,000 people (2005-2010), compared with 858,400 people in the period 2000-2005. That is explained by the growth of the negative balance of Morocco (the highest in the whole area) and the fact that Syria and, to a lesser extent, Lebanon, have ceased to be net recipients and have

---

<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, even though the general unemployment rate among MPC's (12.1 per cent) is slightly higher than the EU's (9.9 per cent), it is still lower than various Mediterranean Member States.

<sup>5</sup> According to the World Bank's definition, family assistance networks (people who work with no remuneration in some type of family business or production).

<sup>6</sup> United Nations Organization, *World Migration Report 2011*.

<sup>7</sup> In terms of *stock*, total foreign population in the European Union stood at 33.3 million people in 2011, according to Eurostat data.

become population emitting countries during this period. It is also worth pointing out that during these years the Jordanian migration balance has become positive (because of the significant inflow of people from Iraq, and more recently, Syria), and that the Israeli migration balance, traditionally positive, has practically trebled.

Except from global economic crisis, the immigration in the MPC's has also been influenced by the political and social conflicts in a number of Arab countries (known as the *Arab Spring*), that have resulted in significant movements of people, mainly towards other Arab states, but also, to a lesser extent, to the European Union<sup>8</sup>. More precisely, the Arab uprisings known as the "Arab spring" that marked 2011 and caused major transformations from North Africa to the Middle East, strengthened the immigration flow to the Euro-Mediterranean countries<sup>9</sup>. According to the information provided by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Euro-Mediterranean Region is host to about half of the total number of refugees in the world, with a higher concentration in the case of the MPC's, where a total of 3.9 million refugees were recorded in 2011, compared to 1.3 million in the European Union (Table 8).

The conflicts in Syria have also affected the migration flows to the Euro-Mediterranean countries. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees says that more than half a million Syrian refugees have been recorded or are waiting to be recorded in the four neighboring countries (Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq) and North Africa<sup>10</sup>. Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq, unlike Turkey<sup>11</sup>, have not signed the 1951 Refugee Convention<sup>12</sup> and while offering protection, officially, they consider Syrian refugees visitors.

Syrian refugees enter Europe either by land, through Turkey (legally or illegally) to Greece and Bulgaria, by air (legally) to the other European states or by sea (illegally) across the Mediterranean, Greece, Cyprus, Malta or Italy (and possibly France and Spain). According to the European Commission, member states of the European Union,

---

<sup>8</sup> In recent times there has been a significant increase in the number of first residence permits granted in EU countries to citizens from Tunisia, Syria and Egypt, which would largely be explained by the conflicts that have taken place in these countries.

<sup>9</sup> See relevant reference on the previous Report on Migration and Cooperation in the Euro- Mediterranean Region.

<sup>10</sup> Specifically, and according to the latest figures: Lebanon 154.387 persons, Jordan 142.664 persons, Turkey 136.319 persons, Iraq 64.449 persons, UNHCR, the UN Refugee Agency, 11 December 2012.

<sup>11</sup> Turkey has signed it, but with geographic restriction that limits its application to "persons who had become refugees as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951" (preface of the convention).

<sup>12</sup> 1951 Refugee Convention.

along with Norway and Switzerland, received 16.474 asylum claims until August 2012<sup>13</sup>.

Europe responded directly and actively during the events in Syria in terms of humanitarian and economic assistance. However, regarding asylum, member states decide based on their needs and considerations for national security. While most member states process the asylum claims and provide protection to Syrians, there are significant differences in the interpretation of protection criteria and the type of status and rights provided. In Greece, for example, the asylum system fails to meet the protection needs of large numbers of refugees. Rejection rates of asylum applications greater than 50% are encountered in certain countries on the eastern border of the EU. Moreover, some countries also keep the Syrians under tolerated stay instead of offering them real protection<sup>14</sup>. As highlighted by the UNHCR, the number of asylum approvals in Europe is small in relation to the size of the refugee crisis.

With respect to the total number of asylum applications, according to the latest EASO figures,<sup>15</sup> the 27 EU member states received 85% of all asylum applications in Europe. Ten EU member states received 90% of all applications submitted to the EU<sup>16</sup>. One in four first instance decisions was positive and granted either refugee status under the Geneva Convention of 1951, subsidiary protection status within the meaning of the Qualification Directive or a residence permit for humanitarian reasons under a national scheme which is not subject to the EU legislation.

### *Illegal Migration*

As far as the illegal crossing of European borders is concerned, according to the latest available data<sup>17</sup>, it has decreased recently by 50%, mainly due to the lower intensity of political conflicts in North Africa.

This reduction, naturally, does not apply to the entire European Union and especially not to the Mediterranean European countries. In the Eastern Mediterranean

---

<sup>13</sup> Germany received 5.515, Sweden 2.506, followed by Switzerland (1.405), Austria (972), United Kingdom (912), Denmark (908) and Belgium (796).

<sup>14</sup> UNHCR, the UN Refugee Agency, 16 October 2012.

<sup>15</sup> Annual Report on the situation of asylum in the European Union and activity report of the European Asylum Support Office for the year 2011, European Asylum Support Office, 2011.

<sup>16</sup> France remained in the first place for 2011 (56.300 applications), followed by Germany (53.300 applications), Italy (34.100 applications), Belgium (31.900 applications), Sweden (29.700), United Kingdom (26.400), Netherlands (14.600), Austria (14.400), Greece (9.300) and Poland (6.900).

<sup>17</sup> 2012 data.

countries there is an increase in illegal crossings by 27%<sup>18</sup>. There was a significant increase in the number of migrants from Somalia, with Malta as the final destination of the majority, which seems to be preferred over Italy.

In Western Mediterranean, rates of illegal crossing have not changed compared to 2011. Migrants in the area are mainly from Algeria, Morocco and possibly sub-Saharan Africa, as a large number is recorded as stateless. Spanish authorities identify an upward trend in the number of Algerian and Moroccan immigrants arriving by sea in their country since the beginning of 2012.

In the Greek-Turkish border, the increase in illegal crossings involves mainly nationalities from Bangladesh and Syria. In the Greek-Albanian border the efforts of migrants from Albania to enter with forged documents have been increased. There is also an increase in the entry trend with forged documents of Pakistanis in Greece, Moroccans in Spain and Nigerians in France.

### *Policy Trends*

The migration in the Euro-Mediterranean has been becoming progressively more complex and the situation can no longer be viewed only as an exclusively unidirectional flow from the Southern Mediterranean countries towards the EU.

There are "horizontal" migration trends among the MPC's (while there is also a significant amount of migration from the MPC's towards the Gulf States), and from other states to the MPC's, both as destination countries and as transit countries (mainly towards the EU), which is due to economic and political factors, especially work and refugee (Table 7).

All these facts affected the administration of immigration policy issues in Europe. The weight of immigration policies shifted from the need to renew the economically active European population to the need to reduce the unemployment of European citizens.

It is evident that there is a shift in European policies on discouraging immigration flows, through greater border guard and increasing the difficulty of migrants' legalization. The lower tolerance to new migrants' entry is characteristic of all EU

---

<sup>18</sup> compared with 2011.



member states, but is manifested more strongly in southern European countries, which are most affected by the economic crisis and recession.

Although there are significant differences between countries in the Mediterranean Region, the numbers of concessions of first residence and work permits have been reduced. In the European Union as a whole, between 2008 and 2011, the number of permits issued was down 23.4 %, a drop which, in absolute terms, was concentrated in Spain and Italy and which affected the population from Morocco particularly, followed, at a distance, by the citizens of Turkey and Algeria, given that most of this migrants are by nature labor related (Table 6).

But as it is evident, the whole situation does not only affect illegal migrants, but also legally residing migrants in Europe. High unemployment restricts employment opportunities, with all its implications for the renewal of their residence permit (inability to concentrate stamps) and their family's residence permit (reduced family income). The risk of social marginalization and economic exclusion of legal migrants is very high mainly in southern Europe where, as it was noticed, migration flows are higher. Nevertheless the migrants' concentration patterns have not changed because they are primarily based on historical and cultural links. For example, the destination of the majority of Turkish immigrants is Germany, those from Algeria prefer France, the Egyptians Italy, Moroccan nationals reside in Spain, France and Italy, Tunisians in France and Italy, Israelis and Syrians in Germany, Jordanians in Germany and Italy, the Lebanese in Germany and France, and the Palestinians in France and Italy. In turn, the main EU destination of the migrants originating from the MPC's is Germany (36% of the total), followed by France (25% of the total), Spain (15% of the total), and Italy (13% of the total) (Table 5).

### 3. European Policy on Immigration and Asylum

The movement of people in the Mediterranean Region, is heavily influenced by the structure and the features of the Common European Policy on Immigration and Asylum, in terms of a framework within each member state retain broad powers, but in which there is also a varied set of Community Instruments ranging from the control of external borders to common visa and asylum policies, the harmonization of legislation on residence and work, or policies of equal treatment or cooperation with third countries. It seems therefore necessary to briefly review the development and the features of the Common European Policy, as it affects migration relations between the two shores of the Mediterranean.

The turning point that marked the birth of the Common European Policy on Immigration and Asylum should be located at the approval of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997, and there does not appear to be any need to go back to earlier times<sup>19</sup>. The Treaty of Amsterdam introduced the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice, and was the basis for the European Council held in Tampere in 1999 which defined the common policy on asylum and migration and adopted a first multi annual action program (1999-2004). As a result, the European Commission proposed the first guidelines for a common Immigration Policy, primarily in the area of migration flow management, admission of economic migrants, partnership with third countries and integration of migrants and their families. Following, the European Council held in Seville (2002) put more emphasis on security policies as a result of the attacks in the U.S. in September 2001.

Although the Tampere actions had an uneven assessment in relation to their implementation by member states, the overall positive view led to the adoption of a second five-year program, the Hague Program (2005-2010), which pointed out the need for a balanced approach to the management of legal migration, combating illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings, especially women and children.

---

<sup>19</sup> In this sense, the Schengen Agreement, which allowed the removal of internal borders of Member States. The so-called "Schengen Group", formed by Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, undersigned the Agreement under the same name in 1985, and subsequently the Convention implementing the Agreement in 1990. The Schengen Agreement gradually spread to almost all Member States except Ireland, Cyprus, Bulgaria, Romania and the UK, making it possible to attain the European objective of physical suppression of internal borders as well as police and judiciary cooperation within the framework of the Schengen Information System (SIS).

In 2008 the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum gave a new impetus to the common migration policy setting five goals<sup>20</sup>: manage legal immigration and encourage integration, combat illegal immigration by ensuring the return to countries of origin or transit, strengthen border control and improve the Asylum System. With regard to the first point, which refers to legal immigration, the Pact focuses more on promoting the immigration of highly qualified people and students, and proposes temporary or circular migration schemes for less skilled migrants, with stricter regulations on family reunification.

The importance of legal migration as a factor of economic growth and long-term competitiveness of the EU, is recognized by the Stockholm Program adopted by the European Council on 10/11 December 2009. The Stockholm Program focuses mainly on three main areas: ensuring a true balance between freedom and security and making extensive use of new technologies, developing the programs established in Tampere and The Hague, and developing the external dimension and cooperation with third countries, strengthening external security as a mean of bolstering internal security<sup>21</sup>.

Additionally, common immigration policy was developed through Instruments such as: Regional Cooperation Programs in the field of Justice, and Strategic Partnerships with third countries, which paved the way to EU cooperation on immigration. In order to harmonize the laws of member states, legal instruments were introduced, such as: the Family Reunification Directive<sup>22</sup>, the Directive on third-country nationals access to the EU to study, to participate in exchanges or unpaid internships<sup>23</sup> or the Directive on the admission of researchers<sup>24</sup>.

The same period also included the adoption of legal instruments such as the Directive on entry and residence of highly skilled workers and the Framework Decision

---

<sup>20</sup> A Common Immigration Policy for Europe: Principles, Actions and Tools, COM(2008)359 final.

<sup>21</sup> The implementation of the Stockholm Programme coincided with the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, which features institutional changes that have an impact on immigration policy because, in addition to acquiring the legally binding Charter of Fundamental Rights, the measures on legal immigration, border control, mobility and integration have become adopted through ordinary legislative procedures. This means introducing a qualified majority for almost all Home Office and Justice concerns, although unanimity is still required for issues such as passports, issuance of identity documents, family law with cross-border implications or operational police cooperation, among others.

<sup>22</sup> Directive 2003/86/EC.

<sup>23</sup> Directive 2004/114/EC.

<sup>24</sup> Directive 2005/71 of the Council.

to combat racism and xenophobia through the criminal courts of justice. Furthermore, several Directives were adopted, such as sanctions on employers of illegal immigrants and the Directive on the return of illegal third-country immigrants<sup>25</sup>, which featured highly controversial issues that gave rise to much dispute.

In more recent times, the common immigration and asylum policy has been reflected in legal instruments such as: the adoption of Directives on legal migration, the single permit to live and work in the EU for third-country nationals and a set of common rights for third-country workers legally residing in a particular Member State. In this line, it is also worth mentioning the Directive 2011/51/EU which extends the condition of long-term residents to beneficiaries of international protection and the Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims

Furthermore, negotiation is underway to establish a uniform legal framework at EU level regarding the seasonal workers and intra-corporate transfers. Specifically with reference to:

*a) Intra-corporate transfers*

Nowadays, in multinational companies it is quite common to temporary transfer employees to subsidiaries or branches of the group. However, the lack of uniformity in the procedures of the member states and the relevant restrictions regarding bureaucracy make intra-business transfer procedures difficult in practice for workers from third countries.

The latest developments at the level of labor mobility require reconsideration of the current situation by the European institutions, in order to meet new challenges. The aim of the Commission is the gradual simplification of procedures, the explicit harmonization of the legislative framework and the enhancement of the flexibility in the world of labor. These three elements will contribute to the economic growth and competitiveness of multinational enterprises.

---

<sup>25</sup> Directive 2008/115/EC, of 16<sup>th</sup> of December 2008, on Member States common regulations and procedures for the return of third-country illegal immigrants.

### *b) Seasonal Migration*

The arrangements to be adopted immediately by the European Commission on seasonal migration are a step towards transparency and homogenization of the relevant policies of the member states. There is also a need to focus on the issues of working conditions and the rights of seasonal migrants. Moreover, the Directive should consider the possibility of seasonal migrants moving between member states. On the other hand, a range of arrangements is positively evaluated, such as: the fact that the employee is not bound to the employer; he/she has the right to participate in trade unions, while a simplified paperwork for multiple entry visas is also proposed.

#### *The Provisions of New EU Directive*

Until December 25, 2013, the Directive on a single application procedure and authorization of workers from third countries, who are legally residing in the EU member states, will be implemented.

The European Directive on a "single permit" complements other measures already taken on legal migration, such as the blue card, while it has been designed in such a way as to facilitate the migration that meets the needs of the European labor market. Through this Directive, it is expected that the control and the balance of migration flows will be facilitated and the incentives for illegal migration will be limited. The Directive enables foreign workers to obtain work and residence permits via a single procedure.

The new rules, through which the procedures for issuing residence and work permits are simplified, do not affect EU countries' power to decide whether or not to admit non-EU workers or how many to admit. Member states are able to decide within four months whether they will grant the single permit.

The single permit holders will enjoy a standard set of rights comparable to that of European workers, such as decent working conditions, recognition of professional qualifications and the right to participate in trade unions, as well as insurance and pension rights. Only certain restrictions on the above can be implemented by various EU countries (e.g. restrictions on social security for workers with contracts of less than 6 months' duration). Moreover, vocational training and education will be provided to non-EU workers who have a job or are registered as unemployed.

The adoption of the new European legislation by the European Parliament is in the last stage of the legislative process. Member states will then have two years in which they ought to incorporate the new directives into their national laws.

Also in this period, the effects of the economic crisis, and more significantly the effects of humanitarian crises and movements of people which have taken place in the MPC's between 2011 and 2012, have caused tensions in the common European immigration policy, and have opened up a debate on the revision of Schengen in order to reinforce, in certain circumstances, external border controls, and to enable decision-making at European level on reinstatement of internal border controls in real situations of crisis.

With regard to guarding the borders of the European Union, EU countries are committed to the Dublin II Regulation. It has been established that the spirit of the Regulation does not help manage such a serious issue in a rational way: on the contrary, it exacerbates it, at least in countries such as Greece, Italy and Spain. These countries, which due to their geographic location are the main gateway for migrants, have great difficulty controlling their land and water borders, resulting in having to manage a disproportionate, compared to their capacity, number of illegal migrants. They are not allowed to repatriate these migrants or deport them and they are required to keep them "trapped" within their borders.

Greece, like Italy, has proposed the principle of equal redistribution and relocation of undocumented migrants, with a fair proportion for all member-states of Europe<sup>26</sup>. Therefore, there is an urgent need for revision of the Regulation. This revision certainly requires the agreement of both the North and the South of the EU.

### **3.2. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: frameworks and instruments for cooperation**

The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, from the original Barcelona Process (1995) to the current Union for the Mediterranean (2008), has provided a framework for multilateral cooperation in the political, economic, commercial and social spheres, and since the Barcelona Summit in 2005, also on immigration. This Regional Cooperation

---

<sup>26</sup> tvxs.gr. 03-14-2011

Framework was complemented by a more customised approach, by means of bilateral relations with Mediterranean Partner Countries (MPC's) and others, by means of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), which has sought to strengthen those aspects in the Barcelona Process that might be considered weaker through more direct cooperation with each country.

Cooperation instruments, which both in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and in the European Neighbourhood Policy incorporated the conditional nature of aid, subject to political and economic reforms, have highlighted the need to act from a more global perspective, with the aim of avoiding the risk of exploiting cooperation for the benefit of purely commercial or strategic interests, and for combating illegal immigration, putting forward support instruments which combine immigration and development, promoting legal migration and integration of immigrants in the member states.

The initial efforts made by the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on the central subject on economic cooperation were directed primarily at the promotion of development which focused on strengthening private investment and attracting foreign direct investment through financial instruments, which regional programmes were based on, and through trade agreements. In this context we should mention the Free Trade Agreement, which was intended to create a Euro-Mediterranean free trade area by 2010<sup>27</sup>, something which does not seem to have met initial co-development expectations.

The main financial instrument of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership-Barcelona Process, the MEDA funds<sup>28</sup>, has been used to finance various regional programmes, including programs on justice and home affairs, addressing one of the main objectives pursued by the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, cooperation in the fight against organised crime in order to create an area of peace and security. In particular, in the field of cooperation in the fight against illegal immigration, the program covered

---

<sup>27</sup> Undersigned in 2004 between the EU and some MPC's: Jordan, Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco; it was ratified in 2006 and came into effect in 2007.

<sup>28</sup> Created by Council Regulation (EC) 1488/96, of 23<sup>rd</sup> of July 1996, on financial and technical measures to accompany the reform of economic and social structures in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership.

mainly police and judicial training and served to establish a Euro-Mediterranean network for data collection and research on migratory phenomena<sup>29</sup>.

However, MEDA funds did not reach the expected results, in the first instance due to the differences between the amounts committed and the payments made over the two periods in which its activity was divided (1995-1999, 2000-2006)<sup>30</sup>, but mainly because they failed to reverse the progressive increase of the asymmetry and the imbalances between the two shores of the Mediterranean. This highlighted the need for further investment of resources in cooperation policies that fostered the development of the MPC's, but above all, to improve on the effective use of those resources and on the capacity of the recipients for managing and absorbing them.

In this context, the current financial instrument within the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, and the main tool for economic and financial partnership between the EU and the MPC's, the Facility for Euro-Mediterranean Investment and Partnership (FEMIP), was created in 2002 and reinforced after an initial evaluation of its activities in 2003. Its capital, facilitated by the European Investment Bank (EIB) provides loans as well as financial contributions and technical assistance grants for developers, encouraging foreign direct investment and reducing administrative burdens which had been a hindrance on many funded projects previously.

The need to further cooperation with each country, and to encourage South-South integration, prompted the creation of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), which was established as a result of the enlargement of the European Union in 2004. The ENP has opted for a more individualised approach through bilateral relations with the MPC's. To this end, it included the conditional nature of aid subject to advances in reforms in the political and economic areas, incorporating, as an innovation, the aim of participating in the domestic market, along with financial cooperation and an emphasis on investment in infrastructures.

---

<sup>29</sup> Communication from the Commission to the Council and to the European Parliament: Integrating Migration Issues in the European Union's Relations with Third Countries [COM (2002) 703 final].

<sup>30</sup> Whereas the outcome of MEDA I may be regarded as modest, given that the payments made only came to 29 per cent of the available funds, the results of MEDA II are much more positive, as the rate of commitments and payments made trebled and reached 87 per cent. According to Special Report No. 1, 2009, of the European Court of Auditors on Banking Activities in the Mediterranean Region in the context of the MEDA programme and previous Protocols.



The two main instruments of the ENP's activities are, in the first instance, the action plans which have been agreed by the EU and the partner country, whose advantage has been to focus on specific, measurable and time-bound objectives, and secondly, a new financial instrument, the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI), which is intended to co-finance processes of governance reinforcement and equitable social and economic development in ENP partner countries<sup>31</sup>.

The ENP instruments are intended to support political reforms which will strengthen good governance, respect for human rights and the participation of civil society, economic reforms, social reforms, sectoral cooperation and regional or local development programmes, among others. In the period 2007-2013 this fund has had a budget of 12,000 million euros, 95 per cent of which was allocated to national and regional programmes and other cross-border cooperation.

To these resources were added the funds from the Neighbourhood Investment Facility (NIF), created in 2008 to support, by means of credits and loans from the EU and the member states, infrastructure projects in the transport, energy and environment sectors in ENP partner countries and to support their private sector and business development, especially small and medium enterprises.

In order to promote and revitalize relations with the Mediterranean, given the uneven results obtained, the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) was created in 2008, which provided fresh energy to the Barcelona Process by upgrading the political level of the EU's relations with its Mediterranean partners and by promoting more concrete and visible multilateral relations by means of new regional and subregional projects. At the same time, it also incorporated a new management structure that sought to rebalance the Partnership through greater involvement of the MPC's.

The Union for the Mediterranean is also a boost for the funding and implementation of specific projects in the Mediterranean Region in the areas defined by the Paris Declaration<sup>32</sup>, such as transport infrastructure and sustainable energy, but

---

<sup>31</sup> In addition to other neighbouring countries, the MPC's which have benefited are Algeria, the Palestinian National Authority, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Lybia, Morocco, Syria and Tunisia.

<sup>32</sup> Adopted at the Paris Summit on the 13th of July 2008, which is the basis for the creation of the Union for the Mediterranean, underwritten by the Heads of State and Government of 43 countries.

featuring less red tape compared to schemes that existed for projects funded by European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument and other EC funds.

Under the umbrella of the ENP specific thematic programmes on immigration have also launched, such as the program for cooperation with third countries in the field of migration and asylum (AENEAS), adopted in 2004, with an expected duration of three years and a budget of 250 million euros. This programme, which has been hailed as an example of good practice, elicited greater participation by government and non-government organizations from third countries and EU member states than previous programmes and involved not only financial but also technical assistance on immigration.

This specific area of cooperation continued through the Programme for cooperation in the field of migration and asylum in the context of the financial perspectives 2007-2013, with a higher budget, 384 million euros. It follows in the spirit of the The Hague Programme to promote cooperation with third countries on migration and asylum issues, and attempts mainly the following: to stimulate the connection between migration and development; to promote well-managed labour migration; to combat illegal immigration and to facilitate the readmission of illegal immigrants; to protect migrants against exploitation and exclusion and to support the fight against trafficking in human beings; and finally to promote asylum, international protection and the protection of stateless persons.

Another policy instrument within the framework of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the field of immigration, albeit with a lower budget, is the EUROMED MIGRATION program. On the one hand it intends to strengthen police cooperation to prevent illegal migration, secondly, to promote better management of legal migratory flows, by facilitating exchanges in this manner, and thirdly, to strengthen the existing connection between migration and development through the productive use of remittances of migrants in their countries of origin, encouraging investment and the creation of job opportunities and sustainable economic development.

The European Court of Auditors has described the system of funding that the EU uses for cooperation with third countries in the field of migration and asylum as "partially effective", both because of the lack of indicators to measure its effectiveness and in relation to monitoring the efficacy of the measures which have been

implemented locally, and it points out that more technical support needs to be provided to countries in relation to their cost control systems. It would be advisable, in this regard, to strengthen control, transparency and accountability mechanisms by means of support programs to national audits and the evaluation of results.

Despite the more holistic approach to specific programs for cooperation in immigration, and precisely for that reason, it would be wise to question whether they have had and still have sufficient finance and resources, and whether they will have the continuity and the support which is demanded by the real situation of migration, especially in the light of new financial perspectives for the EU which are more restrictive and a more complex and uncertain future for the MPC's.

The economic crisis and the political developments that have taken place in many of the MPC's prompted a response by the European Council in 2011, which highlighted the need for a greater commitment to democracy and human rights, in the face of the political changes which are occurring. These events have prompted the revision of European strategies for cooperation, which have not achieved the expected results, and some of the core ideas of the Barcelona Process have been revived<sup>33</sup> in order to draw up a roadmap which will serve as a common response, in the belief that only a global strategic response is the way to address the issue of migration, but this time clear objectives and measurable priorities are incorporated as a new addition.

Among the priorities for action in relation to cooperation with countries of origin and transit of migration, it is especially worthy of mention the greater support for third countries to act more effectively and to cooperate with the EU to prevent illegal immigration. At the same time readmission agreements of illegal immigrants are being promoted with full respect for their fundamental rights, by means of incentives for cooperation and through negotiations that address all aspects of migration management. In this same line, voluntary return policies are also being promoted<sup>34</sup>.

In this context, the European Association for Democracy and Prosperity in the MPC's and the appointment of the post of EU Special Envoy for the Southern

---

<sup>33</sup> The final Barcelona Declaration includes a multilateral and a bilateral dimension for the attainment of three ambitious aims which would turn the Mediterranean into an area of peace and stability, committed to democracy and human rights, an area of shared prosperity and a space for cultural dialogue and human exchanges.

<sup>34</sup> Communication of the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. III Annual Report on Immigration and Asylum (2011). COM(2012) 250 final.

Mediterranean Region are intended to strengthen democratization and good governance among partner countries.

The first of these initiatives, which has led to the creation of the "European Foundation for Democracy", determines that assistance to MPC's is subject to advances in democratization and human rights, involving not only States but also civil society, including non-government organizations that strive for a democratic transition in neighboring countries.

## 4. PROPOSALS

The statistics confirm that approximately 214 million people worldwide are immigrants, due to financial or sociopolitical reasons, or due to natural disasters. In most cases, immigration occurs as a matter of survival and it is not a choice.

Regarding the Euro-Med Region remains one of the principal geographical areas in terms of immigration because of socio-economic and of geographical and historical factors (historical ties between some European countries and the MPC's). We must also not forget that the MPC's are not only emitters but recipients of migrants, and they also sustain a high proportion of illegal immigration, a situation which would require specific attention and policies within the collaboration and cooperation frameworks.

The fact is that both European and national laws are plenty of regulations for immigrants and there are also a great number of EU Directives incorporated at the national laws. Unfortunately, in practice it is proved that all these Regulations and laws are not effective. Immigrants continue to face problems of survival and great difficulties in being adapted to the host country.

Effective tackling and management of the issue of migration should be a matter of primary importance on the agenda of both the common European and national policies. European countries are required to obtain a comprehensive and responsible perspective on the immigration issue that will define a common immigration policy. A migration policy that would take into account issues such as human rights, equal treatment, protection of asylum seekers, combat against trafficking networks.

Building free and open societies is a matter of the utmost importance for Europe. European governments must not forget that the integration of immigrants is a two-way process requiring compromises by host societies. Racism and xenophobic syndromes are out of place in a democratic Europe. The European Commission should immediately form a new European agenda for integration, taking into account the work of the European Integration Forum.

All member states should commit themselves to a common immigration policy, as laid down in the Treaty and the Stockholm Program. This policy should have medium-term targets, surpass previous restrictions and be adapted to current needs.

Despite the economic crisis and rising unemployment, Europe needs a more open policy for new migrant workers, especially if we take into account demographic developments.

The common European policy must be developed in cooperation with countries of origin, as well as transit countries.

It is necessary to develop a clearer and more stable control system at the borders after the implementation of the Schengen Borders Code being assessed by the member states. Only in cases of unpredictable and strong migratory pressure, a common mechanism should be put in place for reintroducing controls at internal borders.

It is also proposed to assign more operational responsibilities and greater autonomy to "Frontex". However, the operations coordinated by the Agency should be subject to democratic scrutiny by the Parliament as well as the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). Furthermore, there should be continuous evaluation of the Frontex' activities and of the agreements with third countries.

It is also needed a common code of rights, guarantees and obligations of migrants to be created by the European Commission. The European Commission should encourage member states to incorporate international and European Conventions and Treaties of organizations such as the UN, the Council of Europe or the IOC, into their national laws.

The European Commission's actions included in the budget for 2014-2020 are essential for creating an area of freedom, security and justice, as well as for building a more "open" Europe of safety and solidarity. Concerning the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, it is based on the value to build an ever more integrated regional space that can generate mutual benefits in the context of the global economy and society. In the construction of this common regional space, the migration situation and the relevant European policies are in need of a future of stability and continuity which should be independent of economic crises. And at the same time, the Economic and Social Committees demand an approach taking into account the social, economic and security needs, which can support the development of all countries by offering channels and opportunities for legal migration. So that the proposals of the European

Economic and Social Committees are focused on increasing the Asylum and Migration Funds and the Internal Security Funds.

It is also needed to focus on the economic development of the countries of origin which will raise the living conditions of the population and which will respond to the needs for new jobs. To this end, it will be necessary to make progress in political, social, economic and commercial cooperation, in the framework of the Union for the Mediterranean and the European Neighbourhood Policy.

## **ANNEXES**



TABLE 1

**MACROECONOMIC CONTEXT IN THE EU AND IN MEDITERRANEAN PARTNER COUNTRIES**

Países	Crecimiento medio anual del PIB (%)		VAB sectorial (%PIB)			Renta Nacional Bruta per capita en PPA (en \$)
	2001-2010	2011	2010			2010
			Agric.	Indust.	Serv.	
<b>Unión Europea</b>						
Alemania	1,0	3,0	0,9	28,2	71,0	38.100
Austria	1,6	2,7	1,5	29,1	69,4	39.790
Belgica	1,4	1,8	0,7	21,8	77,5	38.290
Bulgaria	4,2	1,7	5,4	31,4	63,3	13.440
Chipre	2,8	0,5	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	30.890
Dinamarca	0,6	1,1	1,2	21,9	76,9	41.100
Eslovaquia	4,9	3,2	3,9	34,9	61,2	22.980
Eslovenia	2,8	0,6	2,5	31,6	65,9	26.530
España	2,1	0,4	2,7	25,7	71,7	31.800
Estonia	3,9	8,3	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	19.810
Finlandia	1,8	2,7	2,9	29,0	68,1	37.070
Francia	1,1	1,7	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	34.750
Grecia	2,1	-7,1	s.d.	18,1	s.d.	27.630
Holanda	1,4	1,0	2,0	23,9	74,2	41.810
Hungría	2,0	1,6	3,5	31,0	65,4	19.550
Irlanda	2,8	1,4	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	33.540
Italia	0,4	0,4	1,9	25,2	72,9	31.810
Letonia	4,6	5,9	4,1	21,8	74,1	16.320
Lituania	2,8	1,7	3,5	28,2	68,3	17.840
Luxemburgo	2,0	1,6	0,3	12,8	86,9	61.240
Malta	1,7	1,6	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	24.820
Polonia	3,9	4,3	3,5	31,6	64,8	19.160
Portugal	0,7	-1,6	2,4	23,1	74,5	24.590
Reino Unido	1,8	0,9	0,7	21,7	77,6	35.840
R. Checa	3,4	1,9	2,4	37,7	60,0	22.910
Rumanía	4,3	2,2	7,1	26,2	66,7	14.290
Suecia	2,2	3,7	1,9	26,7	71,5	39.730
UE-15	1,4	1,5	1,6	23,6	74,3	37139
UE-27	1,3	1,4	2,6	26,4	70,6	29.838
<b>PSM</b>						
Argelia	3,8	2,4	6,9	62,1	31,0	8.100
Egipto	4,9	1,8	14,0	37,5	48,5	6.060
Israel	3,2	4,6	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	27.660
Jordania	6,3	2,6	2,9	30,6	66,5	5.800
Libano	5,2	1,5	6,4	21,5	72,2	14.090
Marruecos	5,0	4,9	15,4	29,7	55,0	4.600
A. Palestina	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.
Siria	4,5	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	s.d.	5.120
Tunez	4,5	-1,8	8,0	32,3	59,7	9.060
Turquía	4,0	8,5	9,6	26,7	63,8	15.530
PSM (media)	4,6	3,0	9,0	34,3	56,6	10.669

Sources: Eurostat (crecimiento medio del PIB de la UE y Turquía), FMI (crecimiento medio del PIB del resto de PSM), Banco Mundial (VAB y RNB).

TABLE 2

## UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (2011)

Países	Tasa de desempleo, 15-24 años			Tasa de desempleo, general		
	Mujeres	Hombres	Total	Mujeres	Hombres	Total
<b>Unión Europea</b>						
Alemania	7,8	9,3	8,6	5,6	6,2	5,9
Austria	8,8	7,9	8,3	4,3	4,0	4,2
Bélgica	18,7	18,7	18,7	7,2	7,1	7,2
Bulgaria	25,2	27,6	26,6	10,0	12,3	11,2
Chipre	21,5	23,3	22,4	7,7	7,9	7,8
Dinamarca	12,7	15,7	14,2	7,5	7,7	7,6
Eslovaquia	33,6	33,0	33,2	13,6	13,5	13,5
Eslovenia	16,8	15,0	15,7	8,2	8,2	8,2
España	44,4	48,2	46,4	22,2	21,2	21,7
Estonia	20,7	23,7	22,3	11,8	13,1	12,5
Finlandia	18,4	21,8	20,1	7,1	8,4	7,8
Francia	24,0	22,0	22,9	10,2	9,2	9,7
Grecia	51,5	38,5	44,4	21,4	15,0	17,7
Hungría	24,6	27,2	26,1	10,9	11,0	10,9
Irlanda	23,3	35,3	29,4	10,6	17,5	14,4
Italia	32,0	27,1	29,1	9,6	7,6	8,4
Letonia	30,6	31,3	31,0	13,8	18,6	16,2
Lituania	30,4	34,6	32,9	13,0	17,8	15,4
Luxemburgo	18,9	12,9	15,6	6,3	3,7	4,8
Malta	13,8	13,7	13,8	7,1	6,2	6,5
Países Bajos	7,8	7,5	7,6	4,4	4,5	4,4
Polonia	28,9	23,6	25,8	10,5	9,0	9,7
Portugal	31,7	28,7	30,1	13,2	12,7	12,9
Reino Unido	18,4	23,5	21,1	7,3	8,7	8,0
República Checa	17,9	18,1	18,0	7,9	5,8	6,7
Rumanía	23,8	23,7	23,7	6,8	7,9	7,4
Suecia	22,0	23,8	22,9	7,5	7,6	7,5
<b>PSM</b>						
Argelia	46,3	42,8	24,3	10,1	11,0	11,3
Egipto	47,9	17,2	24,8	22,9	5,2	9,4
Israel	13,9	15,7	14,7	7,6	7,6	7,6
Jordania	45,9	22,6	27,0	24,1	10,3	12,9
Líbano	21,5	22,3	22,1	10,1	8,6	9,0
Marruecos	19,4	22,8	21,9	10,5	9,8	10
Palestina	47,3	38,8	46,9	38,6	17,7	24,5
Siria	49,1	13,1	19,1	25,7	5,2	8,4
Túnez	29,3	31,4	30,7	17,3	13,1	14,2
Turquía	25,0	25,4	25,3	14,3	13,9	14,0

Data for 2011 or last available year.

Sources: Eurostat (UE) and World Bank, World Developments Indicators & Global Development Finance (PSM), 2011.

Source: World Population Prospects UN, Revised 2010.

TABLE 3

## POPULATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN THE EU AND THE MPC'S

Países	Características de la población					Índice de Desarrollo Humano	
	Población total	Población menor de 15 años	Población 15-30 años	Ratio de dependencia (65 años y más)	Edad mediana	Índice de desarrollo humano (IDH) (valor)	Posición en la clasificación del IDH
	Millones	(% del total)	(% del total)		años		
	2010	2010	2011	2010	2010	2011	2011
<b>Unión Europea</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2011</b>
Alemania	81,8	18,4	17,2	25,9	44,3	0,905	9
Austria	8,4	14,7	18,8	26,0	41,8	0,885	19
Bélgica	10,8	15,0	18,4	19,8	41,2	0,886	18
Bulgaria	7,6	16,9	18,9	26,5	41,6	0,771	55
Chipre	0,8	13,7	23,7	25,5	34,2	0,840	31
Dinamarca	5,5	14,0	18,1	20,9	40,6	0,895	16
Eslovaquia	5,4	15,1	22,3	16,6	36,9	0,834	35
Eslovenia	2,0	13,9	18,3	23,6	41,7	0,884	21
España	46,0	15,0	17,2	24,9	40,1	0,878	23
Estonia	1,3	18,0	21,1	25,1	39,7	0,835	34
Finlandia	5,4	15,3	18,7	25,5	42,0	0,882	22
Francia	64,7	16,5	18,5	26,0	39,9	0,884	20
Grecia	11,3	13,5	16,9	30,8	41,4	0,861	29
Hungría	10,0	14,6	19,2	27,7	39,8	0,816	38
Irlanda	4,5	14,7	20,0	24,0	34,7	0,908	7
Italia	60,3	21,2	15,7	17,4	43,2	0,874	24
Letonia	2,2	14,1	21,7	31,0	40,2	0,805	43
Lituania	3,3	13,8	21,9	26,0	39,3	0,810	40
Luxemburgo	0,5	14,9	18,8	23,2	38,9	0,867	25
Malta	0,4	17,7	21,3	20,4	39,5	0,832	36
Países Bajos	16,6	17,7	18,3	22,9	40,7	0,910	3
Polonia	38,2	14,8	22,4	19,0	38,0	0,813	39
Portugal	10,6	15,1	17,7	26,8	41,0	0,809	41
Reino Unido	62,0	17,4	20,1	25,1	39,8	0,863	28
República Checa	10,5	17,8	19,2	16,4	39,4	0,865	27
Rumanía	21,5	15,2	21,5	21,3	38,5	0,781	50
Suecia	9,3	16,5	19,5	28,0	40,7	0,904	10
UE-27 (media)	18,6	15,8	19,5	23,9	40,0	0,855	-
<b>PSM</b>							
Argelia	35,5	27,0	28,4	4,6	26,2	0,698	96
Egipto	81,1	31,5	26,9	4,5	24,4	0,644	113
Israel	7,6	27,2	20,7	10,0	30,1	0,888	17
Jordania	6,0	37,5	29,2	3,6	20,7	0,698	95
Libano	4,2	24,8	24,8	7,3	29,1	0,739	71
Marruecos	32,0	28,0	26,8	5,3	26,3	0,582	130
A. Palestina	4,2	42,5	28,1	2,9	18,1	0,641	114
Siria	20,4	36,9	27,4	3,2	21,1	0,632	119
Túnez	10,5	23,5	26,1	6,7	28,9	0,698	94
Turquía	72,8	26,4	24,7	5,8	28,3	0,699	92
PSM (media)	27,4	30,5	26,3	5,4	25,3	0,692	-

Sources: 1) Eurostat (EU) and World Bank (MPC), 2) Eurostat (EU) and UN (MPC), 3) World Bank, 4) UN. 5) UN Report on Human Development 2011.

TABLE 4

## NET MIGRATIONS IN THE EU-27 AND IN THE MPC'S

Países	Migración neta		Tasa de migración neta	
	miles		Por 1000 hab.	
	2000-2005	2005-2010	2000-2005	2005-2010
<b>Unión Europea</b>	<b>8.392,1</b>	<b>7.887,7</b>		
Alemania	769,0	550,0	1,9	1,3
Austria	219,9	160,0	5,4	3,8
Bélgica	195,9	200,0	3,8	3,8
Bulgaria	-41,3	-50,0	-1,1	-1,3
Chipre	61,8	44,2	12,5	8,3
Dinamarca	46,3	90,3	1,7	3,3
Eslovaquia	7,5	36,7	0,3	1,3
Eslovenia	22,5	22,0	2,3	2,2
España	2.829,2	2.250,0	13,5	10,1
Estonia	0,9	0,0	0,1	0,0
Finlandia	33,3	72,6	1,3	2,7
Francia	765,8	500,0	2,6	1,6
Grecia	192,5	154,0	3,5	2,7
Holanda	144,6	50,0	1,8	0,6
Hungría	66,2	75,0	1,3	1,5
Irlanda	199,9	100,0	10,0	4,6
Italia	1.853,7	1.998,9	6,4	6,7
Letonia	-19,6	-10,0	-1,7	-0,9
Lituania	-35,8	-35,5	-2,1	-2,1
Luxemburgo	14,4	42,5	6,5	17,6
Malta	8,6	5,0	4,3	2,4
Polonia	-104,1	55,6	-0,5	0,3
Portugal	180,0	150,0	3,4	2,8
Reino Unido	968,4	1.020,2	3,3	3,3
R. Checa	56,9	240,5	1,1	4,6
Rumanía	-200,0	-100,0	-1,8	-0,9
Suecia	155,4	265,6	3,5	5,8
<b>PSM</b>	<b>-858,4</b>	<b>-934,0</b>		
Argelia	-140,0	-140,0	-0,9	-0,8
Egipto	-370,8	-346,9	-1,0	-0,9
Israel	102,9	273,6	3,3	7,8
Jordania	-93,9	202,9	-3,7	7,0
Libano	100,0	-12,5	5,1	-0,6
Libia	-20,3	-20,3	-0,7	-0,7
Marruecos	-614,0	-675,0	-4,2	-4,3
A. Palestina	-190,0	-90,0	-11,3	-4,7
Siria	548,3	-55,9	6,4	-0,6
Túnez	-80,6	-20,0	-1,7	-0,4
Turquía	-100,0	-50,0	-0,3	-0,1

Source: United Nations

TABLE 5

## MPC'S POPULATION RESIDING IN THE EU-27, 2005 AND 2011

(number and percentage)

País de destino	Total PSM en países UE-27		Distribución PSM por países UE-27		% PSM sobre total extranjeros	
	2005	2011	2005	2011	2005	2011
Bélgica <sup>1</sup>	137.839	149.333	2,8	2,7	15,8	12,8
Bulgaria <sup>1</sup>	2.247	4.239	0,0	0,1	8,6	10,9
Rep. Checa	2.399	4.842	0,0	0,1	1,2	1,2
Dinamarca	38.017	37.588	0,8	0,7	14,2	10,9
Alemania	1.970.508	1.942.548	39,9	35,6	27,0	27,0
Estonia <sup>7</sup>	26	26	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Irlanda <sup>2</sup>	1.804	1.865	0,0	0,0	0,7	0,5
Grecia <sup>8</sup>	24.445	24.445	0,5	0,4	2,8	2,6
España	514.830	843.186	10,4	15,5	15,3	14,9
Francia <sup>6</sup>	1.339.145	1.339.145	27,1	24,6	37,0	35,0
Italia	466.995	707.774	9,5	13,0	19,4	15,5
Chipre	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Letonia	416	511	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1
Lituania <sup>3</sup>	344	717	0,0	0,0	1,1	2,1
Luxemburgo <sup>8</sup>	810	810	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,4
Hungría	3.040	5.320	0,1	0,1	2,1	2,5
Malta <sup>9</sup>	560	560	0,0	0,0	4,7	2,7
Holanda	200.191	157.007	4,1	2,9	28,6	23,3
Austria <sup>4</sup>	126.775	122.332	2,6	2,2	16,4	13,5
Polonia <sup>5</sup>	1.223	1.536	0,0	0,0	2,9	3,3
Portugal <sup>5</sup>	3.397	3.140	0,1	0,1	1,2	0,7
Rumania <sup>4</sup>	5.387	5.573	0,1	0,1	20,8	17,8
Eslovenia	80	234	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,3
Eslovaquia	487	1.121	0,0	0,0	2,2	1,6
Finlandia	4.244	6.841	0,1	0,1	3,9	4,1
Suecia	23.646	26.332	0,5	0,5	4,9	4,2
Reino Unido <sup>6</sup>	66.686	66.686	1,4	1,2	2,2	1,5
<b>UE-27</b>	<b>4.935.541</b>	<b>5.453.711</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>19,0</b>	<b>16,4</b>

1) Data for 2005 is for 2008; 2) Data for 2005 is for 2009; 3) Data for 2011 is for 2008; 4) Data for 2011 is for 2009; 5) Data for 2005 is for 2007; 6) Both sets of data for 2005; 7) Data for 2000; 8) Data for 2001, and 9) Both sets of data for 2008

Source: Eurostat.

TABLE 6

**CONCESSION OF FIRST RESIDENCE PERMITS TO MPC'S NATIONALS IN THE EU-27, IN  
2011**

(number and percentage)

	2011			Variación 2011/2008	
	Número	Distribución (%)	Peso sobre permisos totales (%)	Número	%
<b>Países de destino</b>					
<b>Total en UE-27</b>	<b>287.157</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>12,2</b>	<b>-87.916</b>	<b>-23,4</b>
Bélgica	14.505	5,1	24,1	1.673	13,0
Bulgaria	1.534	0,5	30,5	9	0,6
Rep. Checa	1.272	0,4	6,1	270	26,9
Dinamarca	1.576	0,5	6,4	-121	-7,1
Alemania	17.484	6,1	15,8	-851	-4,6
Estonia	119	0,0	3,5	58	95,1
Irlanda	631	0,2	2,6	-259	-29,1
Grecia	1.323	0,5	6,2	-1.294	-49,4
España	57.161	19,9	20,2	-38.572	-40,3
Francia	69.066	24,1	34,9	-6.695	-8,8
Italia	68.627	23,9	20,7	-35.103	-33,8
Chipre	1.692	0,6	10,8	-1.794	-51,5
Letonia	205	0,1	5,1	9	4,6
Lituania	111	0,0	4,6	-376	-77,2
Luxemburgo	211	0,1	7,8	-20	-8,7
Hungría	1.664	0,6	11,2	-1.279	-43,5
Malta	225	0,1	7,9	-356	-61,3
Holanda	7.034	2,4	12,8	-2.050	-22,6
Austria	6.167	2,1	17,4	1.032	20,1
Polonia	4.849	1,7	1,8	2.788	135,3
Portugal	746	0,3	2,1	132	21,5
Rumania	2.483	0,9	25,5	-3.234	-56,6
Eslovenia	187	0,1	1,9	100	114,9
Eslovaquia	236	0,1	6,5	-114	-32,6
Finlandia	1.035	0,4	5,1	-134	-11,5
Suecia	7.812	2,7	10,3	2.251	40,5
Reino Unido	19.202	6,7	2,7	-3.986	-17,2
<b>Países de origen</b>					
Turquía	52.251	18,2	2,2	-8.851	-14,5
Argelia	33.818	11,8	1,4	-3.016	-8,2
Egipto	23.121	8,1	1,0	1.901	9,0
Marruecos	119.591	41,6	5,1	-84.160	-41,3
Tunez	34.554	12,0	1,5	7.684	28,6
Israel	4.931	1,7	0,2	-1.819	-26,9
Jordania	3.504	1,2	0,1	85	2,5
Libano	5.218	1,8	0,2	-906	-14,8
Palestina	1.117	0,4	0,0	-335	-23,1
Siria	9.052	3,2	0,4	1.501	19,9

Source: Eurostat.

TABLE 7

**ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT WORKERS (AND THEIR FAMILIES) IN THE MPC'S**

(mid-2000's)

<b>Países</b>	<b>Número estimado</b>	<b>Principales países de origen</b>
Argelia	> 10.000	Mali, Niger
Egipto	> 100.000	Sudan
Israel	100.000	Países de la antigua Unión Soviética
Jordania	> 100000	Egipto, Bangladesh
Líbano	0,4 - 0,5 mill	Siria
Libia	1,0 - 1,2 mill	Sudan, Egipto, Tunez, Chad
Marruecos	10.000	África Subsahariana
A. Palestina	422.000	Israel
Siria	< 10.000	
Túnez	< 10.000	
Turquía	0,1 - 0,5 mill	Moldavia, Rumanía, Ucrania, Rusia
<b>Total</b>	<b>2-3 millones</b>	

Source: CARIM

TABLE 8

## REFUGEES, BY COUNTRY OF ASYLUM

	2005		2011		Variación 2011/2005	
	Número	%	Número	%	Número	%
<b>Unión Europea</b>	<b>1.488.778</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>1.346.239</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>-142.539</b>	<b>-9,6</b>
Alemania	700.016	47,0	571.684	42,5	-128.332	-18,3
Austria	21.230	1,4	47.073	3,5	25.843	121,7
Bélgica	15.282	1,0	22.402	1,7	7.120	46,6
Bulgaria	4.413	0,3	5.688	0,4	1.275	28,9
Chipre	701	0,0	3.503	0,3	2.802	399,7
Dinamarca	44.374	3,0	13.399	1,0	-30.975	-69,8
Eslovaquia	368	0,0	546	0,0	178	48,4
Eslovenia	251	0,0	142	0,0	-109	-43,4
España	5.374	0,4	4.228	0,3	-1.146	-21,3
Estonia	7	0,0	50	0,0	43	614,3
Finlandia	11.809	0,8	9.175	0,7	-2.634	-22,3
Francia	137.316	9,2	210.207	15,6	72.891	53,1
Grecia	2.390	0,2	1.573	0,1	-817	-34,2
Holanda	118.189	7,9	74.598	5,5	-43.591	-36,9
Hungría	8.046	0,5	5.106	0,4	-2.940	-36,5
Irlanda	7.113	0,5	8.248	0,6	1.135	16,0
Italia	20.675	1,4	58.060	4,3	37.385	180,8
Letonia	11	0,0	95	0,0	84	763,6
Lituania	531	0,0	821	0,1	290	54,6
Luxemburgo	1.822	0,1	2.855	0,2	1.033	56,7
Malta	1.939	0,1	6.952	0,5	5.013	258,5
Polonia	4.604	0,3	15.847	1,2	11.243	244,2
Portugal	363	0,0	408	0,0	45	12,4
Reino Unido	303.181	20,4	193.510	14,4	-109.671	-36,2
R. Checa	1.802	0,1	2.449	0,2	647	35,9
Rumanía	2.056	0,1	1.005	0,1	-1.051	-51,1
Suecia	74.915	5,0	86.615	6,4	11.700	15,6
<b>PSM</b>	<b>2.446.540</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>3.911.932</b>	<b>100,0</b>	<b>1.465.392</b>	<b>59,9</b>
Argelia	94.101	3,8	94.148	2,4	47	0,0
Egipto	88.946	3,6	95.087	2,4	6.141	6,9
Israel	609	0,0	41.235	1,1	40.626	6.670,9
Jordania	1.828.842	74,8	2.455.710	62,8	626.868	34,3
Libano	405.248	16,6	451.009	11,5	45.761	11,3
Marruecos	219	0,0	736	0,0	517	236,1
A. Palestina	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siria	26.089	1,1	755.445	19,3	729.356	2.795,6
Túnez	87	0,0	4.097	0,1	4.010	4.609,2
Turquía	2.399	0,1	14.465	0,4	12.066	503,0
<b>Total en el mundo</b>	<b>8.661.988</b>	-	<b>10.404.804</b>	-	<b>1.742.816</b>	<b>20,1</b>
% UE-27	17,2	-	12,9	-	84,1	-
% PSM	28,2	-	37,6	-	-8,2	-
% UE-27 + PSM	45,4	-	50,5	-	75,9	-

Source: ACNUR.