# Top-line "Factsheet"

The objective of the study is to offer a general overview of the Spanish experience in the operation of the visa liberalization regime. It aims to identify challenges, best practices and positive experience and provides up-to-date information on the latest trends in this area of migration policy.

The study is structured in five sections. The first section of the study provides a perspective of the experience of Spain after the liberalization of visas. The section also analyses the short and long-term trends after the entry into force of this regime, the factors of attraction and the links between the countries of origin and destination.

The objective in Section 2 is to analyse the positive impact of the liberalization of short-term visas in countries of destination (i.e. Spain) and third-country nationals.

Section 3 investigates possible migration risks as a result of visa liberalization regimes and the capacity of Spain to meet the emerging challenges after the visa liberalization regimes were established.

Section 4 evaluates the measures taken by Member States to deal with the possible misuse of these regimes, the effectiveness of these measures and, more generally, how Member States respond and cooperate in cases of asylum inflow.

Section 5 finally provides the conclusions of the study.

The <u>study specifically covers the Western and Eastern Balkans Association countries that have successfully concluded the visa liberalization</u> dialogues in accordance with the relevant action plans and roadmaps. Looking at the statistics, has to be taken into account that third country nationals legally residing in Spain coming from this geographical area represents 2% of total foreigners residing in Spain.

Besides, as a general comment, neither in terms of asylum applications nor in the case of external border-crossings the figures from Western Balkans represent a significant part of the overall figures of all third countries. This is further confirmed in the field of asylum by the fact that none of the Western Balkans countries was included among the top 5 nationalities in terms of positive or negative decisions.

Figures on asylum requests are very limited to draw any conclusion on possible pull factors. The only possible exception to this rule could be the case of Ukraine in the context of asylum requests, since in the period between 2015 and 2017 Ukraine it was included among the main countries of origin of the applicants. This trend is however evolving, since asylum applications of Ukrainian citizens decreased in 2017 compared to previous years.

So, the relevance of our findings is consequently limited taking into account the limited presence of these nationalities in Spain and visa liberalization for these countries has not posed relevant challenges to Spain.

## Section 1: The National Framework

#### SECTION 1.1: DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SITUATION

Q1.1 Please provide an analysis of the short term (within two years) and long-term (beyond two years) trends which appeared in your Member State after the commencement of visa-free regimes disaggregated by region and third countries of interest.<sup>1</sup>

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Tables 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5 and 3.2.2.

Western Balkans - FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Looking at the external borders crossing, there does not seem to be a clear pattern. Irregular border crossings are extremely limited in numbers in the Spanish case. On external border crossings, in general terms the trend seems to confirm an increasing figure. It does not, however, seem to be directly linked to the period starting the visa-free regime. As an example, both in the FYROM and Serbia arrivals decreased in 2011 compared to the previous year. The same applies in Albania in 2012 compared to the previous year.

As a general comment, neither in terms of asylum applications nor in the case of external border-crossings the figures from Western Balkans represent a significant part of the overall figures of all third countries. This is further confirmed in the field of asylum by the fact that none of the Western Balkans countries was included among the top 5 nationalities in terms of positive or negative decisions.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

With the exception of Ukraine neither in terms of asylum applications nor in the case of external border-crossings the figures from Moldova or Georgia represent a significant part of the overall figures of all third countries. This is further confirmed in the field of asylum by the top five nationalities included as part of positive/negative decisions on asylum applications (see table 1.2.8).

The only exception to the foregoing trend is the case of Ukraine. Arrivals do not, however, seem to be related to visa liberalisation, since an increasing pattern on external border crossings and asylum applications can be observed from 2011 and 2013 respectively (see tables 1.2.1 and 1.2.5). Ukraine is included in the period 2016 and 2017 among the top five nationalities both in terms of negative and positive decisions on asylum (as confirmed by table 1.2.8). This is logic considering Ukraine was one of the main nationalities of asylum seekers. The number of overall decisions is expected to decrease along with the decrease of requests (which reached its peak in 2015 and is since then descending). Recognition rate is however limited.

**Q1.2.** What are the main links between the countries of origin and your Member State or the applicable 'pull factors' disaggregated by region and third countries of interest?

Western Balkans - FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Figures on asylum are very limited to draw any conclusion on possible pull factors.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Please use information such as: increase of entries, number of asylum applications, refusals of entry, return and removal decisions in your answers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> These may include: presence of diaspora, historical links between countries, social assistance received by asylum seekers, probability of receiving a residence permit/long-term visa, schemes (tourism, family ties, business) for attracting certain categories of migrants using visa-free regime.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Figures on asylum requests are very limited to draw any conclusion on possible pull factors. The only possible exception to this rule could be the case of Ukraine in the context of asylum requests, since in the period between 2015 and 2017 Ukraine it was included among the main countries of origin of the applicants. This trend is however evolving, since asylum applications of Ukrainian citizens decreased in 2017 compared to previous years.

**Q1.3.** Which national institutions and/or authorities are involved in implementing the visa liberalisation process and what is their respective role in this process?<sup>3</sup>

The negotiation of the liberalization of visas in the EU scope are carried out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation with prior coordination with the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Q1.4	. Were there changes in your national legislation in connection with the introduction of the visa-
	free regimes? If yes, please explain their scope and impact on nationals coming from the third
	countries analysed in this study?

No.

Q1.5. Where there any public/policy debates related to the visa liberalisation process in you (Member) State? If yes, what were the main issues discussed and how did this impact national policy?

Not as a priority.

**Q1.6.** Do you have any other remarks relevant to this section that were not covered above? If yes, please highlight them below.

There is no additional remarks.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For example: changes in instructions for border patrol agents and in equipment.

#### **SECTION 1.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION**

Please provide, to the extent possible, the following statistics (with their source) along with, if necessary, an explanatory note to interpret them in particular when the statistics provided are partial, had to be estimated (e.g. on the basis of available statistics that differs from the below, or of first-hand research) or when they reflect any particular trends (e.g. a change in policy). If statistics are not available, please try to indicate an order of magnitude and why they are not available. When available, statistics from Eurostat should be used and presented annually covering the period between 2008 and 2017 inclusive. For year 2007, national data should be provided, if available.

At a minimum please provide data two years before and after the waiver agreement date for each third country (as highlighted in green in each table). Ideally, the study aims to present data for the whole period if available (e.g. from Eurostat).

## When filling in the tables please do not leave blank cells and follow these conventions:

N/A – not applicable, in cases where the question is not applicable to your (Member) State please insert N/A in relevant cells.

NI - no information, in cases where there is no data available please insert NI in relevant cells.

0 – insert 0 whenever you have collected data and the result was 0.

Table 1.2.1: Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries<sup>4</sup>

Indicator		(insert a										
Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	315	1.184	220	4.066	1.301	1.952	3.606	3.432	8.024	12.607	13.993	
Montenegro	N/A	N/A	158	75	142	447	2.489	1.211	2.994	3.403	2.934	
Serbia	N/A	242	342	5.488	5.128	8.326	8.210	11.145	13.735	15.622	13.119	
Albania	843	490	1.241	4.469	4.992	2.916	6.092	5.708	6.866	6.659	9.396	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	459	716	613	680	891	1.201	1.778	2.647	3.559	4.131	3.923	
Moldova	611	1.044	875	1.086	1.159	2.368	5.885	7.825	8.806	11.594	22.957	
Georgia	1.692	1.455	905	1.538	1.793	3.643	10.166	13.388	15.806	20.196	27.856	
Ukraine	39.461	35.085	22.280	26.415	43.270	73.296	96.108	83.537	95.613	117.276	140.902	
Total	43.611	40.216	26.634	43.817	58.676	94.149	134.334	128.893	155.403	191.488	235.080	
Total number of external border crossings (persons) <sup>5</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. The indicator refers to border-crossings at the external borders of the EU plus NO.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of border crossings (persons)

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination. Spain

Table 1.2.2: Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries<sup>6</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	
Total	0	0	0	О	o	О	o	3	12	0	0	
Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings <sup>7</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Frontex: Number of detections of illegal border-crossings by sea and land; Available at: http://frontex.europa.eu/trends-and-routes/migratory-routes-map/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of irregular border crossings.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 1.2.3: Total number of short-stay visa applications by third country<sup>8</sup>

Indicator			Character of the second				est (2007-			4 -1-4-X		
al number of short- stay visa applications by third country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)		
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	718	452	278	56	26	35	68	79	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	]
Serbia		NI	NI	400	333	254	259	375	232	221	319	1
Albania	NI	NI	NI	2.087	52	29	21	37	38	87	102	The visa
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	3.561	33	73	69	55	17	15	17	exception applies only to biometric
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	passport holders
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ukraine		NI	NI	31.763	56.561	80.043	105.956	76.983	82.289	92.151	40.095	
Total	NI	NI	NI	38.529	57.431	80.677	106.361	77.476	82.611	92.542	40.612	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See DG HOME Schengen Visa statistics, Available at: <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy\_en#stats">https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy\_en#stats</a>. For MS that still apply visa requirements, please remove the N/A and complete the table in full.

Total number of short-stay visa applications – all third countries <sup>9</sup>	NI	NI	NI	1.124.667	1.496.142	1.812.204	2.056.401	1.893.708	1.599.743	1.554.038	1.594.808	
---	----	----	----	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa applications.

Table 1.2.4: Total number of short-stay visa application <u>refusals</u> by third country<sup>10</sup>

Indicator		(insert	all availat				2007-20		agreemer	nt date)		
tal number of short- stay visa application <u>refusals</u> by third country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	dditional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	22	24	9	2	3	3	6	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	6	8	3	5	4	3	8	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	3	0	4	0	1	7	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	The visa exception applies only to biometric passport
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	holders
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	2.854	234	535	1.024	3.666	3.593	1.586	
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	2.883	269	548	1.035	3.676	3.600	1.607	
Total number of short-stay visa application refusals  – all third countries 11	NI	NI	NI	NI	106.994	95.156	108.304	116.388	123.772	127.004	134.071	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See DG HOME Schengen Visa statistics, Available at: <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy\_en#stats">https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy\_en#stats</a>. For MS that still apply visa requirements, please remove the N/A and complete the table in full.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa application refusals.

f you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	
	_

Table 1.2.5: Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries<sup>12</sup>

Indicator	(in:	Period of interest (2007-2017)  (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)											
Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)	
FYROM	0	5	10	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	5		
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Serbia	10	0	0	5	0	5	5	0	15	10	20		
Albania	5	0	5	5	0	5	15	10	15	25	55		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	The methodology of 2007 differs from that corresponding to	
Moldova	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	5	subsequent years, from the entry into force of Regulation (CE)	
Georgia	15	60	35	50	10	10	10	20	55	70	235	862/2007 (2008 onwards)	
Ukraine	5	5	10	5	10	20	15	895	3.345	2.570	2.270		
Total	50	70	60	75	20	40	50	925	3.440	2.695	2.595		
Total number of asylum applications – all third countries 13	7.195	4.515	3.005	2.740	3.420	2.565	4.485	5.615	14.780	15.775	31.120		

# Source: Eurostat (11/05/2018)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> See Eurostat: Asylum and first time asylum applicants by citizenship, age and sex Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr\_asyappctza]. For Georgia and Ukraine, monthly date may be considered.

 $<sup>^{13}</sup>$  All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of asylum applications.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 1.2.6: Total number of positive decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries<sup>14</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of positive decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	0	0	0	О	0	0	0	О	0	0	О	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The methodology of 2007 differs
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	from that corresponding to subsequent years, from the entry
Moldova	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	into force of Regulation (CE) 862/2007 (2008 onwards)
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	275	
Total	О	0	0	o	0	О	О	0	0	65	280	

Source: Eurostat (11/05/2018)

\*Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> See Eurostat: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr\_asydcfsta]; Total positive decisions, including only refugee status and subsidiary protection, rounded up to the unit of 5.

Table 1.2.7: Total number of <u>negative</u> decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries<sup>15</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of negative decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	0	0	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Serbia	10	5	15	5	0	5	5	0	10	0	5	
Albania	5	0	5	0	5	0	10	15	10	10	20	The methodology of 2007 differs
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10	10	10	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	from that corresponding to subsequent years, from the entry
Moldova	10	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	into force of Regulation (CE) 862/2007 (2008 onwards)
Georgia	15	20	30	65	35	10	10	20	25	25	55	
Ukraine	15	10	15	5	5	15	15	80	35	355	3.025	
Total	65	45	85	105	45	35	40	115	80	390	3.105	

Source: Eurostat (11/05/2018)

\*Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> See Eurostat: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex, Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr\_asydcfsta]

Table 1.2.8: Total number of positive and negative decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)<sup>16</sup>

Indicator												
Total number of positive decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
Syria	0	15	5	0	0	0	150	1.160	655	6.215	3.490	
Cuba	20	15	45	215	550	30	15	10	5	5	10	The methodology of 2007 differs
Palestine	0	0	0	90	95	85	75	85	45	90	245	from that corresponding to subsequent years, from the entry into force of Regulation (CE) 862/2007 (2008 onwards)
Somalia	0	10	5	40	75	50	90	90	110	100	35	
Pakistan	0	5	10	40	10	35	65	55	60	45	45	
Total	20	45	65	385	730	200	395	1.400	875	6.455	3.825	
Total number of negative decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
Colombia	1.650	1.505	1.005	380	420	100	75	70	55	120	240	The methodology of 2007 differs from that corresponding to
Algeria	195	225	330	180	120	195	220	285	370	720	1.035	subsequent years, from the entry
Ukraine	15	10	15	5	5	15	15	80	35	355	3.025	into force of Regulation (CE) 862/2007 (2008 onwards)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> This is to provide a broader context; any nat785ionality may be included in250 the top five. See Eurostat: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr\_asydcfsta]; Total positive decisions, including only refugee status and subsidiary protection, rounded up to the unit of 5.

Nigeria	605	785	600	215	250	300	225	200	95	45	50
Mali	5	10	25	15	35	15	15	130	230	1.025	460
Total	2.470	2.535	1.975	795	830	625	550	765	785	2.265	4.810

Source: Eurostat (11/05/2018)

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:

Table 1.2.9: Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country<sup>17</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all ava	ailable da									
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	61	42	35	52	41	51	59	55	68	74	
Montenegro	NI	17	15	25	27	19	18	25	27	54	46	
Serbia	NI	362	275	240	349	257	272	262	249	351	344	
Albania	NI	165	141	121	131	133	138	134	172	217	258	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	152	55	52	59	41	57	61	46	56	76	
Moldova	NI	2.410	142	1.058	1.014	723	621	510	511	567	539	
Georgia	NI	984	922	875	1.240	992	901	802	853	692	663	
Ukraine	NI	8.563	5.112	3.857	4.413	3.687	3.637	3.595	3.809	3.893	4.138	
Total	NI	12.714	7.984	6.263	7.285	5.893	5.695	5.448	5.722	5.898	6.138	
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) 18	NI	399.827	290.813	258.309	282.763	223.318	196.244	189.481	192.931	211.533	231.153	

Source: Eurostat (26/09/2018)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat - Number of first residence permits issued by reason, EU-28, 2008-2016 [migr\_resfirst]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of residence permit applications.

Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).	
f you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 1.2.10: Total number of identity document fraud instances by visa-free country<sup>19</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of identity document fraud instances by visa-free country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	6	8	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Albania	2	1	4	5	6	2	7	0	14	4	3	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Moldova	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Georgia	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	5	
Ukraine	2	1	1	8	4	0	1	0	4	3	2	
Total	5	2	15	16	14	3	9	7	32	9	11	
Total number of identity document fraud instances <sup>20</sup>												

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.
 <sup>20</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identity document fraud instances.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

# Section 2: Positive impact of visa liberalisation on (Member) States

National Contribution (max. 6 pages, excluding statistics)

The aim of this Section is to analyse the positive impact of short-term visa liberalisation on countries of destination (i.e. Member States) and third-country nationals as evidenced by quantitative and qualitative information.

The synthesis report will aim to include infographics and visuals, therefore please take that into account when answering the questions / filling the tables by adding any innovative or visual presentations in your national reports that can carry through into the synthesis report. We also welcome any photos/images which are captioned, relevant and (data) protected with your national contribution.

When answering the questions in this section please consider the statistical data as presented in the tables listed below and detailed in Section 2.2:

- Table 2.2.1: Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries;
- Table 2.2.2: Total number of first-time residence permit applications received from visa-free country nationals;
- Table 2.2.3: Total number of first residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons to visa-free country nationals;
- Table 2.2.4: Total number of first residence permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals;
- Table 2.2.5: Total number of first residence permits issued to entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries.

If you do not have data as requested in the above tables, please explain why this is the case after each table in the relevant box.

Please do not leave any answer box or table cell blank or empty and insert N/A, NI or 0 as applicable.

## SECTION 2.1: DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SITUATION

**Q2.1.** What impact did the visa liberalisation have on your (Member) State? Please provide a short description of your national situation.

The liberalization of visas, with a general character, entails an increase in movements when the barriers are reduced. However, in relation to the countries to which the Study refers, there is no relevant information due to the relative weight of the figures of these nationalities in the group of residents in Spain.

Q2.1.1 If applicable, please categorise your answer to Q2.1 by third country:

Western Balkans - FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Non available	е
---------------	---

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Non available.

**Q2.2.** Did your (Member) State assess the impact of visa liberalisation as positive? If yes, please explain the reasons for your positive assessment and how this was reached (i.e. who was

involved in the assessment and how they reached this conclusion). If no, explain why this is the case.

Due to the limited nature of the figures compared to other nationalities, no assessment is possible.

**Q2.2.1.** Did your collaboration with relevant third countries improve within the field of migration since the introduction of visa liberalisation?<sup>21</sup> If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

There is no conclusive information regarding this point.

**Q2.2.2.** Did your (Member) State identify specific economic benefits?<sup>22</sup> If yes, please list them and provide a short description for each.

**Q2.2.3.** Did your (Member) State experience a growth in tourism<sup>23</sup> from third-country nationals under the visa liberalisation regime? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 2.2.1.

In view of the table 2.2.1. there has been a continuous increase in visitors in Spain during the last five years. However, there is no conclusive demonstration that the increase is due to liberalization. For instance, in Ukraine the increase has been sustained every year.

**Q2.2.4.** Did your (Member) State experience an impact on its labour market since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples, including background information on the link between visa free travel and access to the labour market in the national context.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 2.2.3.

There are no conclusive data. For instance, in Spain there were more Ukrainian residents before the visa liberalization.

**Q2.2.5.** Did your (Member) State experience a growth in the number of students arriving from third countries since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 2.2.4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> For example: in cases of return and readmission.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> For example: an increase in direct investments from the respective third countries to your (Member) State.

 $<sup>^{23}</sup>$  For example: third-country national visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments increased.

Slight increases of students of these nationalities are perceived but in relation to the total number of students have a reduced weight. The light increase coincides with the Government's commitment to the internationalization of the Spanish university.

**Q2.2.6.** Did your (Member) State experience a growth of entrepreneurship, including of self-employed persons from third countries since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples, including background information on the access to self-employment from visa free regimes in the national context.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 2.2.5.

Figures remain reduced and stable without growth.

**Q2.2.7.** Did your (Member) State experience a growth in trade with third countries since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples (i.e. in which sectors / what type of goods or services).

Non available.

Q2.2.8. What other benefit (or positive impact) was identified by your (Member) State in relation to visa liberalisation that was not already captured in the previous questions, if applicable?<sup>24</sup>

Positive impact on tourism.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> For example: agreements with third countries for exchange of students, scholars; social benefits (social assistance, social trust and cooperation).

#### **SECTION 2.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION**

Please provide, to the extent possible, the following statistics (with their source) along with, if necessary, an explanatory note to interpret them in particular when the statistics provided are partial, had to be estimated (e.g. on the basis of available statistics that differs from the below, or of first-hand research) or when they reflect any particular trends (e.g. a change in policy). If statistics are not available, please try to indicate an order of magnitude and why they are not available. When available, statistics from Eurostat should be used and presented annually covering the period between 2008 and 2017 inclusive. For year 2007, national data should be provided, if available.

At a minimum please provide data two years before and after the waiver agreement date for each third country (as highlighted in green in each table). Ideally, the study aims to present data for the whole period if available (e.g. from Eurostat).

## When filling in the tables please do not leave blank cells and follow these conventions:

N/A – not applicable, in cases where the question is not applicable to your (Member) State please insert N/A in relevant cells.

NI - no information, in cases where there is no data available please insert NI in relevant cells.

0 – insert 0 whenever you have collected data and the result was 0.

Table 2.2.1: Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries<sup>25</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1.070	1.543	2.144	2.336	2.748	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	297	601	764	1.081	1.373	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	4.095	5.639	6.962	9.946	11.810	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2.802	4.332	5.728	5.746	7.231	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	269	605	705	1.073	1.396	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1.557	2.307	3.051	4.187	4.341	
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1.915	3.448	4.043	4.382	5.702	
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	31.388	34.693	37.158	47.388	54.430	
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	43.393	53.168	60.555	76.139	89.031	
Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments <sup>26</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

 $<sup>^{25}</sup>$  Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of tourism visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the box below:	

Table 2.2.2: Total number of first-time residence permit applications received from visa-free country nationals<sup>27</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of first-time residence applications received from the respective visa-free country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	Data not available at the national level
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	
Total number of first- time residence applications <sup>28</sup>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.
<sup>28</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of first-time temporary residence applications.

Table 2.2.3: Total number of first residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons to visa-free country nationals<sup>29</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)											
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons to visa-free country nationals	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	6	8	5	6	9	5	7	7	12	11	
Montenegro	NI	3	4	6	6	2	6	3	4	10	14	
Serbia	NI	75	54	45	57	48	50	41	63	62	73	
Albania	NI	20	18	12	17	22	18	17	19	22	25	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	84	15	3	7	5	9	6	6	11	19	
Moldova	NI	568	481	276	355	202	157	92	127	120	108	
Georgia	NI	91	537	466	731	509	431	345	375	257	209	
Ukraine	NI	2.045	2.367	1.537	1.791	1.379	1.341	1.060	1.095	898	1.046	
Total	NI	2.892	3.484	2.350	2.970	2.176	2.017	1.571	1.696	1.392	1.505	
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons <sup>30</sup>	NI	96.319	102.736	79.315	86.468	63.713	49.525	42.873	41.566	38.154	42.672	

Source: Eurostat (27/09/2018)

See Eurostat: Number of first residence permits issued by reason, EU-28, 2008-2016 [migr\_resfirst]
 All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 2.2.4: Total number of first residence permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals<sup>31</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)											
Total number of permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	NI	15	11	17	21	18	21	20	25	27	26	
Montenegro	NI	10	5	13	16	11	7	21	19	26	17	
Serbia	NI	79	84	101	161	95	108	99	93	101	115	
Albania	NI	22	25	20	35	25	29	34	45	76	66	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	18	11	19	16	12	19	21	15	21	27	
Moldova	NI	34	12	27	15	9	10	12	8	11	19	
Georgia	NI	16	31	23	31	43	51	72	72	54	82	
Ukraine	NI	112	93	149	171	212	282	370	493	451	426	
Total	NI	306	272	369	466	425	527	649	770	767	778	
Total number of permits issued for education reasons <sup>32</sup>	NI	21.665	22.068	24.864	35.037	27.114	26.416	29.668	33.096	35.636	39.664	

Source: Eurostat (27/09/2018)

See Eurostat: Number of first residence permits issued by reason, EU-28, 2008-2016 [migr\_resfirst]
 All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of permits issued for education reasons.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 2.2.5: Total number of first residence permits issued to entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries<sup>33</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da	ate)													
Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)					
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	0	2	0	0	3	3	1	0						
Albania	NI	NI	NI	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1						
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	Law 14/2013 on support for					
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	entrepreneurs and its internationalization came into					
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	effect on September 27, 2013, so there are no permits granted					
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	6	4	0	8	7	15	9	15	under this law prior to that date					
Total	NI	NI	NI	6	7	0	8	10	18	13	18						
Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) 34	NI	NI	NI	158	192	209	193	257	274	279	378						

 <sup>33</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.
 34 All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons).

#### Source: Permanent Observatory of Immigration. Ministry of Labor, Migration and Social Security

\*Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

# Section 3: Challenges of visa liberalisation on Spain

#### SECTION 3.1: DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SITUATION

**Q3.1.** Did your (Member) State face certain challenges (if any) since the introduction of visa liberalisation? Please provide a short description of your national situation.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Section 3.2, while specific challenges can be detailed in sub-questions Q3.1.2 to Q3.1.7.

Spain has faced no disproportionate challenges after visa liberalization for these countries.

Q3.1.1 If applicable, please categorise your answer to Q3.1 by third country:

Western Balkans - FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Groups of Albanian nationals have gathered next to the ports of Bilbao and Santander and repeatedly try to embark illegally on the ferries to the UK.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

**Q3.1.2** Did your (Member) State encounter a rise in illegal employment since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 3.2.5.

No relevant information.

**Q3.1.3** Did your (Member) State encounter a rise in smuggled and/or trafficked persons from the visa-free countries since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Tables 3.2.6 and 3.2.7.

No significant changes.

**Q3.1.4** Did your (Member) State encounter a rise in the number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 3.2.8.

No significant changes.

Q3.1.5 Did your (Member) State encounter a rise in the number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 3.2.9.

Only with Albanians. Q3.1.6 Did your (Member) State encounter a rise in the number of overstayers since the introduction of visa liberalisation? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples. Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 3.2.10. Yes, only with Albanians. Q3.1.7 Did your (Member) State encounter any signs of possible misuse of the visa liberalisation?<sup>35</sup> If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples. Not in a significant amount. Q3.2. Did your (Member) State as a country of destination face any administrative burden<sup>36</sup> since the introduction of the visa-free regime? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples. No. Q3.2.1. If applicable, please list the institutions that faced administrative burdens. Q3.3. Did your (Member) State as a country of destination face any security risks since the introduction of the visa-free regime? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples. No new risks compared to the situation before.

Q3.3.1. Did the visa liberalisation regime increase the security risks in your (Member) State? If yes, please provide a short description explaining why and provide examples.<sup>37</sup>

No.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> For example, dealing with cases when persons enter the country legally but later become illegally employed, are staying in the country legally, but are working without a work permit or apply for asylum without reasonable grounds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> For example: significant increase of residence permit applications, increased demand for work permits, more time-consuming border control procedure due to the lack of visas. etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> For example: did your (Member) State identify any increased terrorism risks arising from the entry or residence of respective TCNs.

Q3.3.2. If applicable, what types of offences<sup>38</sup> were committed by third-country nationals in your (Member) State after the commencement of the visa-free regime?<sup>39</sup> Where there any significant differences compared to the time before the visa-free regime started?

Q3.3.3. If applicable, what was the rate of offences (final court rulings) committed by third-country nationals <sup>40</sup> in your (Member) State after the commencement of the visa-free regime? Where there any significant differences compared to the time before the visa-free regime started?
Q3.4. What is the role and impact of irregular migration facilitators that provide their services to third-country nationals with an entry ban? Please provide a short description with specific examples about your (Member) State situation and make a clear distinction between people who assist migrants and people who are profiting from facilitation.
Please answer this question by making a link with the data presented in Table 3.2.6, 3.2.7 and 3.2.8.
The caseload is not big enough.
Q3.4.1 How did the activities of irregular migration facilitators impact your (Member) State? <sup>41</sup> Please provide a short description with specific examples about your (Member) State situation.
Curveillance of the perimeter of the parts of Contender and Dilbae had to be increased due to the

Surveillance of the perimeter of the ports of Santander and Bilbao had to be increased due to the attempts of Albanian migrants to board on the ferries to the UK. Travel documents of passengers travelling to the UK from small Spanish airports need to be carefully checked for forgeries by, among others, Albanian nationals.

**Q3.4.2.** If applicable, please list and explain any challenges and risks identified by your country related to the activities of irregular migration facilitators, while making a clear distinction between people who assist migrants and people who are profiting from facilitation.

See above.	
------------	--

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> Please use this pre-defined list of categories: cybercrime; drugs offences; economic and financial offences; illicit immigration; illicit trafficking (not drug related); offences against property; offences against public order and safety; offences against public trust (e.g. fraud, forgery, counterfeiting); offences against the person; sexual exploitation of children (including child pornography); sexual offences against adults; terrorism-related activity; trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> This applies to third-country nationals who do <u>not</u> live your country, but visited (short stay of up to 90 days). <sup>40</sup> See above.

<sup>41</sup> Did their activities lead to increases in irregular border-crossings, enhanced border controls or document fraud?

(	Q3.5.	What other challenge (or negative impact) was identified by your (Member) to visa liberalisation that was not already captured in the previous questions,	

#### **SECTION 3.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION**

Please provide, to the extent possible, the following statistics (with their source) along with, if necessary, an explanatory note to interpret them in particular when the statistics provided are partial, had to be estimated (e.g. on the basis of available statistics that differs from the below, or of first-hand research) or when they reflect any particular trends (e.g. a change in policy). If statistics are not available, please try to indicate an order of magnitude and why they are not available. When available, statistics from Eurostat should be used and presented annually covering the period between 2008 and 2017 inclusive. For year 2007, national data should be provided, if available.

At a minimum please provide data two years before and after the waiver agreement date for each third country (as highlighted in green in each table). Ideally, the study aims to present data for the whole period if available (e.g. from Eurostat).

#### When filling in the tables please do not leave blank cells and follow these conventions:

N/A – not applicable, in cases where the question is not applicable to your (Member) State please insert N/A in relevant cells.

NI - no information, in cases where there is no data available please insert NI in relevant cells.

0 – insert 0 whenever you have collected data and the result was 0.

Table 3.2.1: Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders<sup>42</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	N/A	0	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	
Montenegro	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	N/A	5	0	10	10	5	5	5	0	10	20	
Albania	N/A	0	5	5	10	5	35	55	50	130	220	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	
Moldova	N/A	15	15	10	10	5	5	15	20	25	50	
Georgia	N/A	0	5	0	5	10	5	25	15	10	35	
Ukraine	N/A	20	5	15	20	30	15	10	15	15	15	
Total	N/A											
Total number third- country nationals refused entry at the external borders <sup>43</sup>	N/A	510.010	387.015	290.045	227.655	199.830	192.775	172.185	168.345	192.135	203.025	

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> See Eurostat: Third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eirfs]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders.

Table 3.2.2: Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries<sup>44</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	N/A	20	40	55	60	40	20	30	15	5	5	
Montenegro	N/A	0	5	0	25	5	5	5	10	0	5	
Serbia	N/A	140	195	105	120	140	90	65	105	50	35	
Albania	N/A	150	185	110	210	250	195	445	570	285	345	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	185	145	130	105	120	55	70	65	40	10	
Moldova	N/A	290	295	190	170	195	70	50	80	40	20	
Georgia	N/A	745	800	570	425	435	170	355	400	305	140	
Ukraine	N/A	965	1.270	1.000	880	810	370	450	390	335	190	
Total												
Total number of return decisions issued to third-country nationals <sup>45</sup>	N/A	82.940	103.010	78.920	73.220	60.880	32.915	42.150	33.495	27.845	27.340	

See Eurostat: Third-country nationals ordered to leave - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eiord]
 All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of nationals ordered to leave.

\*Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

Table 3.2.3: Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries<sup>46</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	
Georgia	0	0	2	1	4	2	4	7	7	0	0	
Ukraine	0	0	42	15	9	7	10	13	16	8	38	
Total	0	0	46	20	13	9	16	20	26	9	40	
Total number of voluntary returns (all types) – all third-country nationals <sup>47</sup>	0	О	8.387	4.488	4.760	2.937	3.850	3.392	2.794	1.052	1.540	They are returned voluntarily through assisted voluntary return programs. The data come from the annual monitoring reports presented by the non-profit social entities that manage these returns with the co-financing of the General Directorate of Migration.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Number of voluntary and forced returns [migr\_eirt\_vol]; <sup>47</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of voluntary returns.

Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).
f you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:

Table 3.2.4: Total number of forced returns by visa-free country<sup>48</sup>

Indicator	(in:	sert all av	ailable da									
Total number of forced returns by visa-free country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10	0	0	Disaggregated data for type of return only available since 2014
Montenegro	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	0	5	0	
Serbia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	20	20	15	
Albania	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	135	85	75	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	5	10	10	
Moldova	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15	25	15	10	
Georgia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	105	150	130	115	
Ukraine	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	10	45	35	
Total												
Total number of forced returns - all third-country nationals <sup>49</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.295	10.960	9.280	9.470	

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Number of voluntary and forced returns [migr\_eirt\_vol];

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of forced returns.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 3.2.5: Total number of nationals from the visa - free countries found in illegal employment<sup>50</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	vailable da									
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries found in illegal employment	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM			NI									Please name the top 5 labour sectors where TCNs were illegally employed (see footnote list for pre-defined sectors). <sup>51</sup>
Montenegro			NI									Please see above.
Serbia			NI									Please see above.
Albania				NI								Please see above.
Bosnia and Herzegovina				NI								Please see above.
Moldova								NI				Please see above.
Georgia											NI	Please see above.
Ukraine											NI	Please see above.
Total												

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup> Agriculture, forestry and fishing; Mining and quarrying; Manufacturing; Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply; Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities; Construction; Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; Transportation and storage; Accommodation and food service activities; Information and communication; Financial and insurance activities; Real estate activities; Professional, scientific and technical activities; Administrative and support service activities; Public administration and defence; compulsory social security; Education; Human health and social work activities; Arts, entertainment and recreation; Other service activities; Activities of households for own use; Activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies.

Total number third- country nationals found in illegal employment <sup>52</sup>										
*Visa waiver agreement dates: FV	ROM Monteneard	and Serhi:	a (19/12/2009)	Δlhania	Rosnia a	nd Herzea	ovina (1	5/12/201	0) Moldova (28/4/2014)	

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number third-country nationals found in illegal employment.

Table 3.2.6: Total number of <u>smuggled</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>53</sup>

Indicator	(ins	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)										
Total number of smuggled persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)		2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM			NI									
Montenegro			NI									
Serbia			NI									
Albania				NI								
Bosnia and Herzegovina				NI								
Moldova								NI				
Georgia											NI	
Ukraine											NI	
Total												
Total number of smuggled persons from third countries (final court rulings) <sup>54</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of smuggled persons from third countries.

Table 3.2.7: Total number of <u>trafficked</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>55</sup>

Indicator	(ins	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)										
Total number of <u>trafficked</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)		2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM			NI									
Montenegro			NI									
Serbia			NI									
Albania				NI								
Bosnia and Herzegovina				NI								
Moldova								NI				
Georgia											NI	
Ukraine											NI	
Total												
Total number of trafficked persons from third countries (final court rulings) <sup>56</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of trafficked persons from third countries.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:	

Table 3.2.8: Total number of identified facilitators<sup>57</sup> of unauthorised entry, transit and residence<sup>58</sup> from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>59</sup>

Indicator	(ins	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)									late)	
Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM			NI									
Montenegro			NI									
Serbia			NI									
Albania				NI								
Bosnia and Herzegovina				NI								
Moldova								NI				
Georgia											NI	
Ukraine											NI	
Total												
Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence (final court rulings) 60												

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> This refer to the nationality of the facilitators. EU nationalities can be provided in the second part of the table.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup> Facilitators of the unauthorised entry, transit and residence - intentionally assisting a person who is not a national of an EU Member State either to enter or transit across the territory of a Member State in breach of laws on the entry or transit of aliens, or, for financial gain, intentionally assisting them to reside within the territory of a Member State in breach of the laws of the State concerned on the residence of aliens (see Article 1(1)(a) and (b) of Council Directive 2002/90/EC).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence.

EU nationality 1						Please add the number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from EU MS (top 5 EU nationalities).
EU nationality 2						Please see above.
EU nationality 3						Please see above.
EU nationality 4						Please see above.
EU nationality 5						Please see above.

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

Table 3.2.9: Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries<sup>61</sup>

Indicator	(ins	sert all av	ailable da		od of in	· ·		<b>017)</b> the visa w	vaiver agr	eement d	'ate)	
Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries	2007	2008 *2009 *2010 2011 2012 2013 *2014 2015 2016 *2017		Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)								
FYROM	N/A	20	30	55	50	30	25	35	15	10	15	
Montenegro	N/A	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	10	
Serbia	N/A	140	165	90	100	100	115	75	120	120	85	
Albania	N/A	140	165	105	235	215	415	665	525	455	800	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	150	130	90	105	65	80	60	65	70	30	
Moldova	N/A	285	225	140	135	110	95	0	90	80	80	
Georgia	N/A	635	595	440	355	290	245	390	455	495	345	
Ukraine	N/A	1.040	1.060	955	840	640	380	590	620	435	480	
Total												
Total number of third- country nationals found to be illegally present <sup>62</sup>	N/A	92.730	90.500	70.315	68.825	52.485	46.195	47.885	42.605	37.295	44.625	

<sup>61</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre]

62 All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of third-country national found to be illegally present.

\*Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

Table 3.2.10: Total number of overstayers from the visa-free countries<sup>63</sup>

Indicator	(ins	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)										
Total number of overstayers from the visa- free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
FYROM			NI									
Montenegro			NI									
Serbia			NI									
Albania				NI								
Bosnia and Herzegovina				NI								
Moldova								NI				
Georgia											NI	
Ukraine											NI	
Total												
Total number of third- country nationals overstayers <sup>64</sup>												

<sup>\*</sup>Visa waiver agreement dates: FYROM, Montenegro and Serbia (19/12/2009), Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010), Moldova (28/4/2014), Georgia (28/3/2017) and Ukraine (11/6/2017).

<sup>63</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of third-country national overstayers.

If you do not have data as requested in the above table (e.g. for year 2007), please explain why this is the case below:

We don't have disaggregated data for the reason of illegal stay.

# Section 4: Measures put in place to deal with possible misuse of visa-free regimes by (Member) States

#### SECTION 4.1: DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL SITUATION

**Q4.1.** Did your (Member) State implement certain measures (if any) to deal with the challenges that appeared after the commencement of the visa-free regime? Please provide a short description of your national situation.

Specific measures can be detailed in sub-questions Q4.1.2 to Q4.1.7.

- Enhanced border controls on departures to the UK.
- Negotiation of bilateral protocols to implement the EU readmission agreements.
Q4.1.1 If applicable, please categorise your answer to Q4.1 by third country:
Western Balkans – FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:
Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:
<b>Q4.1.2</b> . If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to increase the efforts to promote voluntary return? If yes, for which nationalities and explain their impact.
Voluntary return promotion activities have not been addressed expressly and reinforced to these nationalities
Q4.1.3. If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to expand the legal possibilities of stay? If yes, for which nationalities and explain their impact.
<b>Q4.1.4</b> . If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to fight illegal employment? If yes, please explain their impact and add specific examples.

The existing measures were maintained, especially concerning THB for sexual exploitation and for criminal activities.

and add specific examples.

Q4.1.5. If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to fight the smuggling and/or trafficking of persons from the visa-free countries? If yes, please explain their impact

**Q4.1.6**. If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to fight the activities of facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence? If yes, please explain their impact and add specific examples.

As explained above, Spain is in some cases a transit country to the UK.

**Q4.1.7**. If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to reduce the incidence of nationals found to be illegally present in your country? If yes, please explain their impact and add specific examples. Please also see **Q4.4** (on overstayers) before answering to avoid overlap.

Negotiation of the implementing protocols for the respective EURAs. However, no big readmission numbers need to be carried out.

**Q4.1.8**. If applicable, what was the effectiveness of the measures listed above and which of them were most successful in reaching their intended goals? Please provide any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

No big challenges are faced, and the measures adopted have been sufficient.

**Q4.2.** Did your (Member) State implement measures to deal with administrative burdens since the introduction of the visa-free regime?<sup>65</sup> If yes, please list and explain these measures, their impact / effectiveness and add any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

(No)

**Q4.3.** Did your (Member) State implement measures to deal with the possible misuse of visa liberalisation?<sup>66</sup> If yes, please list and explain these measures, their impact / effectiveness and add any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

See above

**Q4.4.** How did your (Member) State deal with cases when third-country nationals entered the country legally, but did not legalize their stay after 90 days (overstayers)? Please provide a short description of such instances while highlighting any measures implemented by your country to deal with this. If applicable, what was the impact / effectiveness of these measures and are there any good practices / lessons learned you have identified?

Return.

Readmission protocols with Serbia and Albania have been signed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> For example: significant increase of residence permit applications, increased demand for work permits, more time-consuming border control procedure due to the lack of visas, etc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>66</sup> For example, dealing with cases when persons enter the country legally but later become illegally employed, are staying in the country legally, but are working without a work permit or apply for asylum without reasonable grounds.

**Q4.4.1** In the case of overstayers from the visa-free countries, does your (Member) State apply a different return procedure compared to the usual procedure? If yes, please provide a short description of such instances while highlighting any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

No.

**Q4.4.2** Does your (Member) State apply any special procedures in cases where overstayers have lost their identification documents or in instances where there are problems with their identification? If yes, please provide a short description of such instances while highlighting any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

Procedures established in the readmission agreements and protocols are followed in order to obtain the travel documents.

Q4.4.3 If applicable, what was the effectiveness of these procedures (see Q4.4.1 and Q4.4.2) and were they successful in reaching their intended goals? Please provide any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

Cooperation from these countries was, in general, satisfactory. With some of them the relation is limited due to the very small caseload.

**Q4.5**. How did your cooperation with the visa-free countries evolve over time in terms of assistance and information exchange, before and after the visa-free regime commencement?<sup>67</sup> Please provide a short description and specific examples of your national situation disaggregated by region and third countries of interest.

Western Balkans - FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina:

In general, there has been a positive evolution in the field of readmissions and police cooperation.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

In general, there has been a positive evolution in the field of readmissions and police cooperation.

**Q4.5.1.** If applicable, how effective was the cooperation with third countries to reach your desired goals? Where there any particular differences in your interactions with different third countries and did you identify any good practices / lessons learned?

$\overline{}$			_				
S	at	101	ta	$C^{1}$	to	r١	1
$\boldsymbol{\smile}$	uι	J	u	C	ı	ı y	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup> For example, in terms of information campaigns in the third countries working on the elimination of 'push factors' – unemployment, poverty, poor conditions in the national health system, assistance to visa-free countries from Member States and reintegration assistance to returnees.

<b>Q4.6.</b> If applicable, how did your (Member) State respond to the influx of asylum seekers from the visa-free countries? Please provide a short description of the measures taken and any good practices / lessons learned you have identified. <sup>68</sup>
Q4.6.1 If applicable, were the measures of your (Member) State effective to manage the influx of asylum seekers from the visa-free countries? Please provide a short description of your national situation highlighting any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.
<b>Q4.6.2</b> If applicable, how did your (Member) State cooperate with other (Member) States found in a similar situation (i.e. influx of asylum seekers from the visa-free countries)? Please provide a short description of your national situation and any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.
<b>Q4.6.3</b> Did you receive assistance from the EU to deal with the influx of asylum seekers from the visa-free countries? If yes, how effective was the assistance in supporting your (Member) State? Please provide a short description of your national situation and any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.
Q4.7. What other measure (or good practice / lesson learned) was adopted by your (Member) State in relation to visa liberalisation that was not already captured in the previous questions, if applicable?
At the same time, are there any <u>planned measures</u> that will be adopted in the nearby future? <sup>69</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> For example, using the concept of safe country of origin.<sup>69</sup> For example, in relation to Ukraine or Giorgia for which the visa waiver agreement entered into force in 2017.

## Section 5: Conclusions

**Q5.1.** With regard to the aims of this Study, what conclusions would you draw from the findings reached in elaborating your National Contribution?

Visa liberalization for these countries has not posed relevant challenges to Spain.

**Q5.2**. What do you consider to be the relevance of your findings to (national and/or EU level) policymakers?

The relevance of our findings is consequently limited concerning most of these countries since numbers are small. The total number is small and the increase has not been relevant enough to define or implement measures.