

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Common Template of EMN Study 2018

Version: May 2018

Subject: Common Template for the EMN Study 2018 on the "*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*"

Action: EMN NCPs are invited to submit their completed Common Templates by **31 July 2018**. If needed, further clarifications can be provided by directly contacting the EMN Service Provider (ICF) at emn@icf.com

1 STUDY AIMS, SCOPE AND BACKGROUND

1.1 TARGET AUDIENCE

The target audience is national and EU officials/practitioners concerned with legal and illegal mobility and migration, including but not limited to cooperation with third countries on return and readmission, asylum trends and border control.

The results of the study will assist the target audience to take decisions on the need (or otherwise) to amend current policies and practices used to prevent and combat misuse and/or abuse of the visa-free regime¹, as well as identify the positive impact on Member States (MS) achieved since the introduction of visa liberalisation.

1.2 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The border-free Schengen Area² cannot function efficiently without a common visa policy which facilitates the entry of visitors into the EU. The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) makes a distinction between short stay and long stay for third-country nationals (TCN), covering short stays in the Schengen acquis in Article 77(2) and long stays as part of a Common Immigration Policy in Article 79(2), thus excluding long stays from the scope of this study

The EU has established a common visa policy for transit through or intended stays in the territory of Schengen States of no more than 90 days in any 180-day period. The Visa Code³ provides the overall framework of EU visa cooperation. It establishes the procedures and conditions for issuing visas for short stays in and transit through the territories of EU countries. It also lists the non-EU

¹ The misuse of the visa-free regime e.g. entry and stay for purposes other than the intended short-term travel to the EU, overstay etc.

² To date the Schengen Area encompasses most EU States, except for Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Ireland, Romania and the United Kingdom. In some cases, a visa requirement may still be in place for the third countries analysed in this study (e.g. in Ireland and UK).

³ Regulation (EC) No 810/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 establishing a Community Code on Visas (Visa Code)

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

countries whose nationals are required to hold an airport transit visa when passing through the international transit areas of EU airports and establishes the procedures and conditions for issuing such visas.⁴

According to the Visa Code⁵ *'Bilateral agreements concluded between the Community and third countries aiming at facilitating the processing of applications for visas may derogate from the provisions of this Regulation'*. In line with this provision, Regulation (EC) No 539/2001⁶ establishes the visa requirements and visa exemptions for non-EU nationals entering the EU in view of a short stay. It also provides for exceptions to the visa requirements and visa waivers that EU countries may grant to specific categories of persons.

The regulation provides a common list of countries whose nationals must hold a visa when crossing the external borders of a (Member) State and a common list of those who are exempted from the visa requirement.

The two lists are regularly updated with successive amendments to Regulation (EC) No 539/2001. The decisions to change the lists of non-EU countries are taken on the basis of a case-by-case assessment of a variety of criteria also known as visa liberalisation benchmarks. Those include, *inter alia*:

- migration management;
- public policy and security;
- social benefits;
- economic benefit (tourism and foreign trade);
- external relations including considerations of human rights and fundamental freedoms; and
- regional coherence and reciprocity.

Notably, these decisions are sometimes taken as a result of successful visa liberalisation dialogues with the third countries concerned.⁷ Furthermore, Regulation 1289/2013 establishes a suspension mechanism to respond to emergency situations such as abuse resulting from Visa exemption. In this regard, the instrument sets out conditions under which Visa requirements can be temporarily reintroduced.

1.3 LITERATURE REVIEW AND AIM OF THE STUDY

Visa policies are considered a major instrument to regulate and control mobility and cross-border movements. Border policies dealing with short-term mobility represent the bulk of cross-border movement of people. While on the one hand migration policies have received considerable attention from comparative researchers, much less is known about global shifts in border policies dealing with short term mobility.⁸ Visa requirements often reflect the relationships between individual nations and generally affect the relations and status of a country within the international community of nations.⁹

In the adopted strategy for "A credible enlargement perspective for and enhanced EU engagement with the Western Balkans", the European Commission stated that visa liberalisation, which fosters

⁴ Based on Regulation 539/2011

⁵ Recital 26

⁶ Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 of 15 March 2001 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from that requirement.- Official Journal L 081, 21.03.2001.

⁷ Visa requirements for non-EU nationals -<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:j10031>.

⁸ Mau, Steffan, Gulzau, Fabian, Laube, Lene and Zaun Natascha (2015) The global mobility divide: How visa policies have evolved over time. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41, (8) pp. 1192-1213. ISSN 1369-183X

⁹ See: <http://www.henleyglobal.com/citizenship/visa-restrictions/> (accessed October 23, 2009)

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

mobility, has improved regional cooperation and creates more open societies. The Commission shall monitor the continuous fulfilment of the specific requirements, which are based on Article 1 of Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 509/2014 and which were used to assess the appropriateness of granting visa liberalisation, by the third countries whose nationals have been exempted from the visa requirement when travelling to the territory of Member States as a result of a successful conclusion of a visa liberalisation dialogue conducted between the Union and that third country.¹⁰

Finding actual evidence concerning the effects of visa liberalization appeared to be a difficult task.¹¹ Studies conducted in the past have revealed that visa restrictions were costly, they carried an administrative burden and required additional personnel. The imposition of travel requirements did not reduce only inflows but also outflows, and thus, overall movement of persons.¹² In 2016, the Western Balkan region's total trade with the EU was over EUR 43 billion, up 80% since 2008.¹³ The importance of the visa liberalisation agreements has been demonstrated also by research that was pursued prior to the visa waiver agreements in light of the political commitments between the EU and its eastern neighbours, given the growing need for less division on the European continent.¹⁴ Furthermore, analysis showed that the prospects of visa liberalisation agreements constitute a powerful incentive for far-reaching reforms in the policy areas of freedom, security and justice.¹⁵ What has not been addressed thoroughly however, was whether measures affecting the granting of short-term visas could have an impact not only on short term travel but also on longer-term immigration and residence of foreign nationals.¹⁶ EU Member States have been facing different challenges caused by visa liberalisation, such as persisting irregular migration, and issues related to prevention and fight against organised crime.¹⁷

Whereas the limited research done in this field proved that there were clear benefits for the EU to conclude such agreements with third countries, the overall impact of visa liberalisation agreements with the Western Balkan and the Eastern Partnership countries remains vastly under-researched. Methodological challenges, such as research conducted in a fragmentary manner or the lack of uniform data across (Member) States had so far not allowed for a comparable analysis of the impact of visa liberalisation on the countries of destination.

Consequently, this EMN study aims to offer a comparative overview of (Member) States experiences with the functioning of visa-free regime. It will identify challenges, best practices and positive experience in different Member States and Norway, and provide up-to-date information on the latest tendencies in this area of migration policy. The study will cover Western Balkan and

¹⁰ Councils Regulation (EC) Nr. 539/2001 1a(2b).

¹¹ Forecasting migration between the EU, V4 and Eastern Europe, impact of visa abolition, Centre for Eastern Studies, 2014, https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/migration_report_0.pdf

¹² The Effect of Visa Policies on International Migration Dynamics (2014), Working Papers, Paper 89, April 2014, University of Oxford, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/23ae/89f7acdec909aaa601210519ef48848917e.pdf>

¹³ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions A credible enlargement perspective for and enhanced EU engagement with the Western Balkans - Strasbourg, 06.02.2018 COM(2018) 65 final.- https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication-credible-enlargement-perspective-western-balkans_en.pdf

¹⁴ Consequences of Schengen Visa Liberalisation for the Citizens of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, Migration Policy Center, 2012, <http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/23497/MPC-RR-2012-01.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

¹⁵ The Impact of Visa Liberalisation in Eastern Partnership Countries, Russia and Turkey on Trans-Border Mobility, CEPS Paper in Liberty and Security, 2014, <https://www.ceps.eu/publications/impact-visa-liberalisation-eastern-partnership-countries-russia-and-turkey-trans-border>

¹⁶ Forecasting migration between the EU, V4 and Eastern Europe, impact of visa abolition, Centre for Eastern Studies 2014, https://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/migration_report_0.pdf

¹⁷ Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council First Report under the Visa Suspension Mechanism - Brussels, 20.12.2017 COM (2017) 815 final.- https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-is-new/news/20171220_first_report_under_suspension_mechanism_en.pdf

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Eastern Partnership countries which have successfully concluded visa liberalisation dialogues according to the relevant action plans and roadmaps.

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

While there are 60 countries around the world that benefit from visa-free travel to the EU, in some cases, decisions on visa-free access to the Schengen Area may follow from bilateral negotiations (i.e. visa liberalisation dialogues).¹⁸ The visa liberalisation dialogues were successfully conducted between the EU and the **former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia** (2009), **Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina** (2010) as well as **Moldova** (2014), **Ukraine** (2017) and **Georgia** (2017). They resulted in granting visa-free travel to citizens of these countries.

This study will focus on those **Western Balkan and Eastern Partnership countries** which have successfully reached visa liberalisation agreements according to the relevant action plans and roadmaps, and more specifically on the **impact of visa liberalisation** on countries of destination. The visa-free regime is the most tangible benefit for the citizens of the Western Balkan countries in the process of their integration into the EU and one of the core objectives for the Eastern Partnership countries.

This study will consider the policies and practices of EU Member States and Norway following changes in migration flows raised by visa exemptions in the mentioned third countries. The scope of the study includes the period **2007-2017** and focuses on the immediate years prior to and after the visa waiver agreements entered into force.

Thus, the subjects of the study are third-country nationals¹⁹ from:

- Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (19/12/2009);
- Montenegro (19/12/2009);
- Serbia (19/12/2009);
- Albania (15/12/2010);
- Bosnia and Herzegovina (15/12/2010);
- Moldova (28/4/2014);
- Georgia (28/3/2017); and
- Ukraine (11/6/2017).

This study will limit itself in three respects: First, it investigates the impact of short-term Visa liberalisation and thus excludes effects of long-stay residence and Visa permits. Notwithstanding this limitation, the study may display medium and long-term impact on countries of destination ensuing from short-term Visa liberalisation.²⁰

Second, the study is based on the presumption that Visa liberalisation yields effects on cross-border mobility.²¹ Where it relies on quantitative data on short-term Visa mobility, it cannot establish a causal link between Visa liberalisation and cross-border mobility but rather indicates a correlative effect between the two.

¹⁸ See: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-17-5364_en.htm

¹⁹ Holders of biometric passports. The visa-free regime is valid for a period of maximum 90 days in any 180-day period.

²⁰ By doing so, the study tests the hypothesis of Czaika and De Haas who review short and long-term effects of Visa policies, including Visa waivers, on cross border mobility: Czaika, Mathias; De Haas, Hein: The Effect of Visas on Migration Processes. In: International Migration Review, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 893-926.

²¹ Which corroborates the findings of Landesmann, Leitner and Mara. Available at: <https://wiiw.ac.at/should-i-stay-should-i-go-back-or-should-i-move-further-contrasting-answers-under-diverse-migration-regimes-dlp-3561.pdf>

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Third, the study will not differentiate between TCNs from Visa exempt states who made use of the Visa free regime and those who entered the Union on a conventional short-term Visa regime. This limitation follows from the fact that Visa exemption is exclusively granted to TCNs who provide biometric passports and available data does not state the procedure pursuant to which (s)he entered the state of destination.

1.5 POLICY CONTEXT

At the political level, the Stockholm Programme underlined that the Visa Code “will create important new opportunities for further developing the common visa policy”. The Programme envisaged that “the access to the EU territory has to be made more effective and efficient” and that the visa policy should serve this goal.²² Visa liberalisation is one of the Union's most powerful tools in facilitating people-to-people contacts and strengthening ties between the citizens of third countries and the Union. At the same time, visa regimes are instrumental to restrict unlimited and unwanted migration and trans-border organised crime. Visa liberalisation is therefore granted to countries that are deemed safe and well-governed, meeting a number of criteria in various policy areas.

The EU has conducted bilateral negotiations with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine.²³ Those dialogues were built upon ‘Visa Liberalisation Roadmaps’ for the Western Balkan countries and ‘Visa Liberalisation Action Plans’ (VLAP) for the Eastern Partnership countries. They included four blocks of requirements which the countries had to fulfil. These benchmarks related to document security, including biometrics; border management, migration and asylum; public order and security; and external relations and fundamental rights. These elements impinged both upon the policy and institutional framework (legislation and planning) as well as the effective and sustainable implementation of this framework.

During the visa liberalisation dialogues, the European Commission closely monitored the implementation of the Roadmaps and Action Plans through regular progress reports. It assessed the progress of all five Western Balkan countries in meeting the visa roadmap requirements first on 18 November 2008 and then on 18 May 2009.²⁴ Likewise, it has delivered progress reports on the implementation of the Action Plans on Visa Liberalisation for the Eastern Partnership countries.²⁵

Third countries that have concluded visa facilitation agreements with the EU should not only meet the benchmark criteria in advance, but continue complying with the visa liberalisation requirements after the agreement is reached. The Commission has the duty to monitor this compliance and report on those matters to the European Parliament and the Council, at least once a year in accordance with Article 1a (2b) of Regulation (EC) No 539/2011.

The European Commission published its First Report under the Visa Suspension Mechanism in December 2017. It focused on specific areas identified for each country where further monitoring and actions were considered necessary to ensure the continuity and sustainability of the progress achieved in the framework of the visa liberalisation process.²⁶

²² The Impact of Visa Liberalisation in Eastern Partnership Countries, Russia and Turkey on Trans-Border Mobility, CEPS Paper in Liberty and Security - <https://www.ceps.eu/publications/impact-visa-liberalisation-eastern-partnership-countries-russia-and-turkey-trans-border>

²³ An overview of the progress reports for Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/eastern-partnership/visa-liberalisation-moldova-ukraine-and-georgia_en

²⁴ Available at: <http://www.esiweb.org/index.php?lang=en&id=353>

²⁵ Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/international-affairs/eastern-partnership/visa-liberalisation-moldova-ukraine-and-georgia_en

²⁶ Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-is-new/news/20171220_first_report_under_suspension_mechanism_en.pdf

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Visa liberalisation with third countries is linked to the return and readmission policy, as well as to asylum applications and border controls. The Frontex alert mechanism is crucial in this regard, providing a detailed analysis of the dynamic migration inflow trends from the two regions. The Frontex alert reports are instrumental for better understanding the phenomenon of the abuse of visa liberalisation, assessing its development and identifying concrete measures to tackle the challenges.²⁷ The contribution of the (newly adopted) Entry-Exit System is expected to be also significant as, among others, it aims at increasing the efficiency of (border) controls towards third-country nationals.

In this context, the following EMN products are relevant for this study:

- 2017 EMN Study “Challenges and practices for establishing the identity of third-country nationals in migration procedures”²⁸
- 2016 EMN Study “Illegal employment of third-country nationals in the European Union”²⁹
- 2015 EMN Study “Information on voluntary return: how to reach irregular migrants not in contact with the authorities?”³⁰
- 2012 EMN Study “Visa policy as migration channel”³¹
- 2011 EMN Inform “Migration and Development”³²

2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The National Reports should be primarily based on secondary sources. In particular, information on national policies and approaches will be a key source of information, while available evaluations and view of experts should provide evidence of good practices and challenges in existing approaches regarding visa liberalisation.

2.1 AVAILABLE STATISTICS

- **Eurostat data**³³: available period 2008 – 2017
 - Number of third-country nationals found to be illegally present – annual data (rounded) [migr_eipre]
 - Number of third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders – annual data (rounded) [migr_eirfs]
 - Number of third-country nationals ordered to leave – annual data (rounded) [migr_eiord]
 - Number of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave – annual data (rounded) [migr_eirtn]

²⁷ Available at:

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/sec/2011/1570/COM_SEC\(2011\)1570_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/sec/2011/1570/COM_SEC(2011)1570_EN.pdf)

²⁸ Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_synthesis_report_identity_study_final_en_1.pdf)

[affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_synthesis_report_identity_study_final_en_1.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_synthesis_report_identity_study_final_en_1.pdf)

²⁹ Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_illegal_employment_synthesis_report_final_en_0.pdf)

[affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_illegal_employment_synthesis_report_final_en_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_eu_illegal_employment_synthesis_report_final_en_0.pdf)

³⁰ Available at:

https://emnbelgium.be/sites/default/files/publications/info_on_return_synthesis_report_20102015_final_0.pdf

³¹ Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/migration-channel/00b._synthesis_report_visa_policy_as_migration_channel_final_april2013_en.pdf)

[affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/migration-channel/00b._synthesis_report_visa_policy_as_migration_channel_final_april2013_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/migration-channel/00b._synthesis_report_visa_policy_as_migration_channel_final_april2013_en.pdf)

³² Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/emn-informs/Oa_emn_inform_apr2011_migration-development_january2013_en.pdf)

[affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/emn-informs/Oa_emn_inform_apr2011_migration-development_january2013_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/reports/docs/emn-studies/emn-informs/Oa_emn_inform_apr2011_migration-development_january2013_en.pdf)

³³ Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database>

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

- Number of return decisions [migr_eiord];
 - Number of return decisions effectively carried out [migr_eirtn];
 - Number of voluntary and forced returns [migr_eirt_vol];
 - Number of asylum applications (monthly and yearly) [migr_asyappctzm and migr_asyappctza];
 - Number of rejected asylum applications [migr_asydcfsta];
 - Number of first residence permits, by reason [migr_resfirst]:
 - Number of first residence permits for family reasons;
 - Number of first residence permits for study reasons;
 - Number of first residence permits for the purposes of remunerated activity.
 - Third-country nationals who have left the territory by type of assistance received and citizenship [migr_eirt_ass]
 - Third-country nationals who have left the territory to a third country by type of agreement procedure and citizenship [migr_eirt_agr]
 - Third-country nationals who have left the territory to a third country by destination country and citizenship [migr_eirt_des]
- **Frontex data**³⁴: available period 2009 – 2017
 - Number of detections of illegal border-crossings by sea and land
 - **Europol data**³⁵: available period 2007 – 2017
 - Data on criminal proceedings, investigations or suspects of criminal acts
 - **European Commission, DG HOME Schengen Visa statistics**³⁶: available period 2010-2016
 - Uniform visas applied for in Schengen States' consulates in third countries;
 - Total uniform visas issued (including multiple entry visas) in Schengen States' consulates in third countries;
 - Total uniform visas not issued in Schengen States' consulates in third countries.
- **National data**

The Study also requests national-level data (see study section tables). Any statistical indicator that does not have EU level data (e.g. Eurostat) will rely on national data (e.g. year 2007 for which Eurostat data is not available). Should the requested statistics not be available in (Member) State, EMN NCPs are asked to indicate this and specify, to the extent possible, the reasons why this is the case.

- **Other relevant datasets**

The European Visa Database:

<http://www.mogensholth.dk/evd/default.aspx>

³⁴ Available at: <http://frontex.europa.eu/trends-and-routes/migratory-routes-map/>

³⁵ Available at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/activities-services/main-reports>

³⁶ Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy_en#stats

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

University of Oxford's International Migration Institute:

<https://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/data/demig-data>

Aggregated data on the Schengen area as a whole:

<https://www.schengenvisainfo.com/schengen-visa-statistics-third-country-2016/>

The World Bank's World Development Indicators - Movement of people across borders:

<http://wdi.worldbank.org/table/6.13>

2.2 DEFINITIONS

The following key terms are used in the Common Template. The definitions are taken from the EMN Glossary 5.0 (2017) and should be considered as indicative to inform this study.

When discussing about illegal or irregular migration there is no unified terminology concerning foreigners. The UN and EU recommend using the term irregular rather than illegal because the latter carries a criminal connotation and is seen as denying humanity to migrants. Entering a country in an irregular manner, or staying with an irregular status, is not a criminal offence but an infraction of minor offences or administrative regulations. As a result, referring to Resolution 1509 (2006) of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, 'illegal' is preferred when referring to a status or process, whereas 'irregular' is preferred when referring to a person.

Asylum seeker – In the global context, a person who seeks protection from persecution or serious harm in a country other than their own and awaits a decision on the application for protection under the Geneva Convention of 1951 and Protocol of 1967 in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken.

Country of destination – The country that is a destination for migration flows (regular or irregular).

European Border Surveillance System – A common framework for the exchange of information and for the cooperation between EU Member States and the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex) to improve situational awareness and to increase reaction capability at the external borders for the purpose of detecting, preventing and combating irregular immigration and cross-border crime, and contributing to ensuring the protection and saving the lives of migrants.

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. Definition is based on Article 1(1)(a) and (b) of Council Directive 2002/90/EC of 28 November 2002 defining the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence.³⁷

Fraudulent travel or identity document – Any travel or identity document: (i) that has been falsely made or altered in some material way by anyone other than a person or agency lawfully authorised to make or issue the travel or identity document on behalf of a State; or (ii) that has been improperly issued or obtained through misrepresentation, corruption or duress or in any other unlawful manner; or (iii) that is being used by a person other than the rightful holder.

Illegal employment of third-country nationals – Economic activity carried out in violation of provisions set by legislation.

Illegal employment of a legally staying third-country national – Employment of a legally staying third-country national working outside the conditions of their residence permit and / or without a work permit which is subject to each EU Member State's national law.

³⁷ Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002L0090:EN:NOT>

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Illegal employment of an illegally staying third-country national – Employment of an illegally staying third-country national.

Irregular entry – In the global context, crossing borders without complying with the necessary requirements for legal entry into the receiving State. In the Schengen context, the entry of a third-country national into a Schengen Member State who does not satisfy Art. 6 of Regulation (EU) 2016/399 (Schengen Borders Code).

Irregular migration – Movement of persons to a new place of residence or transit that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving countries. There is no clear or universally accepted definition of irregular migration. From the perspective of destination countries it is entry, stay or work in a country without the necessary authorization or documents required under immigration regulations. From the perspective of the sending country, the irregularity is for example seen in cases in which a person crosses an international boundary without a valid passport or travel document or does not fulfil the administrative requirements for leaving the country.

Irregular stay – The presence on the territory of a Member State, of a third-country national who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils the conditions of entry as set out in Art. 5 of Regulation (EU) 2016/399 (Schengen Borders Code) or other conditions for entry, stay or residence in force in that Member State.

Overstay(er) – In the global context, a person who remains in a country beyond the period for which entry was granted. In the EU context, a person who has legally entered but then stayed in an EU Member State beyond the allowed duration of their permitted stay without the appropriate visa (typically 90 days), or of their visa and / or residence permit.

Passport – One of the types of travel documents (other than diplomatic, service/official and special) issued by the authorities of a State in order to allow its nationals to cross borders³⁸. All third-country nationals subject to the visa-free regime have to carry a biometric passport to qualify for visa-free travel in the EU (except for UK and Ireland). Non-biometric passport holders from the visa-free third countries require a Schengen visa to enter the EU.

Pull factor – The condition(s) or circumstance(s) that attract a migrant to another country.

Push factor – The condition(s) or circumstance(s) in a country of origin that impel or stimulate emigration.

Refusal of entry – In the global context, refusal of entry of a person who does not fulfil all the entry conditions laid down in the national legislation of the country for which entry is requested. In the EU context, refusal of entry of a third-country national at the external EU border because they do not fulfil all the entry conditions laid down in Art. 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 399/2016 (Schengen Border Code) and do not belong to the categories of persons referred to in Art. 6(5) of that Regulation. Regulation (EU) 2017/458 subsequently amended the Schengen Borders Code to reinforce the rules governing the movement of persons across borders and the checks against relevant databases at external borders.

Regularisation – In the EU context, state procedure by which irregularly staying third-country nationals are awarded a legal status.

Return decision – An administrative or judicial decision or act, stating or declaring the stay of a third-country national to be illegal and imposing or stating an obligation to return.

Schengen Borders Code – The rules governing border control of persons crossing the external EU borders of the EU Member States.

³⁸ Available at: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52011XC0722\(02\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52011XC0722(02))

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Short - stay visa – The authorisation or decision of a Member State with a view to transit through or an intended stay on the territory of one or more or all the Member States of a duration of no more than 90 days in any 180-day period.

Third-country national – Any person who is not a citizen of the European Union within the meaning of Art. 20(1) of TFEU and who is not a person enjoying the European Union right to free movement, as defined in Art. 2 (6) of Regulation (EU) 2016/399 (Schengen Borders Code).

Third-country national found to be illegally present – A third-country national who is officially found to be on the territory of a Member State and who does not fulfil, or no longer fulfils, the conditions for stay or residence in that EU Member State.

Travel document – A document issued by a government or international treaty organisation which is acceptable proof of identity for the purpose of entering another country.

Visa – The authorisation or decision of a Member State required for transit or entry for an intended stay in that EU Member State or in several EU Member States.

Visa Code – Regulation outlining the procedures and conditions for issuing visas for transit through or intended stays in the territory of the Schengen Member States not exceeding 90 days in any 180-day period.

3 ADVISORY GROUP

For the purpose of providing support to EMN NCPs while undertaking this Study and for developing the Synthesis Report, an “Advisory Group” has been established, consisting of the original study proposer, LV EMN NCP, interested EMN NCPs, i.e. BE, CZ, DE, EE, LU, NL, NO, SI, SE, the European Commission and the EMN Service Provider (ICF). EMN NCPs are thus invited to send any requests for clarification or further information on the study to the following “Advisory Group” members:

Advisory Group Members	Email
BE NCP	Peter.VanCostenoble@ibz.fgov.be Geert.tiri@ibz.fgov.be, emn@ibz.fgov.be
CZ NCP	ludmila.touskova@mvcr.cz
DE NCP	paula.hoffmeyer-zlotnik@bamf.bund.de
EE NCP	Borloff@tlu.ee emn@tlu.ee
LV NCP (Lead)	ilze.silina-osmane@pmlp.gov.lv emn@pmlp.gov.lv
LU NCP	Adolfo.sommarribas@uni.lu
NL NCP	J.a.matus@ind.minvenj.nl EMN@ind.minvenj.nl
NO NCP	ssh@udi.no
SE NCP	jonas.hols@migrationsverket.se bernd.parusel@migrationsverket.se

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Advisory Group Members	Email
	EMN@migrationsverket.se
SI NCP	helena.korosec@gov.si emn.mnz@gov.si
UK NCP	Zoe.Pellatt@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk Carolyne.Tah@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
ICF (EMN Service Provider)	dan.ungureanu@icf.com Sonia.Gsir@icf.com emn@icf.com Neza.Kogovsek@mirovni-institut.si (Odysseus Expert)
EASO	Teddy.Wilkin@easo.europa.eu Karolina.Lukaszczyk@easo.europa.eu
European Commission	Ramona.TOADER@ec.europa.eu Tania.VERLINDEN@ec.europa.eu Irregular migration and return policy - Dir C Migration and Protection

4 TIMETABLE

Date	Action
12 December 2017	First meeting of the Advisory Group for the Study (ICF Brussels) First draft proposal of the Common Template for review by Advisory Group / Odysseus / COM
6 March 2018	Second meeting of the Advisory Group for the Study Discussion on the revised first draft and work on the second draft of the Common Template begins
26 March 2018	Review by Advisory Group / Odysseus / EASO / COM of the second draft
4 April 2018	Deadline for second draft review of the Common Template by NCPs / Odysseus expert / EASO / COM and work on final draft begins
25 April	Deadline for final draft review and preparation to launch the study
8 May	Launch of the study
31 July	Submission of completed common template by NCPs
14 September	Circulation of the 1st draft of the Synthesis Report to all NCPs + EC + EASO + Odysseus experts to provide comments

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Date	Action
28 September	Deadline for the NCPs to provide comments on 1st draft
12 October	Circulation of the 2nd draft of the SR to all NCPs + EC + EASO + Odysseus experts to provide comments
26 October	Deadline for the NCPs to provide comments on 2nd draft
9 November	Circulation of the 3rd draft of the SR to all NCPs+ EC + EASO + Odysseus experts to provide final comments
16 November	Deadline for the NCPs to provide the final comments
30 November 2018	Finalisation of the Study, publication and dissemination

5 TEMPLATE FOR NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The template outlines the information that should be included in the National Contributions to this Study in a manner that makes the contributions reasonably comparable. The expected maximum number of pages to be covered by each section is provided in the guidance note. For national contributions the total number of pages should **not exceed 30 pages**, excluding the statistics.

A description of how each section will appear in the Synthesis Report is included at the beginning of each section so that EMN NCPs have an indication of how the contributions will feed into the Synthesis Report.

A limit of **40 pages** will apply to the Synthesis Report, in order to ensure that it remains concise and accessible.

Common Template of EMN Study 2018

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

National Contribution from Cyprus³⁹

Disclaimer: The following information has been provided primarily for the purpose of contributing to a Synthesis Report for this EMN Study. The EMN NCP has provided information that is, to the best of its knowledge, up-to-date, objective and reliable within the context and confines of this study. The information may thus not provide a complete description and may not represent the entirety of the official policy of the EMN NCPs' (Member) State.

Top-line "Factsheet"

National Contribution (one page only)

Overview of the National Contribution – drawing out key facts and figures from across all sections of the Study, with a particular emphasis on the elements that will be of relevance to (national) policymakers. Please add any innovative or visual presentations that can carry through into the synthesis report as possible infographics and visual elements.

Cyprus has not been affected significantly in relation to the numbers of asylum applications from visa-liberalisation countries. Although in 2008 and 2009, there was an increase in the asylum applications by Serbian nationals, this trend did not continue, mainly due to the immediate examination of these asylum applications (sometimes under accelerated procedures depending on the merits of each case). In 2014 and 2015, there was some increase in applications for asylum from Ukrainian nationals, which again did not continue as a trend in 2016 and 2017. In 2017, there was an increase in asylum applications submitted by Georgian nationals, which continued in the early months of 2018. In general, the impact of visa liberalisation did not have a significant impact on Cyprus, although any increase in asylum applications from this category of applicants, is closely monitored by the competent authorities.

In addition, we have witnessed an increased number of arrivals from Georgia, a large number arriving at the illegal airport in the areas which are not under the effective control of the government of the Republic of Cyprus and then crossing into the areas under the effective control of the government of the Republic of Cyprus. Noting that all citizens of countries of Annex II of Regulation 539/2001/EC have the right to cross and no migration checks are performed at the checkpoints since the Republic of Cyprus does not consider them an entry point, many citizens of Georgia who may have been refused entry at the formal entry points tend to arrive via the illegal airport and many of them do not depart after 90 days.

³⁹ Replace highlighted text with your **(Member) State** name here.

Section 1: The National Framework

National Contribution (max. 6 pages, excluding statistics)

The aim of this Section is to provide an insight into the scale and scope of Member States experiences after the visa-free regime at national and EU level, as evidenced by quantitative and qualitative information. The section will also analyse the short and long-term trends after the visa-free regime entered into force, pull factors and links between the countries of origin and destination.

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 1.2:

Table 1.2.1: Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries;

Table 1.2.2: Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries;

Table 1.2.3: Total number of short-stay visa applications by third country;

Table 1.2.4: Total number of short-stay visa application refusals by third country;

Table 1.2.5: Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries;

Table 1.2.6: Total number of positive decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries;

Table 1.2.7: Total number of negative decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries;

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

Table 1.2.9: Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by third country;

Table 1.2.10: Total number of identity document fraud instances by third country;

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.⁴⁰

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.⁴¹

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:

⁴⁰ N/A – not applicable, NI – no information, 0 - collected data resulted in 0 cases.

⁴¹ Please use information such as: increase of entries, number of asylum applications, refusals of entry, return and removal decisions in your answers.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Since not all the data are available, there can be made no assumption. For further details, please refer to the available data in the statistical tables

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Since not all the data are available, there can be made no assumption. For further details, please refer to the available data in the statistical tables

Q1.2. What are the main links between the countries of origin and your Member State or the applicable 'pull factors'⁴² disaggregated by region and third countries of interest?

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

There are no links.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Georgia – There is a significant number of Georgian citizens who are descendants of Greek citizens and thus there is a small community of Georgian-Greek citizens in Cyprus, residing under the regime of free movement for EU citizens. Subsequently a large number of friends and relatives of these persons are frequently visiting Cyprus, many with the purpose of acquiring a residence status.

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?⁴³

The authority involved in the implementation is the Immigration Police, who performs all checks at the official entry points. The border guards are trained and educated on all the relevant EU and national legislation regarding their duties, which includes EU visa liberalization policy, while at the same time implementing all border controls provided by the Schengen Borders Code.

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.

⁴² 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.

⁴³ For example: changes in instructions for border patrol agents and in equipment.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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?

No

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

No

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.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.1: Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries⁴⁴

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries												
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	
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 external border crossings (persons) ⁴⁵	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	

⁴⁴ 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.

⁴⁵ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of border crossings (persons)

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

Data not available

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.2: Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries⁴⁶

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries													
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	2	0	0		
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0		
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	0	10	2		
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	3	0	1		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0		
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	1	0	0		
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	18	26	20	26		
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	10	2	2		
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	20	42	32	31		
Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings⁴⁷	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	846	1416	1800	2574		

⁴⁶ 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/>

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

⁴⁷ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of irregular border crossings.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.3: Total number of short-stay visa applications by third country⁴⁸

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	
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 short-stay visa applications – all third countries⁴⁹	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	

⁴⁸ See DG HOME Schengen Visa statistics, Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy_en#stats. For MS that still apply visa requirements, please remove the N/A and complete the table in full.

⁴⁹ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa applications.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

Data not available

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.4: Total number of short-stay visa application refusals by third country⁵⁰

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior the visa waiver agreement date)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	N/A	N/A	N/A	
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 short-stay visa application refusals – all third countries⁵¹	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	

⁵⁰ See DG HOME Schengen Visa statistics, Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/visa-policy_en#stats. For MS that still apply visa requirements, please remove the N/A and complete the table in full.

⁵¹ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa application refusals.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

Data not available

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.5: Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries⁵²

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <i>at least</i> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries												
FYROM	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	180	170	45	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	
Albania	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	40	20	25	10	10	5	5	0	0	5	5	
Georgia	350	120	75	40	15	10	0	10	15	20	85	
Ukraine	60	15	25	10	10	5	0	95	70	30	40	
Total	480	335	295	105	40	20	5	105	90	75	130	
Total number of asylum applications – all third countries⁵³	6789	3922	3199	2882	1770	1620	1246	1728	2253	2936	4582	

*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).

⁵² 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.

⁵³ 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:

--

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.6: Total number of positive decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries⁵⁴

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of <u>positive</u> decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries												
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	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	00	0	0	5	0	00	0	0	
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	

*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).

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:

⁵⁴ 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.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.7: Total number of negative decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries⁵⁵

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of <u>negative</u> decisions on asylum applicants from visa-free countries												
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	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	40	20	20	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	
Georgia	185	200	120	65	30	5	5	5	0	0	30	
Ukraine	45	25	65	20	5	5	0	0	0	0	85	
Total	270	245	210	90	50	15	10	5	0	0	115	

*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).

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:

⁵⁵ See Eurostat: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex, Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr_asydcfsta]

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.8: Total number of positive and negative decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)⁵⁶

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>	
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017		
Total number of <u>positive</u> decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)													
<i>Nationality 1</i>	IQ	IQ	PS	PS	IQ	PS	SY	SY	SY	SY	SY		
<i>Nationality 2</i>	PS	PS	IQ	IQ	PS	IQ	PS	IQ	STLS	PS	SO		
<i>Nationality 3</i>	TR	TR	TR	SY	TR	IR	SL	SO	PS	IQ	ER		
<i>Nationality 4</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
<i>Nationality 5</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Total number of <u>negative</u> decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)													
<i>Nationality 1</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
<i>Nationality 2</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

⁵⁶ This is to provide a broader context; any nationality may be included in the top five. See Eurostat: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex Annual aggregated data (rounded) [migr_asydcfstst]; Total positive decisions, including only refugee status and subsidiary protection, rounded up to the unit of 5.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Nationality 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Nationality 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Nationality 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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:

--

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.9: Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country⁵⁷

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country												
FYROM	NI	4	9	14	6	4	4	2	4	9	7	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Montenegro	NI	1	5	3	8	8	14	4	3	1	6	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Serbia	NI	184	157	183	145	113	93	99	105	184	89	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Albania	NI	75	35	48	64	46	39	26	33	75	44	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	16	12	11	6	12	3	5	6	8	3	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Moldova	NI	1045	1033	822	733	438	314	291	315	262	337	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Georgia	NI	312	243	187	184	133	137	99	109	108	141	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Ukraine	NI	1040	983	897	752	611	576	779	886	625	756	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Total	NI	2677	2477	2165	1898	1365	1180	1305	1461	1144	1383	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits)⁵⁸	NI	25156	25638	19139	15645	11715	11455	13841	15569	16970	18971	EUROSTAT DATA BASE [migr_resfirts]

⁵⁷ 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]

⁵⁸ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of residence permit applications.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

2017: Information based on data submitted for the EUROSTAT 2017 statistics.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 1.2.10: Total number of identity document fraud instances by visa-free country⁵⁹

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
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	1	0	0	1	
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	1	0	0	1	0	0	
Ukraine	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Total	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	
Total number of identity document fraud instances⁶⁰	276	266	299	284	225	362	377	297	218	214	231	

⁵⁹ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

⁶⁰ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identity document fraud instances.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

--

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination***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.

No significant impact.

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

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

No significant impact.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Increase of arrivals and overstayers from Ukraine and Georgia.

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.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Not applicable. There was no significant impact.

Q2.2.1. Did your collaboration with relevant third countries improve within the field of migration since the introduction of visa liberalisation?⁶¹ If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

No

Q2.2.2. Did your (Member) State identify specific economic benefits?⁶² If yes, please list them and provide a short description for each.

No

Q2.2.3. Did your (Member) State experience a growth in tourism⁶³ 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.

No

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.

No

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.

No

⁶¹ For example: in cases of return and readmission.

⁶² For example: an increase in direct investments from the respective third countries to your (Member) State.

⁶³ For example: third-country national visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments increased.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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.

No

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).

No.

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?⁶⁴

N/A

⁶⁴ 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.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 2.2.1: Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries⁶⁵

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries												
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	
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 visitors staying in hotels and other	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	

⁶⁵ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

accommodation establishments ⁶⁶												
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*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).

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:

--

⁶⁶ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of tourism visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 2.2.2: Total number of first-time residence permit applications received from visa-free country nationals⁶⁷

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
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	
FYROM	6	1	11	11	3	4	2	1	5	6	5	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Montenegro	1	2	4		5	6	7	4	1	6	3	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Serbia	39	27	66	74	94	71	47	45	53	59	72	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Albania	43	55	36	31	43	39	26	11	14	24	44	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Bosnia and Herzegovina	13	13	8	10	5	10	3	4	4	4	2	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Moldova	1290	1337	790	530	436	287	184	185	175	155	176	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Georgia	235	213	196	71	100	87	72	52	59	55	73	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Ukraine	1065	875	685	458	413	369	325	633	648	470	612	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of

⁶⁷ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

												a person.
Total	2692	2523	1796	1185	1099	873	666	935	959	779	987	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.
Total number of first-time residence applications⁶⁸	19093	21813	20874	12579	9519	7117	7079	9906	11502	13315	17157	National data. First-time permit defined as the first permit ever of a person.

**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).*

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:

⁶⁸ 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 nationals⁶⁹

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons to visa-free country nationals												
FYROM	NI	0	7	4	2	1	2	0	0	4	2	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Montenegro	NI	0	2	1	1	5	3	1	0	5	2	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Serbia	NI	63	63	63	66	44	27	31	29	31	18	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Albania	NI	37	12	21	34	19	15	5	5	8	7	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	8	5	7	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Moldova	NI	719	791	540	500	274	153	144	131	106	188	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Georgia	NI	63	39	84	52	37	43	32	32	24	27	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Ukraine	NI	295	446	368	315	231	177	151	166	137	188	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Total	NI	1185	1365	1088	972	614	421	365	364	317	433	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons⁷⁰	NI	15069	15127	13005	10869	7503	7034	8354	7701	7702	8204	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]

*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).

⁶⁹ See Eurostat: Number of first residence permits issued by reason, EU-28, 2008-2016 [migr_resfirst]

⁷⁰ 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:

2017: Information based on data submitted for the EUROSTAT 2017 statistics.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 2.2.4: Total number of first residence permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals⁷¹

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals												
FYROM	NI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Montenegro	NI	1	2	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Serbia	NI	13	32	21	20	19	12	14	15	4	3	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Albania	NI	10	9	10	12	0	3	3	3	4	1	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	3	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Moldova	NI	40	54	47	45	42	35	15	11	2	5	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Georgia	NI	12	6	14	15	11	18	18	15	4	6	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Ukraine	NI	128	168	109	92	90	89	126	105	24	40	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Total	NI	207	273	203	189	165	162	177	148	39	55	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]
Total number of permits issued for education reasons⁷²	NI	4217	5648	2880	2076	1579	1547	1607	2361	3348	4923	Eurostat [migr_resfirst]

*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).

⁷¹ See Eurostat: Number of first residence permits issued by reason, EU-28, 2008-2016 [migr_resfirst]

⁷² 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:

2017: Information based on data submitted for the EUOROSTAT 2017 statistics.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 2.2.5: Total number of first residence permits issued to entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries⁷³

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date</u>)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries												
FYROM	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Montenegro	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Serbia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Albania	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Moldova	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Georgia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Ukraine	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

⁷³ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

(including self-employed persons)⁷⁴												
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

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:

Cyprus does not issue specific residence permits to entrepreneurs. It is not possible to distinct if Self-employed persons are entrepreneurs or not.

⁷⁴ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons).

Section 3: Challenges of visa liberalisation on (Member) States

National Contribution (max. 6 pages, excluding statistics)

The aim of this Section is to investigate migratory risks since the introduction of visa-free regimes and the differences in the capacity of (Member) States to meet emerging challenges after the visa-free regimes were established 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 3.2:

Table 3.2.1: Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders;

Table 3.2.2: Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries;

Table 3.2.3: Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries;

Table 3.2.4: Total number of forced returns by visa-free country;

Table 3.2.5: Total number of nationals from the visa - free countries found in illegal employment;

Table 3.2.6: Total number of smuggled persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings);

Table 3.2.7: Total number of trafficked persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings);

Table 3.2.8: Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from the visa-free countries (final court rulings);

Table 3.2.9: Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries;

Table 3.2.10: Total number of overstayers from the 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 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**.

Since the introduction of visa liberalisation, Cyprus is facing a challenge, in relation to the total number of nationals from the visa-free countries, refused entry at the external borders. Taking in consideration the statistical table 3.2.1, you can observe the gradually increase at the numbers, prior and after the visa waiver agreements. In specific, from the total number third country nationals refused entry at the external borders, the percentage that reflects the nationals from visa-free countries is, 20% for 2008, 21% for 2009, 18,5% for 2010, 26% for 2011, 18,5% for 2012, 16% for 2013, 31% for 2014, 43% for 2015, 46% for 2016 and 49% for 2017. The reason of the rise of the numbers, in relation to table 3.2.1, is based on the fact, that visa-free countries nationals, take advantage of their right to visit an E.U country, without fulfilling the necessary

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

requirements at entry. In conclusion, the above mentioned data indicates, unjustified use of the visa waiver agreement, from the visa-free countries, with the majority of the cases coming from Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova nationals.

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

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

In relation to Western Balkans countries, the majority of the cases concerns nationals of Serbia and Albania, 166 nationals and 333 nationals, for the period 2008-2017, respectively.

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

In relation to Eastern Partnership countries, which consists the main source of nationals, refused entry at the external borders, the numbers are dramatically rising from 2013 and after. In detail the total for Moldova is 362, for Georgia 172 and for Ukraine 605.

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.

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.

Since 2009 when the Regulation (EC) No 810/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 establishing a Community Code on Visas (Visa Code) has been put into effect, there is not a significant rise in the identification of victims of trafficking with the exception in 2009, with a large number of Romanian nationals being located and identified as victims of trafficking. However, since the liberalization of visa, hundreds of Russian and Ukrainian young women arrive in Cyprus allegedly as tourists. Most of them are located in bars and pubs pretending to be customers, but in reality they are paid to keep company to the customers. There are indications and reasons to believe that this is a new trafficking trend, hard to evidence, but related information is under investigation. The numbers of victims located and interviewed by the police varies according to the prevalent and evolving trafficking trends.

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.

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.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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

No.

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.

No.

Q3.1.7 Did your (Member) State encounter any signs of possible misuse of the visa liberalisation?⁷⁵ If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

No.

Q3.2. Did your (Member) State as a country of destination face any administrative burden⁷⁶ 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.

No

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.

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.⁷⁷

No.

⁷⁵ 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.

⁷⁶ 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.

⁷⁷ For example: did your (Member) State identify any increased terrorism risks arising from the entry or residence of respective TCNs.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Q3.3.2. If applicable, what types of offences⁷⁸ were committed by third-country nationals in your (Member) State after the commencement of the visa-free regime?⁷⁹ Where there any significant differences compared to the time before the visa-free regime started?

N/A

Q3.3.3. If applicable, what was the rate of offences (final court rulings) committed by third-country nationals⁸⁰ 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?

N/A

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.

Table 3.2.8, indicates only one facilitator from Albania in 2015.

Q3.4.1 How did the activities of irregular migration facilitators impact your (Member) State?⁸¹ Please provide a short description with specific examples about your (Member) State situation.

Table 3.2.8, indicates only one facilitator from Albania in 2015.

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.

N/A

⁷⁸ 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.

⁷⁹ This applies to third-country nationals who do not live your country, but visited (short stay of up to 90 days).

⁸⁰ See above.

⁸¹ Did their activities lead to increases in irregular border-crossings, enhanced border controls or document fraud?

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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

N/A

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.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.1: Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders⁸²

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders												
FYROM	NI	2	1	1	7	3	1	1	2	2	0	
Montenegro	NI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Serbia	NI	28	15	27	5	8	8	5	10	17	43	
Albania	NI	29	17	17	81	49	17	20	11	27	64	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	2	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	5	
Moldova	NI	45	33	29	12	16	11	47	81	105	118	
Georgia	NI	10	17	19	14	10	2	5	7	13	145	
Ukraine	NI	61	52	31	23	13	22	49	68	98	328	
Total	NI	177	137	124	145	99	62	128	179	262	705	
Total number third-country nationals	NI	894	669	687	577	545	432	423	416	563	1426	

⁸² See Eurostat: Third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders - annual data (rounded) [migr_eirfs]

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

refused entry at the external borders ⁸³												
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

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:

--

⁸³ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.2: Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries⁸⁴

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries												
FYROM	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	9	10	0	5	10	5	20	10	5	15	5	
Albania	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	10	0	10	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	65	55	60	20	20	25	40	25	20	10	20	
Georgia	124	120	100	105	100	75	95	45	55	30	80	
Ukraine	70	65	40	20	30	20	60	55	45	40	50	
Total	269	255	205	150	165	135	230	135	135	95	165	
Total number of return decisions issued to third-country nationals⁸⁵	2833	3610	3410	2995	3370	3245	4360	3660	2385	1670	2015	

*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).

⁸⁴ See Eurostat: Third-country nationals ordered to leave - annual data (rounded) [migr_eiord]

⁸⁵ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of nationals ordered to leave.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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:

--

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.3: Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries⁸⁶

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries													
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	National data
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	National data
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	National data
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	National data
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	National data
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	2	0	National data
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	2	0	0	National data
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	2	1	4	0	National data
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	2	3	6	0	National data
Total number of voluntary returns (all types) – all third-country nationals⁸⁷	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	11	149	106	190	0	National data. In mid 2015 a voluntary return support programme has been established with the participation of NGO/IOM

⁸⁶ 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];

⁸⁷ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of voluntary returns.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

2007-2013: Data is not available for these years as it is not possible to collect them.

Table 3.2.4: Total number of forced returns by visa-free country⁸⁸

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	
Montenegro	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	10	8	8	11	9	11	8	6	15	3	
Albania	NI	1	1	2	4	4	2	2	11	1	7	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	5	1	
Moldova	NI	69	97	39	42	35	32	14	12	5	13	
Georgia	NI	131	152	139	140	106	69	45	46	34	65	
Ukraine	NI	74	50	42	51	25	45	31	12	14	12	
Total	NI	288	308	232	248	179	162	101	89	74	101	
Total number of forced returns - all third-country nationals⁸⁹	NI	3480	4522	4063	4607	4372	4027	2967	1693	874	512	Figures for the period 2008-2014 refer both to forced and voluntary returns, while figures for the period 2015-2017 refer

⁸⁸ 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];

⁸⁹ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of forced returns.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

												only to forced 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).*

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:

--

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.5: Total number of nationals from the visa - free countries found in illegal employment⁹⁰

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries found in illegal employment													
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	Please name the top 5 labour sectors where TCNs were illegally employed (see footnote list for pre-defined sectors). ⁹¹
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	Please see above.
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	5	2	5	1	1	Please see above.
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	1	0	0	0	Please see above.
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	1	2	0	0	Please see above.
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	13	7	7	2	1	1	Please see above.
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	10	20	8	2	10	10	Please see above.
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	10	11	7	8	10	10	Please see above.

⁹⁰ 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]

⁹¹ 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 as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use; Activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	34	43	26	19	22	
Total number third-country nationals found in illegal employment⁹²	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	911	651	437	282	485	

**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).*

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:

⁹² All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number third-country nationals found in illegal employment.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.6: Total number of smuggled persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)⁹³

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of <u>smuggled</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)													
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	2	0	0		
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0		
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	1	0	0	0		
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	4	1	14		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	1	0		
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	0	0	0	0		
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	4	0	0	1	1		
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	1	2	2	0		
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	7	2	8	5	15		
Total number of <u>smuggled</u> persons from	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	249	182	249	461	1080		The figures in this table refer to persons detected and not final court rulings

⁹³ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

third countries (final court rulings)⁹⁴												
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

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:

--

⁹⁴ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of smuggled persons from third countries.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.7: Total number of trafficked persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)⁹⁵

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) <i>(Insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											Additional Information <i>(e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)</i>
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of <u>trafficked</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)												
FYROM	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Albania	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	NI	NI	4	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	
Georgia	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Ukraine	NI	NI	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	
Total	NI	NI	6	3	1	1	1	4	3	4	3	
Total number of <u>trafficked</u> persons from	NI	NI	6	5	5	1	2	8	3	4	4	

⁹⁵ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

third countries (final court rulings)⁹⁶												
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

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:

--

⁹⁶ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of trafficked persons from third countries.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.8: Total number of identified facilitators⁹⁷ of unauthorised entry, transit and residence⁹⁸ from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)⁹⁹

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)												
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	1	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	1	0	0	

⁹⁷ This refer to the nationality of the facilitators. EU nationalities can be provided in the second part of the table.

⁹⁸ 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).

⁹⁹ Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence (final court rulings) ¹⁰⁰	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	12	12	18	23	16	The figures in this table refer to persons detected and not final court rulings
United Kingdom	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	6	2	3	0	<i>Please add the number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from EU MS (top 5 EU nationalities).</i>
Cyprus	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	4	1	2	0	0	<i>Please see above.</i>
Sweden	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	3	1	0	0	<i>Please see above.</i>
France	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	0	0	2	0	<i>Please see above.</i>
Belgium	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	0	0	2	0	<i>Please see above.</i>

**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).*

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:

¹⁰⁰ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination*Table 3.2.9: Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries¹⁰¹

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)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries												
FYROM	NI	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	
Montenegro	NI	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	9	15	26	23	17	22	16	10	24	6	
Albania	NI	2	2	5	5	11	5	1	8	1	8	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	0	0	5	0	1	5	1	1	1	0	
Moldova	NI	79	161	213	214	153	118	40	35	25	34	
Georgia	NI	281	276	279	327	295	159	89	81	66	97	
Ukraine	NI	92	122	121	179	136	122	70	53	41	65	
Total	NI	466	577	649	749	614	432	218	190	158	210	
Total number of third-country nationals found to be illegally present¹⁰²	NI	7002	8029	8005	8231	7840	7014	4980	4217	3450	4090	

¹⁰¹ 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]

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

**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).*

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:

--

¹⁰² All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of third-country national found to be illegally present.

Table 3.2.10: Total number of overstayers from the visa-free countries¹⁰³

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017) (insert all available data or <u>at least 2 years</u> prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)											Additional Information (e.g. data source(s), explanation of trends and numbers for this indicator)
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	0	1	0	0	0	
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	22	14	7	4	3	
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	4	1	5	1	6	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	5	1	1	2	0	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	89	32	24	21	32	
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	104	57	43	38	62	
Ukraine	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	94	58	34	33	56	
Total	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	319	164	114	99	159	
Total number of third-country nationals	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	6056	4044	2732	1622	1456	

¹⁰³ 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]

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

overstayers ¹⁰⁴												
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

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:

--

¹⁰⁴ All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of third-country national overstayers.

*Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination***Section 4: Measures put in place to deal with possible misuse of visa-free regimes by (Member) States*****National Contribution (max. 6 pages)***

The aim of this Section is to evaluate the measures put in place by Member States to deal with the possible misuse of visa-free regimes, how effective these measures were and more generally how did Member State respond and cooperate in cases of an influx of asylum seekers from the visa-free countries.

The synthesis report will aim to include infographics and visuals, therefore please take that into account when answering the questions 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.

Please do not leave any answer box empty and insert N/A or NI as applicable.

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**.

No.

Q4.1.1 If applicable, please categorise your answer to **Q4.1** by third country:

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

N/A

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

N/A

Q4.1.2. 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.

N/A

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.

N/A

Q4.1.4. If applicable, did your (Member) State implement measures to fight illegal employment? If yes, please explain their impact and add specific examples.

N/A

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

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 and add specific examples.

The police officers serving at the entry points of the Republic are systematically trained on trafficking in human beings, and specifically on the trends of trafficking and forms of exploitation, the indicators of victimization, and the means of recruitment and transport of the victims. The application of that knowledge during the arrivals of potential victims in Cyprus can serve as an initial screening. This serves as a deterrent for the traffickers and it is a way for the victims to be informed and receive assistance and guidance. One specific example is of two EU nationals arriving in Cyprus for the purpose of performing forced sham marriages. Upon arrival and after the police officer noticed some victimization indicators, the two women were referred to the Office of Combating Trafficking in Human Beings of the Cyprus Police. Further investigations led to a criminal investigation now pending trial, on the charges of trafficking in human beings for the purpose of forced criminality, which was the commitment of forced sham marriages.

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

Q4.2. Did your (Member) State implement measures to deal with administrative burdens since the introduction of the visa-free regime?¹⁰⁵ 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?¹⁰⁶ If yes, please list and explain these measures, their impact / effectiveness and add any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

¹⁰⁵ 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.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

No.

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?

N/A

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.

No.

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.

N/A

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?¹⁰⁷ 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:

There was no change.

¹⁰⁶ 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.

¹⁰⁷ 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.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Eastern Partnership - Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

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?

N/A

Q4.6. 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.¹⁰⁸

As already mentioned, Cyprus has not been affected significantly in relation to the numbers of asylum applications from visa-liberalisation countries. Although in 2008 and 2009, there was an increase in the asylum applications by Serbian nationals, this trend did not continue, mainly due to the immediate examination of these asylum applications (sometimes under accelerated procedures depending on the merits of each case). In 2014 and 2015, there was some increase in applications for asylum from Ukrainian nationals, which again did not continue as a trend in 2016 and 2017. In 2017, there was an increase in asylum applications submitted by Georgian nationals, which continued in the early months of 2018. In general, the impact of visa liberalisation did not have a significant impact on Cyprus, although any increase in asylum applications from this category of applicants, is closely monitored by the competent authorities. Apart from immediate examination of such applications (e.g. under accelerated procedures), no other measures were adopted.

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.

As above

Q4.6.2 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.

Apart from referring to EASO guidelines, COI Reports and Publications, there was no cooperation with other Member States concerning this matter.

¹⁰⁸ For example, using the concept of safe country of origin.

Impact of visa liberalisation on countries of destination

Q4.6.3 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.

N/A

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 planned measures that will be adopted in the nearby future?¹⁰⁹

N/A

¹⁰⁹ For example, in relation to Ukraine or Georgia for which the visa waiver agreement entered into force in 2017.

Section 5: Conclusions**National Contribution (max. 3 pages)**

The aim of this Section is to outline the main findings of the Study and present conclusions relevant for policymakers at national and EU level.

The synthesis report will aim to include infographics and visuals, therefore please take that into account when answering the questions 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.

Please do not leave any answer box empty and insert N/A or NI as applicable.

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

Taking in consideration the statistical tables, the main conclusions are:

1. The total number of nationals from the visa-free countries, refused entry at the external borders, gradually increased, in compare to two years prior and after the visa waiver agreement. The issue is described on detail, in answer 3.1-3.1.1.
2. The total number of forced returns, related to nationals from visa-free countries, decreased or remained to the same levels.
3. The total number of nationals from the visa-free countries, found in illegal employment, remained at the same levels.
4. The total number of smuggled persons from the visa-free countries, remained at the same levels.
5. The total number of facilitators remained at the same levels.
6. The total number of nationals found to be illegally present or overstayed, remained at the same levels.

Based on the statistical data, it is observed the there is an increasing trend, concerning the refused entry cases. The rest of the data indicates, minor or no fluctuations on numbers.

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