



Funded by the European Union's Asylum,  
Migration and Integration Fund

Study 2018

Impact of visa liberalisation on France

*French Contact Point for the European Migration  
Network*

August 2018

## List of Acronyms

- FYROM: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- BLTIFI: Office for the Fight against Illegal Work and Identity Fraud
- DACG: Directorate of Criminal Matters and Pardons
- DAV: Delegation for victims
- DCPAF: Central Directorate of the French Border Police
- DGEF: General Directorate of Foreign Nationals in France
- DGNN: General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie
- DSED: Department for Statistics, Studies and Documentation
- DVSA: Division for administrative data development
- OCRTH: Central Office for the Repression of Human Trafficking
- OFII: French Office for Immigration and Integration
- OFPRA: French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons
- OLCTI: Central Office for Combating Illegal Employment
- SDLII: Sub-directorate for the Fight against Irregular Immigration

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
<b>SECTION 1: PRESENTATION OF THE FRENCH NATIONAL FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL SITUATION	5
1.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION	11
<b>SECTION 2: POSITIVE IMPACT OF VISA LIBERALISATION ON FRANCE</b>	<b>24</b>
2.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL SITUATION	24
2.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION	31
<b>SECTION 3: CHALLENGES OF VISA LIBERALISATION ON MEMBER STATES</b>	<b>36</b>
3.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL SITUATION	36
3.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION	41
<b>SECTION 4: MEASURES PUT IN PLACE TO DEAL WITH POSSIBLE MISUSE OF VISA-FREE REGIMES BY (MEMBER) STATES</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>67</b>
ANNEX 1: LIST OF INTERVIEWS CARRIED OUT OR PEOPLE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE STUDY	67
ANNEX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY	69

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study analyses the **impact of visa liberalisation in France**. It will consider France's policies and practices following changes in migration flows generated by visa waivers in the Western Balkan and Eastern Partnership 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 targets of the study are third-country nationals 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);

Ukraine (11/6/2017).

The impact will be shown by quantitative and qualitative data in each section.

Following the introduction of the visa waiver system, France has effectively been faced, and continues to be faced, with a strong increase in asylum applications from certain countries targeted by this study. An increase in irregular immigration flows and the facilitation of activities of powerful criminal organisations have also been noted. In this context, these include an increase in Albanian asylum applications since 2012 with a very significant increase from 2016, and a significant increase in the number of Georgian asylum seekers. With 7,633<sup>1</sup> asylum requests, Albania was the leading country of origin for asylum seekers in France in 2017. Georgian asylum requests went from 688 in 2016 to 1,329<sup>2</sup> in 2017. The overall increase in irregular immigration indicators for these two countries is of concern. Against this background, the French authorities remain particularly vigilant with regard to the regular change in the criteria set by the visa liberalisation suspension clause.

The study will begin in the **first section** by providing an insight into the scale and scope of France's experiences after the visa waiver regime, and will analyse the short and long-term trends based on the number of asylum applications over the period.

**Section 2** will look at any positive impact of short-term visa liberalisation on countries of destination and third-country nationals. After describing the impact on France, the action plans and cooperation agreements with third countries, specific attention will also be paid to exchanges between France and the third countries and to cultural, scientific and technical cooperation, and political relations.

**Section 3** will investigate the migratory risks faced by France since the introduction of visa liberalisation regimes, whilst **section 4** will evaluate the measures put in place by France to better manage the influx of asylum seekers from visa-free countries. In this respect, it is important to note the reinforced cooperation with the third countries of origin and transit to manage return and reinsertion, the monthly statistical monitoring tool, the prevention of irregular migration from third countries and measures to intensify efforts to promote voluntary return.

The synthesis report prepared on a European level from the studies by the EMN Contact Points presents an overview of the impact of visa liberalisation on the Member States and Norway, and the measures taken to respond to any misuse of visa liberalisation.

---

<sup>1</sup> First applications, excluding accompanying minors.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

## SECTION 1: PRESENTATION OF THE FRENCH NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

### 1.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL SITUATION

**Q1.1** Please provide an analysis of the short term (within two years) and long-term (beyond two years) trends which appeared in your Member State after the commencement of visa-free regimes disaggregated by region and third countries of interest.<sup>3</sup>

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

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

#### 1. Change in short-term asylum applications (two years)<sup>4</sup>

An increase in the number of asylum applications from certain Western Balkan countries was observed over the two years following the start of the visa waiver regime, in particular:

- asylum applications from the **Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)** surged by 660% from 2009 to 2010, going from 48 applications in 2009 to 365 applications in 2010. This increased trend was confirmed the following year, with a new 29% increase in 2011;

- for **Montenegro**, the increase was mainly observed in 2011, with 102 applications, double the number in 2009 (52 applications) and 2010 (55 applications).

For the other Balkan countries, the number of asylum applications fell the first year, and increased the second:

- for **Serbia**, the number of asylum applications fell by 18% between 2010 and 2011 (from 457 to 375 applications) then increased in the same proportions between 2011 and 2012 (437 applications);

- for **Albania**, after an 18% decrease between 2010 and 2011 (339 applications in 2011 compared to 411 applications in 2010), the number of applications grew strongly in 2012, with 1,744 applications, or a 414% increase;

- for **Bosnia and Herzegovina**, the number of applications decreased by 65% in 2011 (111 applications) compared to 2010 (318 applications) but grew strongly in 2012 with 434 applications.

#### 2. Change in long-term asylum applications (over two years)<sup>5</sup>

Over the long term, we observe a stagnation or reduction up to 2015/2016 then a strong increase from 2016/2017:

- for the **FYROM**, the number of applications grew by 12% in 2012 (524 requests) then decreased over the following years (-60% in 2013 with 208 applications, -16% in 2014 with 175 applications). It increased once again in 2015 (+36% with 238 applications), in 2016 (+15% with 273 applications) and particularly in 2017 with a 143% increase (663 applications);

- for **Montenegro**, the number of applications grew by 75% in 2012 (178 applications) then

<sup>3</sup> Please use information such as: increase of entries, number of asylum applications, refusals of entry, return and removal decisions in your answers.

<sup>4</sup>First applications, re-examinations, reopening of closed files, excluding accompanying minors. .

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

decreased or stagnated over the following years (-25% in 2013 with 134 applications, +8% in 2014 with 145 applications, -12% in 2015 with 127 applications and -37% in 2016 with 80 applications). An increase was observed in 2017 with 108 applications, up 35% compared to 2016;

- for **Serbia**, the trend in the number of applications varied slightly each year after 2012 (+17% in 2012 with 437 applications, -13% in 2013 with 379 applications, -13% in 2014 with 328 applications, +10% in 2015 with 362 applications, +10% in 2016 with 399 applications). After 2017, however, we note a significant increase in the number of applications, with 992 requests, up 149% compared to the previous year.

- for **Bosnia and Herzegovina**, the number of applications grew by 29% in 2013 (561 applications) then decreased over the following years (-6% in 2014 with 525 applications, -36% in 2015 with 337 applications, -8% in 2016 with 310 applications). Since 2017, the number of applications has once again increased, with 474 requests, up 53% compared to 2016.

- for **Albania**, there is a more generally upwards and larger scale trend with a very significant increase from 2016. From 2014, when the number of applications decreased by 37% (going from 3,338 applications in 2013 to 2,095 in 2014), the number of requests has increased steadily: +91% between 2012 and 2013, +30% in 2015 (2,714 applications) and especially +91% in 2016 (5,174 applications) and +61% in 2017 (8,351 applications).<sup>6</sup>

In terms of **irregular immigration**, **Albania** represents a major challenge for France, with an **increase noted across all indicators** in 2017: abusive asylum applications, +1,756% since 2010 and +61% between 2016 and 2017; non admissions, +25% compared to 2016; arrests +10% from 2016 to 2017; removal measures imposed, +50% from 2016 to 2017.

Over several years, Albania has been one of the main countries of origin for irregular immigration to France (first nationality for asylum applications in the territory in 2017). A significant increase in Albanian criminal activity (theft, drug-legislation infractions, imprisonment) has also been noted. These figures are of considerable concern, as they are criteria to be taken into consideration as part of the updated safeguard mechanism for visa liberalisation.

France is aware of the efforts made by Tirana as part of the Action Plan (see Q2.2.1.) but remains vigilant and determined to continue the bilateral cooperation, as shown by the visit to Tirana by the Minister of the Interior in December 2017. The other Western Balkan countries benefiting from visa liberalisation (**FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina**) only pose limited challenges in terms of irregular immigration to France at this stage. However, they constitute significant transit countries for migrants arriving in Greece and who continue their route to the North and the EU (reactivation of the route towards Croatia and Slovenia since the start of 2018). This is also the case for Albania, where this phenomenon is particularly important.

For the Western Balkans, the regional trend in the total number of irregular French border crossings by visa-free country nationals is mainly down over the short term, but up over the long term (see table 1.2.2.).

#### Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

##### Change in asylum applications<sup>7</sup>

**Moldova** is a special case in the scope of states benefiting from the visa-waiver regime targeted by this questionnaire. On the one hand, the volume of asylum seekers is very low (23 applications in 2014, 32 in 2015, 26 in 2016 and 16 in 2017). On the other, with the exception of a slight increase in 2015 (+39%), the trend has been downwards over the last few years (-19% in 2016

<sup>6</sup> OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity Reports.

<sup>7</sup> First applications, re-examinations, reopening of closed files, excluding accompanying minors.

and -38% in 2017).

For Georgia and Ukraine, it is not possible to analyse the trend in asylum applications for the first two years following the visa waiver regime, as it was implemented in 2017. However, it is possible to note:

- for **Georgia**, whereas 1,050 asylum applications were made in 2015 and 940 in 2016, particularly from the second half of 2017, we note an increase in the number of applications, with 1,542 applications for the full year 2017. This trend has significantly accelerated in 2018. Thus, 1,758 applications were made over the first five months of 2018, up 381% compared to the same period in 2017 (365 applications). The number of applications from Georgia puts it in fifth place in the national asylum demand in May 2018, and third place if we include accompanying minors.

- for **Ukraine**, after a very significant increase in the number of asylum seekers in 2014 (1,036 applications) and 2015 (1,231 applications) due to the Ukrainian crisis, the number of asylum applications is generally down. 506 applications were made in 2016, whilst 541 were filed in 2017. Over the first five months of 2018, 236 applications were made, i.e. a 71% increase compared to the same period in 2017 (138 applications).<sup>8</sup>

Since 28 March 2017, **Georgia** has benefited from the visa liberalisation regime. Since then, we note an **increased illegal migratory pressure** from this country. The overall increase in irregular immigration indicators for Georgian nationals in France is of concern:

- significant increase in **arrests** in 2017 (+47%, with around 900 arrests) and in 2018 (over four months: +109% compared to the same period in 2017);
- 1,600 **removal measures decided** in 2017 (23th national rank), compared to 1,364 in 2016 (+17% in one year). The trend has continued in 2018 (+49% over four months);
- **unfounded asylum applications**: Georgian asylum applications increased by 112% between 2016 and 2017, to reach 2,000 applications (19th place nationally), with an acceptance rate down throughout 2017 (10% in Q3).

Against this background, the French authorities remain particularly vigilant with regard to the change in the criteria set by the visa liberalisation suspension clause. The efforts made by the Georgian authorities to remind nationals of the applicable framework for visa liberalisation should continue, in order to dissuade them from misusing the liberalisation and the asylum system in France.

Since 11 June 2017, **Ukrainian nationals** with biometric passports are exempt from short-stay visas within the Schengen area. This facilitation could have an impact on illegal immigration.

To date, whilst Ukraine is not a priority interest country for France in terms of irregular immigration, **a recent increase in migratory pressure requires vigilance within the context of visa liberalisation**:

- **625 Ukrainian nationals were arrested in 2016 (34th nationality)**, compared to 933 arrests in 2015 and 564 in 2014. We recorded 669 arrests in 2017.

- in 2016, **848 removal measures were decided (29th nationality)**, compared to 728 in 2015 and 461 in 2014 (**a significant 84% increase in decisions from 2014 to 2016**). This trend has been confirmed over the first nine months of 2017, with 695 measures decided, compared to 641 for the same period in 2016. **France is in sixth EU place in terms of removal measures decided against Ukrainians** (with 848 measures, but which must be put into perspective compared to 16,170 measures taken by Poland, by far the most affected Member State);

- **the execution rate of measures decided was slightly down in 2016**, at 54% (266 removals to countries of origin in 2016 of which 221 "forced ticket returns"<sup>9</sup>) compared to 59% in 2015; in 2017 (over nine months), 158 removal measures were taken for Ukrainian nationals, including 111 forced returns to Ukraine.

<sup>8</sup> OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity Reports.

<sup>9</sup> All removed persons with proof of return transmitted to the Prefecture by the DCPAF.

For the Eastern Partnership, the **short term trend is up**, but in line with the increases in the years prior to the visa-waiver regime.

With the consequences over the last five years of the visa liberalisation carried out since 2010 in the Western Balkans in mind - which showed that the migratory risk due to structural causes largely continued, and even increased, despite apparent compliance with the liberalisation criteria - France has implemented a **migratory pressure monitoring system, inspired by the European indicators of the monitoring mechanism**, with the aim of ensuring that these third countries benefiting from visa waivers continue to meet the criteria on which the exemption was granted.

These European indicators include the substantial increase in the number of illegally staying third-country nationals or those that have been refused entry at the border, the substantial increase in asylum seekers with a low recognition rate, or the deterioration in cooperation from the third country for returns. Further **grounds for suspension** can be a decrease in cooperation on readmission, including for third-country nationals having transited through the third country concerned, as well as a substantial increase in risks to the public policy or internal security of Member States.

As part of the implementation of these tools at a French level, the General Directorate for Foreign Nationals in France (DGEF) is particularly vigilant as to the regular evolution of the migratory risk criteria under its direct responsibility. For the other indicators (such as refusal of entry or criminal infractions), the other competent services of the Ministry of the Interior (Central Directorate of the French Border Police - DCPAF, General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie - DGGN) provide the required data to the DGEF. A monthly report on changes is carried out, for both the new and former visa waiver beneficiary countries.

On a European level, France supported the amendment to the "safeguard clause" created in 2001 by Regulation 539/2001 setting the list of third countries benefiting from visa waivers, in order to facilitate its triggering. For this reason, considerable attention is paid to changes in migratory flows from these countries in order to request the triggering of this clause if required.

**Q1.2.** What are the main links between the countries of origin and your Member State or the applicable 'pull factors'<sup>10</sup> disaggregated by region and third countries of interest?

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

There is a strong legal community located in Germany. Due to the significant diasporas, there are numerous transits towards departments in the East of France. Asylum applications numbers are at a sustained level.

Another pull factor is the processing time for asylum applications in France. In 2017 asylum applications from third-country nationals from countries benefiting from a visa waiver regime have been processed, the time for judicial remedy included, within an average of 255 days (eight and a half months) compared to an average of 318 days (ten and a half months) for applications from other nationalities.

Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

Low-cost air routes have supported emigration towards West European countries. For France, the most significant example is that of Beauvais airport in 2017.

---

<sup>10</sup> These may include: presence of diaspora, historical links between countries, social assistance received by asylum seekers, probability of receiving a residence permit/long-term visa, schemes (tourism, family ties, business) for attracting certain categories of migrants using visa-free regime.



**Q1.3.** Which national institutions and/or authorities are involved in implementing the visa liberalisation process and what is their respective role in this process?<sup>11</sup>

The Ministry of the Interior prepares and implements the Government's policy on the entry, stay and exercise of a professional activity in France for foreign nationals, the fight against illegal immigration and documentary fraud by foreign nationals, asylum and integration of immigrant populations.

It also has joint responsibility with the Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs for the visa allocation policy.

The DGEF deals with all questions on foreign nationals, in order to improve the way in which public policy is carried out.

The DGEF acts in numerous areas, covering the entire migration process. It is competent to deal with:

- visa regulations;
- general rules on the entry, stay and exercise of a professional activity in France of foreign nationals;
- the fight against irregular immigration, illegal work and documentary fraud;
- asylum;
- the reception and support for newly arrived foreign nationals;
- access to French nationality.

**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?

The law of 29 July 2015 reforming the right to asylum<sup>12</sup> mainly aimed to transpose the three European directives on asylum ("Qualification" Directive 2011/95/EU of 13 December 2011; Directive 2013/32/EU of 26 June 2013 on "procedures" and Directive 2013/33/EU of 26 June 2013 on "reception"). Whilst this does not have a direct link with the introduction of the visa waiver regime, France wishes to maintain the idea of "safe country of origin" in its national law, enabling applications from nationals from these countries to be accelerated. Following the entry into force of the law, all the countries targeted by this study were entered onto the national list of safe countries of origin, and remain there. However, it appears that registration on the list of safe countries of origin and placement in an accelerated procedure are not sufficient to contain the increase in asylum applications that may be generated by the visa waiver regime for these nationalities.

There have not been any changes in national legislation on the other themes (irregular migration, trade, access to stay and work, etc.).

**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?

---

<sup>11</sup> For example: changes in instructions for border patrol agents and in equipment.

<sup>12</sup> Law no. 2015-925 of 29 July 2015 reforming the right to asylum, <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/loi/2015/7/29/INTX1412525L/jo>

In view of the sustained level of irregular Albanian immigration, France and Albania have agreed to implement an Action Plan (see Q2.2.1). See Q1.1. on the "safeguard clause".

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

No

## 1.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Table 1.2.1: Total number of external border-crossings (persons) by nationals of visa-free countries<sup>13</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional Information
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
<b>FYROM</b>	NI											This data is not available due to the absence of tools allowing the number of people crossing external borders to be recorded by nationality.
Montenegro												
Serbia												
Albania												
Bosnia and Herzegovina												
Moldova												
Georgia												
Ukraine												
<b>Total</b>												
<b>Total number of external border crossings (persons)</b>												

<sup>13</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. The indicator refers to border-crossings at the external borders of the EU plus NO.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional Information	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
<b>Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings from nationals of visa-free countries</b>													
<b>FYROM</b>	NI	NI	48	29 (-40%)	57 (+97%)	38 (-33%)	NI	NI	NI	NI	162 (+1%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-admissions: individual border refusal decisions in application of the Schengen Border Code</li> <li>• Simplified readmissions: The foreign national has entered, but has been arrested close to the border; he/she is given back to the authorities of the border country that he/she has just left within a short time period.</li> </ul>	
<b>Montenegro</b>	NI	NI	54	53 (-2%)	51 (-4%)	40 (-22%)	NI	NI	NI	NI	83 (+34%)		
<b>Serbia</b>	NI	NI	167	155 (-7%)	122 (-21%)	117 (-4%)	NI	NI	NI	NI	470 (+67%)		
<b>Albania</b>	NI	NI	258	192 (-25%)	295 (+54%)	166 (-43%)	NI	NI	NI	NI	1 897 (+21%)		
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	NI	NI	86	91 (+2%)	64 (-30%)	48 (-25%)	NI	NI	NI	NI	168 (+8%)		
<b>Moldova</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	62 (+113%)	98 (+58%)	199 (+103%)	493 (+147%)		
<b>Georgia</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	57 (-24%)	58 (+2%)	125 (+114%)	255 (+105%)		
<b>Ukraine</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	126 (+27%)	158 (+25%)	220 (+39%)	239 (+9%)		
<b>Total</b>													
<b>Total number of detections of irregular border-crossings</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	22,936	23,056	21,924	35,799	40,691	69,697 (+71%)	90,418 (+30%)		

Source: DCPAF, SDLII, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior / Source for the "total number": DGEF, Ministry of the Interior, Report to Parliament on the 2016 data, p.78.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											2
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Additional information
FYROM	0	0	4,718	389	70	8	3	0	1	1	0	
Montenegro	0	0	79	3	1	0	3	2	0	2	0	
Serbia	0	0	18,568	318	58	30	20	25	5	6	13	
Albania	0	0	5,605	4,405	224	17	6	1	10	5	2	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	5,075	3,821	110	32	23	3	1	6	6	
Moldova	0	0	4,911	5,711	5,723	4,875	4,435	1,175	107	67	24	
Georgia	0	0	7,492	7,821	9,128	9,420	9,221	8,571	7,957	8,561	2,009	
Ukraine	0	0	46,993	43,921	46,998	49,425	53,700	39,981	35,888	38,179	17,235	
<b>Total</b>	0	0	93,441	66,389	62,312	63,807	67,411	49,758	43,969	46,827	19,289	
<b>Total number of short-stay visa applications – all third countries<sup>14</sup></b>	0	0	1,871,528	2,031,390	2,213,108	2,398,983	2,628,359	2,969,916	3,381,288	3,334,455	3,757,792	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>14</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa applications.

Table 1.2.3 bis: Total number of short-stays visa issued by third country

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of short-stay visas issued by third country												
FYROM	0	0	4,560	368	61	6	1	0	1	1	0	
Montenegro	0	0	75	3	1	0	2	2	0	2	0	
Serbia	0	0	17,734	247	53	26	17	22	3	5	11	
Albania	0	0	4,904	3,945	209	14	4	1	9	5	2	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	4,865	3,687	101	30	10	9	1	3	4	
Moldova	0	0	4,160	4,863	5,036	4,322	3,759	965	105	61	18	
Georgia	0	0	6,971	7,168	7,799	7,956	7,376	7,009	7,240	7,963	1,737	
Ukraine	0	0	44,201	41,419	44,515	47,832	52,163	38,520	34,910	35,815	16,491	
<b>Total</b>	0	0	87,470	61,700	57,775	60,186	63,332	46,528	42,269	43,855	18,263	
<b>Total number of short-stay visas issued – all third countries<sup>15</sup></b>	0	0	1,647,489	1,811,572	1,970,452	2,136,461	2,337,231	2,647,781	3,020,498	2,890,950	3,220,429	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>15</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa applications.

Table 1.2.4: Total number of short-stays visa refused by third country

Indicator	Period of interest											Additional information
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
Total number of short-stay visas refused by third country												
FYROM	0	0	129	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montenegro	0	0	27	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Serbia	0	0	528	46	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	
Albania	0	0	623	418	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	238	121	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	0	0	677	788	597	472	483	85	0	1	5	
Georgia	0	0	626	644	664	742	910	964	637	520	305	
Ukraine	0	0	2,560	1,875	922	405	482	396	697	1,518	610	
<b>Total</b>	0	0	5,408	3,903	2,202	1,621	1,878	1,445	1,334	2,040	921	
<b>Total number of short-stay visas refused – all third countries<sup>16</sup></b>	0	0	197,520	194,174	195,601	220,184	249,007	280,388	334,881	365,063	503,553	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>16</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of short-stay visa applications.

Table 1.2.5: Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries – excluding accompanying minors

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries													Total excluding accompanying minors: first applications, re-examinations, reopening of closed files.
FYROM	100	80	48	365	469	524	208	175	238	273	663		
Montenegro	41	69	52	55	102	178	134	145	127	80	108		
Serbia	2,524	799	656	457	375	437	379	328	362	399	992		
Albania	214	300	433	411	339	1744	3,338	2095	2,714	5,174	8,351		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	192	167	276	318	111	434	561	525	337	310	474		
Moldova	300	169	262	170	224	111	38	23	32	26	16		
Georgia	290	404	445	1,025	1228	1,888	1,994	1192	1,050	940	1,542		
Ukraine	93	63	65	75	79	112	99	1036	1,231	506	541		
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,754</b>	<b>2,051</b>	<b>2,237</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>2,927</b>	<b>5,428</b>	<b>6,751</b>	<b>5,519</b>	<b>6,091</b>	<b>7,708</b>	<b>12,687</b>		
Total number of asylum applications – all third countries <sup>17</sup>	29,937	34,258	38,803	41,619	45,654	47,467	51,715	50,952	64,942	71,290	81,327		

Source: OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity reports.

<sup>17</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of asylum applications.



Table 1.2.5 bis: Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries – including accompanying minors

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of asylum applications received from visa-free countries													Total including accompanying minors: first applications, re-examinations, reopening of closed files
<b>FYROM</b>	134	108	74	594	746	857	347	238	343	427	1,118		
<b>Montenegro</b>	54	121	78	81	197	322	247	260	211	112	150		
<b>Serbia</b>	3,342	1,091	977	799	666	839	701	606	635	655	1730		
<b>Albania</b>	246	354	560	517	507	2,703	5,066	2,996	3,699	7,432	12,131		
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	260	268	452	501	249	786	923	845	509	480	778		
<b>Moldova</b>	313	183	289	187	239	133	57	29	49	34	17		
<b>Georgia</b>	313	463	542	1,435	1,737	2,680	2,693	1,611	1,335	1,164	2,101		
<b>Ukraine</b>	101	77	73	91	101	145	137	1,424	1,651	658	686		
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,763</b>	<b>2,665</b>	<b>3,045</b>	<b>4,205</b>	<b>4,442</b>	<b>8,465</b>	<b>10,171</b>	<b>8,009</b>	<b>8,432</b>	<b>10,962</b>	<b>18,711</b>		
Total number of asylum applications – all third countries <sup>18</sup>	35,520	42,599	47686	52,762	57,337	61,468	66,251	64,811	80,075	85,726	100,755		

Source: OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity reports.

<sup>18</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of asylum applications.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	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 <sup>19</sup>	1	4	13	3	4	6	7	5	5	6	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	6	1	
Serbia	64	94	31	45	27	23	23	47	24	32	46	
Albania	13	16	15	16	39	17	87	344	252	403	662	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	14	23	16	24	13	12	32	48	18	27	43	
Moldova	1	4	5	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	
Georgia	26	46	34	17	35	35	50	107	120	108	74	
Ukraine	7	0	4	8	1	3	12	20	306	214	160	
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>992</b>	

Source: OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity reports.

<sup>19</sup> Total of first instance admissions to refugee and subsidiary protection status, excluding accompanying minors.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	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	103 <sup>20</sup>	76	46	325	493	433	286	140	188	199	525	
Montenegro	0	75	0	48	76	209	139	144	97	73	112	
Serbia	2,471	1,190	589	585	355	357	399	282	258	282	692	
Albania	189	185	301	417	424	431	2,045	3,479	2,057	3,134	9,702	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	168	146	223	345	95	349	553	468	246	285	411	
Moldova	335	175	208	0	206	155	0	20	27	21	15	
Georgia	290	327	401	510	646	1738	1,519	1,704	1,402	966	981	
Ukraine	91	65	55	75	73	89	97	171	953	847	460	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,647</b>	<b>2,239</b>	<b>1,823</b>	<b>2,305</b>	<b>2,368</b>	<b>3,761</b>	<b>5,038</b>	<b>6,408</b>	<b>5,228</b>	<b>5,807</b>	<b>12,898</b>	

Source: OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity reports.

<sup>20</sup> Total of first instance rejections, excluding accompanying minors.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
<b>Total number of <u>positive</u> decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)</b>												
<b>Nationality 1</b>	Sri Lanka (538)	Mali (978)	Sri Lanka (634)	Sri Lanka (585)	Mali (387)	China (376)	Syria (835)	Syria (1404)	Syria (2322)	Syria (3857)	Afghanistan (5,690)	
<b>Nationality 2</b>	Russia (302)	Sri Lanka (567)	Mali (574)	Mali (427)	Erythrea (365)	RD Congo (352)	Russia (488)	China (604)	Irak (1,874)	Afghanistan (3,270)	Sudan (3,694)	
<b>Nationality 3</b>	Guinea (278)	Russia (551)	Irak (439)	Russia (374)	Sri Lanka (347)	Guinea (286)	Afghanistan (462)	Russia (497)	Sudan (1,199)	Sudan (2,456)	Syria (3,497)	
<b>Nationality 4</b>	RD Congo (212)	RD Congo (401)	RD Congo (343)	Erythrea (288)	Russia (343)	Mali (284)	RD Congo (461)	Afghanistan (485)	China (828)	Irak (1,343)	Irak (1,322)	
<b>Nationality 5</b>	Mali (207)	Guinea (287)	Russia (311)	RD Congo (257)	RD Congo (307)	Afghanistan (264)	Sri Lanka (407)	Guinea (481)	Guinea (771)	China (780)	Guinea (854)	
<b>Total<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>3,401</b>	<b>5,153</b>	<b>5,048</b>	<b>5,096</b>	<b>4,630</b>	<b>4,348</b>	<b>5,978</b>	<b>8,763</b>	<b>14,119</b>	<b>19,982</b>	<b>23,958</b>	

<sup>21</sup> Total of first instance positive decisions, all nationalities included, excluding accompanying minors.

Total number of <u>negative</u> decisions on asylum applicants (top five nationalities, not limited to visa-free countries)	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Additional information
<b>Nationality 1</b>	Turkey (2,702)	Sri Lanka (2,666)	Kosovo (2,353)	Kosovo (3,376)	Bangladesh (3,722)	RD Congo (3,812)	Bangladesh (3,386)	RD Congo (3,706)	RD Congo (4,241)	Haïti (3,913)	Albanie (9,702)	
<b>Nationality 2</b>	Sri Lanka (2,639)	Turkey (2,455)	Turkey (2,306)	Bangladesh (2,386)	Kosovo (3,295)	Bangladesh (3,551)	RD Congo (2,820)	Albania (3,479)	Russia (3,076)	Bangladesh (3,486)	Haïti (622)	
<b>Nationality 3</b>	Serbia (2,471)	Russia (2,074)	RD Congo (2,076)	Armenia (2,329)	Sri Lanka (2,811)	Sri Lanka (2,943)	Kosovo (2,819)	Bangladesh (3,459)	Bangladesh (3,045)	Soudan (3,354)	Bangladesh (3,514)	
<b>Nationality 4</b>	RD Congo (1,874)	Armenia (1,923)	Sri Lanka (2,002)	Sri Lanka (2,287)	Russia (2,403)	Armenia (2,687)	Russia (2,208)	Kosovo (3,350)	Kosovo (2,868)	Albanie (3,134)	Guinée (3,150)	
<b>Nationality 5</b>	Armenia (1,607)	RD Congo (1,668)	Armenia (1,893)	Russia (2,279)	RD Congo (2,327)	Russia (2,248)	Armenia (2,186)	Russia (2,502)	Pakistan (2,458)	RD Congo (2,780)	RD Congo (2,996)	
<b>Total<sup>22</sup></b>	<b>25,922</b>	<b>26,648</b>	<b>30,283</b>	<b>32,571</b>	<b>37,619</b>	<b>41,672</b>	<b>40,706</b>	<b>43,066</b>	<b>47,597</b>	<b>49,447</b>	<b>64,092</b>	

Source: OFPRA, 2007 to 2017 Activity reports.

<sup>22</sup> Total first instance rejections, for all nationalities, excluding accompanying minors.

Table 1.2.9: Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) by visa-free country													This data includes first applications and applications for the renewal of resident permits, for all reasons, in Metropolitan France and the Overseas Territories.
FYROM	1,106	1,099	1,159	1,296	1,489	1,701	1,795	1,707	1,898	1,977	1,934		
Montenegro	319	388	382	399	474	575	724	883	898	998	984		
Serbia	4,792	3,790	3,785	4,340	5,177	5,841	6,496	7,516	9,605	10,212	9,415		
Albania	1,479	1,635	1,842	2,048	2,418	2,779	3,138	4,212	5,731	7,073	10,318		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1,932	2,037	2,137	2,056	2,150	2,370	2,766	3,055	3,273	2,889	3,854		
Moldova	1,627	1,996	2,288	2,578	2,767	2,703	2,811	2,341	2,217	2,245	2,026		
Georgia	2,298	2,487	2,804	3,242	3,566	4,219	4,939	5,387	6,073	6,729	7,464		
Ukraine	3,256	3,755	4,052	4,595	5,262	5,828	6,199	6,552	7,555	8,226	8,219		
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,809</b>	<b>17,187</b>	<b>18,449</b>	<b>20,554</b>	<b>23,303</b>	<b>26,016</b>	<b>28,868</b>	<b>31,653</b>	<b>37,250</b>	<b>40,349</b>	<b>44,214</b>		
Total number of residence permits applications (all residence permits) <sup>23</sup>	741,886	786,160	876,270	927,260	1,052,844	1,087,486	1,137,901	1,156,829	1,225,221	1,286,091	1,267,234		

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

This data is used to estimate the annual activity of the Prefectures, but does not represent the number of decisions. Thus, some applications may have been entered (by error) several times or not have been subject to definitive decisions if other applications were entered in parallel. Similarly, this data may include foreign nationals that have left the territory, died or been naturalised over the following years without retroactive corrections to the number of applications. Data regularisation is carried out systematically for the number of decisions but not for the number of applications.

<sup>23</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of residence permit applications.

Table 1.2.10: Total number of identity document fraud instances by visa-free country<sup>24</sup>

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		
<b>Total number of identity document fraud instances by visa-free country</b>													<p>Data on fraud detected by the Prefectures is broken down into category of fraud and permit, but not by nationality.</p> <p>Each half-year, the Prefectures indicate the five nationalities most involved in resident permit fraud attempts, in decreasing order. The nationalities targeted by the study are indicated by a very limited number of <i>départements</i> (thus in 2017, Albanians are indicated by three <i>départements</i>, Georgians by three <i>départements</i>, Serbians and Montenegro nationals by one <i>département</i>).</p>
<b>FYROM</b>	NI												
<b>Montenegro</b>													
<b>Serbia</b>													
<b>Albania</b>													
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>													
<b>Moldova</b>													
<b>Georgia</b>													
<b>Ukraine</b>													
<b>Total</b>												NI	
<b>Total number of identity document fraud instances<sup>2526</sup></b>							3,883	1348	1,365	2,253	3,650		

Source : BLTIFI, SDLII – DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>24</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>25</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identity document fraud instances.

<sup>26</sup> Total number of frauds (for all nationalities) with regard to foreign documents detected by the Prefectures during resident permit applications.

## SECTION 2: POSITIVE IMPACT OF VISA LIBERALISATION ON FRANCE

### 2.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL SITUATION

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

Given the deterioration in the main indicators of **irregular immigration and asylum**, the impact of visa liberalisation cannot be considered as positive for these aspects (*see answers in section 1.*). However, since 2017, French authorities have been able to work in a concerted way with the authorities of the main countries of origin for irregular immigration and asylum applications (Albania, Georgia) to establish action plans and measures to fight against irregular immigration.

Concerning **legal immigration**, relatively few resident permits are issued to these nationals for the purpose of a paid activity (salaried or independent workers) (between 10 and 50 for six of these nationalities in 2017 and between 100 and 150 for Serbians and Ukrainians for the same year); the change over time does not appear to be linked to the visa liberalisation date in each country (except possibly for Albania, where the number of permits went from 20 in 2010 to 52 in 2017). For Ukraine and Georgia, it is not possible to analyse the impact of the visa liberalisation agreements on the issuance of resident permits as they date from 2017.

The number of resident permits issued for studies in France is higher for Serbia, Albania, Ukraine and Georgia, as France has carried out a support policy for the French language and student attractiveness in these countries over several years (Serbia, Ukraine). For this reason to stay, the number of resident permits increased after the visa liberalisation date (to a lesser extent for the FYROM and Montenegro, more significantly for Serbia and Albania).

Overall, France's trade with the third countries listed remains fairly low (FYROM, Montenegro, Albania, Moldova, Georgia) and the increase in these exchanges does not seem to be linked to visa liberalisation. France is often at the **3<sup>rd</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> rank in European suppliers** to these countries (Moldavia, Ukraine, Georgia) behind Germany or Romania, which generally have more significant market shares.

**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.

France has not carried out an overall assessment on the impact of visa liberalisation.

**Q2.2.1.** Did your collaboration with relevant third countries improve within the field of migration since the introduction of visa liberalisation?<sup>27</sup> If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

France has implemented action plans or cooperation agreements with certain countries with which specific difficulties have been identified, for example, the increase in irregular immigration and

<sup>27</sup> For example: in cases of return and readmission.



asylum applications or the fight against criminal organisations.

Whilst consular cooperation with some of these countries is very good (96% of recognition rate with Kosovo, around 80% with Georgia), satisfactory consular cooperation only very partially attenuates the effects of irregular immigration, as numerous failures in removals have been noted. For example, the massive use of asylum applications (Albania), and when this fails, requests for permits for health care reasons which are frequently used as delaying tactics to remain in the country (Albania, Georgia).

In view of the massive and continuous influx of **Albanians with irregular situations**, a **ministerial action plan** (DGEF/DCPAF) was prepared in February 2017, aiming notably to reinforce checks on Albanians on their entry into France, speed up processing of asylum applications by Albanians, and accelerate the implementation of removal decisions when these applications are rejected, increase use of return bans and intensify return operations, if required with support from Frontex.

At Albania's request, a **framework cooperation agreement to develop operational, technical and institutional cooperation** in several areas, including a section on the fight against irregular immigration, was signed by the French and Albanian Prime Ministers on 28 March 2017.

In July 2017, Albania also prepared an action plan to prevent irregular immigration from its country to the EU, and specifically France.

Similarly, after the short-stay visa liberalisation with Georgia, a significant increase in the number of Georgians irregularly present was recorded, along with the number of Georgian asylum seekers, even though Georgia has been on the list of safe countries of origin since 2013. For this reason, as part of an official visit to France on 4 July 2018 by Mr Giorgi Gakharia, Vice-Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior of Georgia, an **action plan to fight against irregular immigration from Georgia** was proposed to the Minister of the Interior. France proposed additional measures to reinforce bilateral cooperation with Georgia. The ministers also proposed to reinforce cooperation between the two countries through the signature of a **bilateral internal security agreement** to allow the implementation of a joint group dedicated to the fight against organised transnational criminal activities.

France was also able to carry out **more specific actions**, for example:

- In 2013, the reinsertion aid programme in Moldova focused on level three aid (aid for company creation) up to a maximum of €7,000, excluding operator costs, for a total budget of €800,000.  
The Project Examination Committee, under the French Embassy and comprising local support structures and local institutions, examined aid requests presented in the different reinsertion areas. It gave an opinion on the relevance of the projects, and the amount of aid to be provided. In light of the Committee's opinion, the French Office for Immigration and Integration (OFII) decided to allocate aid and carried out monitoring based on documents and on-site of reinsertion projects over a 12 month period.
- Regional cooperation (Bulgaria, Romania, Moldova) on **the rights of children** is steered from the French Embassy in Bucharest. In Moldova, it focuses on preventing trafficking in particularly vulnerable children (40,000 to 100,000 children abandoned by their parents who have gone abroad) and access to education for children with special educational needs.

**Q2.2.2.** Did your (Member) State identify specific economic benefits?<sup>28</sup> If yes, please list them and provide a short description for each.

No

**Q2.2.3.** Did your (Member) State experience a growth in tourism<sup>29</sup> from third-country nationals under the visa liberalisation regime? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

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

The countries entering into the scope of this study are not generally found in the studies and statistics consulted<sup>30</sup>. Generally, the studies analyse data by large geographical zones (Europe, America, Asia, Africa, Oceania) and for the countries that represent the highest number of tourists in each geographical area.

Consequently, it is not possible to assess the impact of visa liberalisation for these eight nationalities on the growth of tourism in France.

**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.

The data indicated in table 2.2.3 does not show a significant increase in the number of resident permits issued for salaried work following visa liberalisation. The number of resident permits issued to nationals of the eight states to carry out salaried work is stable, at around 365 permits in 2017 after an initial peak of over 500 permits in 2008 and 2009 then a second peak of over 400 permits in 2015-2016.

Between the year in which the agreements entered into force and 2017, the figure remained stable for Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Moldova. We can note a slight increase for Montenegro (four in 2009 and 10 in 2017) and a more sustained increase for Albania (20 in 2010 and 52 in 2017).

<sup>28</sup> For example: an increase in direct investments from the respective third countries to your (Member) State.

<sup>29</sup> For example: third-country national visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments increased.

<sup>30</sup> Directorate-General for Competitiveness of Industry and Services (*Direction générale de la compétitive de l'industrie et des services* - DGCIS) which became Directorate-General for Enterprise (*Direction Générale des Entreprises* - DGE) on 15 September 2014, Bilan du tourisme en 2012 (*Review of Tourism in 2012*), [https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions\\_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/bilans/2013-07-bilan-tourisme2012.pdf](https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/bilans/2013-07-bilan-tourisme2012.pdf) ; OECD, 2018 Tourism Trends and Policies, <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/tourism/2018-Tourism-Trends-Policies-Highlights-FR.pdf> ; DGE, *Les 4 pages de la DGE*, 87 million foreign tourists in France in 2017, N°84 June 2018, [https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions\\_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2018-07-4p-N84-EVE.pdf](https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2018-07-4p-N84-EVE.pdf)

**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.

The number of resident permits issued for nationals of the eight states for the purpose of studying in France went from 773 in 2007 to 1,012 in 2017, with a stability above 1,000 permits since 2012. This increase does not necessarily reflect the strong increase noted since 2013 in "student" resident permits issued to third-country nationals overall.

However, mobility of Serbian student and researchers to France is a strong priority of the French Embassy in **Serbia**. In the cultural area, cooperation with **Ukraine** is also focused on student and young researcher mobility to France (France welcomes 1,700 Ukrainian students each year) and the opening up to French culture and language for young people.

Similarly, French culture and language occupies an important place in Moldova and Albania, and actions have been carried out to reinforce French teaching and the training of French-speaking elites.

**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.

As shown by the figures in table 2.2.5, entrepreneurial activity (independent/liberal activity) accounts for relatively few nationals of the eight states studied (three permits in 2007 and 12 in 2017) and has not really increased in volume over the period.

**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).

Overall, France's **trade** with the third countries listed remains **fairly low** (FYROM, Montenegro, Albania, Moldova, Georgia) and the increase in these exchanges does not seem to be linked to visa liberalisation. For the FYROM, Montenegro and Albania, the increase in trade dates respectively from 2012 (FYROM and Albania) and 2016-2017 (Montenegro) whilst visa liberalisation dates from 2009 and 2010. For Serbia, where visa liberalisation also took place in 2009, whilst trade significantly increased in 2015-2016, it has more than doubled since 2010, when the interim trade agreement entered into force.

Overall, France is often at the **third or fifth rank in European suppliers** to these countries (Moldova, Ukraine, Georgia) behind Germany or Romania, which often have more significant market shares.

For **Ukraine**, trade resumed in 2016 after the political events of Maidan in 2013-2014 and the country's rapprochement with the EU.

Since 2012, trade between France and the **FYROM** have increased steadily, but France represents

less than 2% of FYROM's imports<sup>31</sup>, including mainly capital equipment and transport equipment which represented over 60% of exports to this country in 2016. France is only the 21<sup>st</sup> investor in the country.

Bilateral trade relations with **Montenegro** are still limited, but opportunities exist in the areas of tourism (French people are the second tourist nationality excluding neighbouring countries after Russia), renewable energies and infrastructures. A France-Montenegro circle of companies was created in Podgorica on 27 November 2017, to promote the relocation and development of French companies in Montenegro and reinforce links between companies. France has recorded a trade surplus since Montenegro's independence in 2006. This surplus more than doubled in 2017 (compared to 2016), mainly due to the export of automobiles. France is Montenegro's 10<sup>th</sup> trade partner.

Trade between France and **Serbia** has increased over the last few years (+8% between 2015 and 2016, +15.5% in exports) with a growth potential that remains significant. It has more than doubled since the entry into force of the interim trade agreement with the EU in 2010. With a balance that returned to a surplus, France is Serbia's 10th customer. French exports are fairly diversified: sales of mechanical, electrical and electronic equipment – mainly comprising industrial and agricultural machines - represented 25.1% of total French exports in 2017; chemical products, fragrances and cosmetics (2%); pharmaceutical products (16.2%); transport equipment (13.1%). Agricultural and agro-food sector exports represented 9.5% of the total. 65 French companies are present in Serbia, employing almost 10,000 people. The main French investors in Serbia are Michelin, Société Générale, Crédit Agricole, Tarkett, Lafarge, Bongrain, Atos and Lactalis.

Trade between France and **Albania** is limited, but has increased over the last few years: trade went from €27M in 2005 to €124M in 2016. France has recorded a trade deficit with Albania since 2012. It amounted to €35M in 2016. French exports to Albania have increased since 2012, and amounted to €44.5M in 2016 (capital equipment and transport equipment represented 26% of the total in 2017, with pharmaceutical and chemical products at 23% of the total and textile and clothing exports at 19.5%). French imports from Albania have increased since 2006, and with a more sustained pace since 2015, reaching €79.6 M in 2016. Almost 440 French companies export to Albania, including around sixty major companies. Textile products are France's main purchases in Albania.

Trade between France and **Bosnia and Herzegovina** increased by 18.2% over one year, to reach €207.5M in 2016. France is the country's 12th customer and supplier.

Whilst trade between France and **Moldova** remains limited, there is a significant presence of French investors in the country. France is amongst the main foreign investors in Moldova. The main companies present in Moldova are Orange (Orange Moldova, the country's leading mobile phone supplier), Lafarge (60% of the country's cement requirements), Lactalis and Société Générale (majority shareholder of Mobiasbanca, 5th Moldovan bank). Bilateral trade remains limited, but relatively stable after an increase over the last few years (€75M in 2012, €101.1M in 2013, €93.7M in 2014, €100M in 2015). France's exports have been relatively irregular, with a decrease in 2017. France is the country's 10<sup>th</sup> world supplier with a market share of 2%, and the 5<sup>th</sup> EU supplier (behind Romania, Germany, Italy and Poland). As the 10<sup>th</sup> Moldovan customer, France absorbs 2% of its exports.

**Trade with Ukraine recovered significantly in 2016, with a 23% increase in French exports to Ukraine**, and a 1.5% increase in imports (mainly cereals and fertilizer). The trade balance was positive in 2017 (+€193M). France is Ukraine's 9th world supplier with a market share of 2%. Amongst European countries, France is Ukraine's 3rd supplier (behind Germany and Poland) and Ukraine's 20th customer (it absorbs 1% of its exports). On 28 October 2016, France

---

<sup>31</sup> Compared to 12% for Germany.

welcomed the second France-Ukraine Business Forum to Paris, in the presence of the Ukrainian Prime Minister, bringing together over 300 companies.

**Georgia** receives French investments in the distribution, transport, hotel and agro-food sectors. Trade with France shows a surplus (€125M of exports for €35M of imports in 2016), but trade remains low with a market share of 1.5%. French exports continued to increase at a sustained pace in 2017 (+44%), mainly in mechanical equipment, electronic and IT equipment (32.2%), pharmaceutical products (23.2%) and industrial and agro-industrial products (17.6%). France is the 6<sup>th</sup> European supplier in 2017 behind Germany, Italy, Romania, Bulgaria and the Netherlands.

**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?

France has developed several cooperation focuses - mainly cultural and scientific - with the eight States. This cooperation was implemented before visa liberalisation (FYROM, Moldova, Ukraine, Georgia) and is often based on promoting French language and culture.

Agreements with Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine and Bosnia and Herzegovina provide for support for reforms or cooperation in line with security or defence issues, and were often implemented after the visa liberalisation date, although it is not always possible to establish a causal relationship.

**Cultural, scientific and technical cooperation** between France and the **FYROM** was implemented well before visa liberalisation as part of the agreement signed on 29 January 1998. This cooperation revolves around three focuses: reinforcing the state of law and support for good governance, training for elites and support for French language and culture.

With regard to **political relations**, France has provided constant support to the FYROM since its independence, and has closely contributed to resolving the crisis in 2001 and the negotiation process for the Ohrid Framework Agreement, whilst the constitutional reform was steered by Robert Badinter.

Cultural, scientific and technical cooperation with **Montenegro** has developed over the last few years: a French international technical expert is detached to the Ministry of the Interior of Montenegro to help Montenegro to achieve the Chapter 24 standards on justice, freedom and security. Montenegro's membership of the International Francophone Association as an observer in October 2010, and the inauguration of the French Institute in Montenegro (formerly the cultural centre) on 4 July 2011, reinforce the outlook for the use of French in Montenegro. Moreover, Montenegro's accession to NATO offers new cooperation prospects in the area of defence. Montenegro is also committed to several external operations (Resolute Support for NATO, Mali EUTM, EU NAVFOR, Atalata and the United Nations Western Sahara mission).

Cultural, scientific and technical cooperation with **Serbia** aims to introduce a **stimulus plan for French in the education system**, develop inter-university exchanges and training in cultural occupations and promote inter-laboratory research programmes. The French School in Belgrade currently educates 516 students, from infant school to the *Baccalaureate*. Moreover, cooperation between France and Serbia has been rolled out in numerous areas (support for European integration and administrative, defence and environmental reform), supported by the presence of French international technical experts (ETI). **Cooperation on security** has been developed (reinforced cooperation for police, legal investigations, and the fight against trafficking; in 2012 installation in Belgrade of the division to fight against organised crime in South-East Europe). France supports the political and economic reforms undertaken by Serbia and its efforts in view of its membership of the EU, especially as part of the Berlin and Brdo-Brijuni process.

The French cooperation mechanism in **Albania** focuses on the cooperation and cultural action service within the Embassy (SCAC) and a network of four *Alliances Françaises*. Albania stands out as one of the anchor points for French speaking in the region: French is the second foreign language taught in the education system. Bilateral cooperation aims to consolidate the position of French and support the country in its European rapprochement through institutional cooperation focused on reinforcing the State of Law and training for elites. With regard to **political relations**,

France supports Albania in its democratisation and stabilisation process and its intention to join the EU.

The cultural, scientific and technical cooperation mechanism is supported by the French Institute in **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (IFBH), located in Sarajevo, with offices in Mostar and Banja Luka, as well as the legacy of the *Centre André Malraux*, located in Sarajevo during the conflict. These two establishments merged in 2014. Moreover, an internal security attaché (ASI) working in Sarajevo implements police-related cooperation actions: the fight against organised crime, terrorism and clandestine immigration. France is a member of the Steering Committee of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC), which supervises compliance with the Dayton Agreements signed in Paris on 14 December 1995 and the actions of the High Representative.

France is one of the longest represented Member States in Chisinau, **Moldova**.

France's **cultural and linguistic cooperation system** is based on the *Alliance Française* in Chisinau, the capital's leading cultural establishment, which celebrated its 20th anniversary in 2012. Each year, it provides French lessons to between 3,000 and 4,000 people. In this very Francophone country (in 2016, Moldova celebrated 20 years of membership of the International Francophone Organisation), French is learned by over half of secondary students, although English has become the first foreign language taught for the last few years.

French cooperation aims to **reinforce French speaking, train new elites, promote cultural diversity and support public institutions** via civil servant training actions. Co-financing is organised with French-speaking (*Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie, Association des parlementaires francophones*), multilateral (UNDP, WHO, UNICEF) and European donors.

This cooperation also covers numerous other areas, for example, a **cooperation agreement for heritage** was signed in 2017 between the Culture Ministries of both countries.

French-Ukraine relations saw a new boost after the Maidan and with **Ukraine's** rapprochement with the EU. In 2017, France and Ukraine celebrated 25 years of diplomatic relations.

In the **cultural area**, the ten *Alliances Françaises* (including eight in activity after the closure of those of Louhansk and Donetsk) are a dynamic relay for cooperation actions with the Embassy.

They welcome over 3,000 students. The French *Lycée Anne de Kiev*, approved by the AEFÉ, continues its development and educates around 400 students.

**In terms of decentralised cooperation**, around forty "twinings" exist between the territorial authorities of the two countries. A declaration of intention for trilateral cooperation between France, Poland and Ukraine was signed on 6 July 2016.

**With regard to support for the reforms and modernisation of Ukraine**, France is able to share its experience and position its expertise in European financing in the areas of the fight against corruption, management of public finances, decentralisation, reform of public administration and healthcare. The Expertise France operator is responsible for implementing the European project to fight against corruption, PRAVO (€15M). The overall volume of Expertise France's activity in Ukraine is €12M. Three FASEP financing of €1.5M enabled three feasibility studies on waste management in Lviv and Cherkasy and the building of a photovoltaic power plant on the Chernobyl site. The AFD, whose intervention mandate was extended to Ukraine during the CICID of October 2016, can play a support role for reforms and the modernisation of Ukraine.

France has long-standing friendly relations with **Georgia** (welcome of the exiled Georgian government from 1918-1921), maintained by contacts at all levels. Cultural cooperation gives priority to training Georgia's elites through a **grant incentive programme and the development of the university sector**. Created in September 2006, the Caucasus French School had over 360 students at the start of the 2017 school year.

## 2.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION

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

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	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
<b>Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments from the visa-free countries</b>													The studies indicate data by large geographical zone (Europe, Americas, Asia, Africa, Oceania) and for the most represented nationalities in each geographical area.
<b>FYROM</b>						NI							
<b>Montenegro</b>						NI							
<b>Serbia</b>						NI							
<b>Albania</b>						NI							
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>						NI							
<b>Moldova</b>						NI							
<b>Georgia</b>						NI							
<b>Ukraine</b>						NI							
<b>Total</b>						<b>NI</b>							
<b>Total number of visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments<sup>32</sup> (in millions)</b>	NI	NI	NI	76,6	80,5	82	83,6	83,7	84,5	82,7	86,9		
<b>Including non-EU nationals (in millions)</b>	NI	NI	NI	11,6	13,4	13,4	14,2	15,4	17,4	18	18,5		

Source : DGE, Les 4 pages de la DGE, 87 million foreign tourists in France in 2017, N°84 June 2018.

<sup>32</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of tourism visitors staying in hotels and other accommodation establishments.

Table 2.2.2: Total number of first-time residence permit applications received from visa-free country nationals

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	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
Total number of first-time residence applications received from the respective visa-free country													This data includes the first resident permits issued, whatever the reason for stay, Metropolitan France and overseas territories.
FYROM	361	350	331	352	440	558	573	544	512	551	659		
Montenegro	96	159	120	108	143	198	274	354	275	334	360		
Serbia	1,262	1,454	1,331	1,299	1,540	1,825	1,906	1,905	1,875	2,117	2,889		
Albania	513	529	582	573	682	864	1,069	1,953	2,835	3,390	6,257		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	925	945	957	620	611	618	733	761	802	853	2,091		
Moldova	683	765	751	784	677	687	892	635	558	677	614		
Georgia	961	923	958	1,042	1,086	1,447	1,892	2,050	2,224	2,624	3,205		
Ukraine	1,114	1,174	1,101	1,257	1,474	1,720	1,917	2,134	2,662	2,930	3,066		
<b>Total</b>	<b>,5915</b>	<b>6,299</b>	<b>6,131</b>	<b>6,035</b>	<b>6,653</b>	<b>7,917</b>	<b>9,256</b>	<b>10,336</b>	<b>11,743</b>	<b>13,476</b>	<b>19,141</b>		
<b>Total number of first-time residence applications<sup>33</sup></b>	245,981	270,286	276,216	280,468	295,044	315,066	346,029	347,749	364,159	392,407	448,590		

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>33</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of first-time temporary residence applications.



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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons to visa-free country nationals	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	9	12	14	9	11	14	9	18	13	8	9	This data includes the first resident permits issued to carry out a paid activity, in application of articles L.313-10, 1° and 2° and L.313-20, 1° to 3° of the CESEDA, Metropolitan France and overseas territories.
Montenegro	3	7	4	4	7	7	12	20	16	18	10	
Serbia	5	36	94	77	45	116	105	115	109	107	97	
Albania	20	29	17	20	16	10	17	24	28	47	52	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	32	59	41	15	12	22	15	15	12	10	15	
Moldova	63	220	168	120	50	37	20	10	12	17	8	
Georgia	33	43	24	25	19	32	32	21	27	34	23	
Ukraine	109	173	151	138	124	142	131	150	219	166	151	
<b>Total</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>365</b>	
Total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons <sup>34</sup>	10,125	20,540	19,570	17,242	14,251	13,200	12,971	13,672	14,765	15,577	18,272	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>34</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of permits issued for remunerated activities reasons.

Table 2.2.4: Total number of first residence permits issued for education reasons to visa-free country nationals

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	
	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	41	52	49	46	56	52	45	42	57	51	57	This data includes the first resident permits issued for studies in application of articles L.313-7, 17 and 18 of the CESEDA, Metropolitan France and overseas territories.	
Montenegro	2	3	9	1	6	20	18	16	15	27	24		
Serbia	6	33	29	19	44	162	160	159	148	152	156		
Albania	66	86	97	122	107	127	143	156	143	171	220		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	15	15	22	21	12	14	31	17	18	27	26		
Moldova	225	221	192	232	168	138	108	104	66	47	48		
Georgia	99	100	133	142	154	111	105	113	112	123	110		
Ukraine	319	258	273	382	403	398	469	479	512	465	371		
<b>Total</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>804</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>1,022</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>1,086</b>	<b>1,071</b>	<b>1,063</b>	<b>1,012</b>		
Total number of permits issued for education reasons <sup>35</sup>	46,971	52,254	58,370	64,487	64,277	57,819	60,627	62,645	67,323	70,702	76,793		

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>35</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of permits issued for education reasons.

Table 2.2.5: Total number of first residence permits issued to entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries<sup>36</sup>

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	
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017		
<b>Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons) from visa-free countries</b>													This data includes the first resident permits issued to carry out an independent-liberal activity, in application of articles L.313-10, 3° and L.313-20, 5° to 8° of the CESEDA, Metropolitan France and overseas territories.
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	NI		
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	NI	NI		
Serbia	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	NI	1	3	NI	3	1		
Albania	NI	NI	1	NI	1	1	3	1	2	1	4		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI		
Moldova	2	NI	1	1	1	1	NI	NI	1	NI	1		
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2		
Ukraine	NI	NI	4	NI	5	2	3	1	5	1	4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>		
<b>Total number of first residence permits issued for entrepreneurs (including self-employed persons)<sup>37</sup></b>	368	288	204	230	260	255	244	211	242	273	408		

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>36</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>37</sup> 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

## 3.1: DESCRIPTION OF THE 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**.

As already indicated (see Q.1.1), France has been faced, and continues to be faced, with a significant increase in **asylum applications** following the introduction of the visa-waiver regime from third-country nationals from the FYROM the year after the visa waiver (in 2010) and Montenegro two years after the implementation of the agreement (in 2011). This very significant increase took place two years after the respective agreements for Albania and Bosnia (in 2012), and later still for Serbia (in 2017). The number of asylum applications strongly increased for Georgians in 2018 (+80%). For Ukraine, the increase in asylum applications is limited.

The most significant cases are undoubtedly <sup>38</sup> :

- that of Albania, with an increase in Albanian applications of 1,931% between 2010 and 2017;
- that of Georgia, with an increase in asylum applications of 381% in the first five months of 2018 compared to the first five months of 2017.

We can also note an increase in **irregular immigration** flows and unfounded asylum applications as well as the facilitation for the activities of powerful, and very active criminal organisations (Albania, Georgia, Ukraine).

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

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

See Q1.1. and above.

Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

See Q1.1. and above.

**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.

---

<sup>38</sup> The figures for asylum applications correspond to the number of first requests and re-examinations, excluding accompanying minors.

The data indicated in table 3.2.5 shows an increase in the number of foreign nationals employed without resident permits **for two nationalities only: Albania and Moldova**. For the other nationalities, the trend is downwards over the period.

The sectors represented by these infractions are mainly construction, commerce, hotels-restaurants, agriculture and transport.

**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.

Table 3.2.6 bis lists the networks that have been dismantled on a national level, whether or not they are classified as criminal "trafficking in human beings", with the main nationalities of the victims.

The table has been completed with the number of networks dismantled by victim nationality, enabling the reader to see the upwards trend of the number of Albanian victims since 2012.

**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.

With regard to the number of final convictions for aiding the illegal entry, circulation or irregular stay of a foreign national, only Albania has seen a significant increase in the number of convictions since 2012.

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

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

An increase has been seen for foreign nationals in irregular situations from the Western Balkans, with the exception of those from Montenegro and Serbia.

Amongst Eastern Partnership countries, the year 2017 saw a strong increase in foreign nationals in irregular situations (+49% for Moldova and +48% for Georgia).

**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.

NI

France does not currently have a tool to record the number of third-country nationals that remain in the French territory beyond the expiry date of their travel documents or resident permits (overstays).

**Q3.1.7** Did your (Member) State encounter any signs of possible misuse of the visa liberalisation?<sup>39</sup> If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

The short-stay visa liberalisation led to a significant increase in the number of Georgians in irregular situations in France, along with the number of Georgian asylum seekers, even though Georgia has been on the list of safe countries of origin since 2013.

Albania has been one of the most represented countries in terms of irregular immigration for several years and in 2017 it was the leading country of origin for asylum seekers in France (see Q1.1).

**Q3.2.** Did your (Member) State as a country of destination face any administrative burden<sup>40</sup> since the introduction of the visa-free regime? If yes, please provide a short description and specific examples.

The general increase in asylum applications between 2015 and 2017, and more particularly for certain nationalities, led to an additional workload for all the administrations involved in processing asylum requests.

**Q3.2.1.** If applicable, please list the institutions that faced administrative burdens.

In terms of asylum, the following are concerned: first reception structures for asylum seekers, one-stop shops (*guichet unique* - GU) responsible for recording asylum applications and orientation in the accommodation system, the French Office for Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA) for the processing of international protection requests, the National Court for the Right to Asylum, the jurisdiction responsible for deciding appeals against OFPRA rejection decisions and the prefectures responsible for monitoring asylum applications.

**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.

---

<sup>39</sup> For example, dealing with cases when persons enter the country legally but later become illegally employed, are staying in the country legally, but are working without a work permit or apply for asylum without reasonable grounds.

<sup>40</sup> For example: significant increase of residence permit applications, increased demand for work permits, more time-consuming border control procedure due to the lack of visas. etc.

We have seen an increase in criminality from Georgia and Albania, notably.

**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.

See Q 3.3.

**Q3.3.2.** If applicable, what types of offences<sup>41</sup> were committed by third-country nationals in your (Member) State after the commencement of the visa-free regime?<sup>42</sup> Where there any significant differences compared to the time before the visa-free regime started?

NI

The types of infractions are not recorded by nationality, but by type of infraction. For each category of infraction, we only have a breakdown by geographical origin (France, EU28 excluding France, Europe excluding EU28, Africa, Asia, others).

**Q3.3.3.** If applicable, what was the rate of offences (final court rulings) committed by third-country nationals<sup>43</sup> in your (Member) State after the commencement of the visa-free regime? Where there any significant differences compared to the time before the visa-free regime started?

NI

**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.

NI

---

<sup>41</sup> Please use this pre-defined list of categories: cybercrime; drugs offences; economic and financial offences; illicit immigration; illicit trafficking (not drug related); offences against property; offences against public order and safety; offences against public trust (e.g. fraud, forgery, counterfeiting); offences against the person; sexual exploitation of children (including child pornography); sexual offences against adults; terrorism-related activity; trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants.

<sup>42</sup> This applies to third-country nationals who do not live your country, but visited (short stay of up to 90 days).

<sup>43</sup> See above.

**Q3.4.1 1** How did the activities of irregular migration facilitators impact your (Member) State?<sup>44</sup>  
Please provide a short description with specific examples about your (Member) State situation.

NI

**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.

NI

**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

---

<sup>44</sup> Did their activities lead to increases in irregular border-crossings, enhanced border controls or document fraud?



### 3.2: STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Table 3.2.1: Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders<sup>45</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries refused entry at the external borders	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	41	52	18	9	15	13	15	15	47	158	160	
Montenegro	28	28	1	8	2	6	6	17	11	35	82	
Serbia	106	333	56	46	46	55	65	110	173	263	463	
Albania	59	60	106	58	171	92	152	106	335	1,511	1,874	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	43	36	23	5	10	6	12	14	43	134	164	
Moldova	113	41	47	18	12	14	8	32	72	187	483	
Georgia	22	25	23	13	28	19	28	6	27	106	235	
Ukraine	61	39	44	41	39	41	33	47	62	177	219	
<b>Total</b>	473	614	318	198	323	246	319	347	770	2,571	3,680	
<b>Total number third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders<sup>46</sup></b>	16,829	18,070	15,861	10,481	11,487	11,515	12,043	11,542	15,978	64,500	87,280	The data provided concerns non-admissions to Metropolitan France.

Source: DCPAF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>45</sup> See Eurostat: Third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eirfs]

<sup>46</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number third-country nationals refused entry at the external borders.

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

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of return decisions issued to nationals from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	30	67	320	245	173	72	68	81	179	Data is not available for 2007 and 2008 in the removal measure management tool.
Montenegro	NI	NI	14	10	18	36	33	44	49	62	30	
Serbia	NI	NI	229	192	269	277	279	203	295	240	241	
Albania	NI	NI	283	244	493	738	1,384	2,472	2,593	2,637	3,555	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	75	159	110	105	156	246	216	126	154	
Moldova	NI	NI	350	327	520	1,404	742	362	529	386	652	
Georgia	NI	NI	230	237	172	279	400	334	370	288	384	
Ukraine	NI	NI	283	245	378	392	380	249	520	457	378	
<b>Total</b>	NI	NI	<b>1,494</b>	<b>1,481</b>	<b>2,280</b>	<b>3,476</b>	<b>3,547</b>	<b>3,982</b>	<b>4,640</b>	<b>4,277</b>	<b>5,573</b>	
Total number of return decisions issued to third-country nationals <sup>47</sup>	NI	NI	19,400	17,886	21,403	23,327	20,758	23,251	25,384	20,928	23,592	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>47</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of nationals ordered to leave.

Table 3.2.3: Total number of voluntary returns (voluntary and forced returns)) by nationals of visa-free countries<sup>48</sup>

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>											Complément d'informations
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
<b>Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries</b>												
FYROM	0	0	0	15	188	125	77	12	6	20	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	2	5	7	0	
Serbia	0	0	10	14	31	37	73	12	24	20	10	
Albania	0	0	7	6	13	15	70	341	120	179	7	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	4	26	26	50	61	50	52	31	4	
Moldova	0	0	46	52	204	418	194	113	185	144	46	
Georgia	0	0	8	24	40	59	88	53	73	45	8	
Ukraine	0	0	36	44	148	160	126	62	46	75	36	
<b>Total</b>	0	0	111	181	651	866	698	645	511	521	111	
<b>Total number of voluntary returns (all types) – all third-country nationals<sup>49</sup></b>	0	0	1,644	2,422	3,923	4,269	3,329	2,710	2,950	2,504	3,734	

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

<sup>49</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of voluntary returns.

Table 3.2.3 bis: Total number of voluntary returns (voluntary aided and spontaneous departures without removal measures) by nationals of visa-free countries<sup>50</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Complément d'informations
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of voluntary returns (all types) by nationals of visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	0	0	0	15	188	125	77	12	6	20	0	
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	2	5	7	0	
Serbia	0	0	10	14	31	37	73	12	24	20	10	
Albania	0	0	7	6	13	15	70	341	120	179	7	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	4	26	26	50	61	50	52	31	4	
Moldova	0	0	46	52	204	418	194	113	185	144	46	
Georgia	0	0	8	24	40	59	88	53	73	45	8	
Ukraine	0	0	36	44	148	160	126	62	46	75	36	
<b>Total</b>	0	0	111	181	651	866	698	645	511	521	111	
<b>Total number of voluntary returns (all types) – all third-country nationals<sup>51</sup></b>			1,644	2,422	3,923	4,269	3,329	2,710	2,950	2,504	3,734	

<sup>50</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Number of voluntary and forced returns [migr\_eirt\_vol].

<sup>51</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of voluntary returns.

Table 3.2.4: Total number of forced returns by visa-free country<sup>52</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of forced returns by visa-free country	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	29	28	62	57	65	25	30	37	51	
Montenegro	NI	NI	14	10	14	29	20	15	18	20	15	
Serbia	NI	NI	192	144	211	207	173	128	136	127	105	
Albania	NI	NI	272	233	473	711	1,302	1,687	2,058	2,208	2,428	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	54	93	45	34	71	48	27	36	60	
Moldova	NI	NI	209	205	276	914	459	125	167	178	191	
Georgia	NI	NI	197	189	109	184	249	170	179	132	226	
Ukraine	NI	NI	225	180	215	210	229	112	352	235	189	
<b>Total</b>	NI	NI	<b>1,192</b>	<b>1,082</b>	<b>1,405</b>	<b>2,346</b>	<b>2,568</b>	<b>2,310</b>	<b>2,967</b>	<b>2,973</b>	<b>3,265</b>	
Total number of forced returns - all third-country nationals <sup>53</sup>	NI	NI	15,558	13,327	15,083	17,070	16,047	11,829	12,053	9,876	11,498	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>52</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Number of voluntary and forced returns [migr\_eirt\_vol].

<sup>53</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of forced returns.

Table 3.2.5: Total number of nationals from the visa - free countries found in illegal employment<sup>54</sup>

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>											
Total number of nationals from the visa-free countries found in illegal employment <sup>55</sup>	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	Le top 5 des secteurs d'activité dans lesquels les ressortissants de pays tiers sont illégalement employés :
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	14	4	2	1	3	2	3	1. Construction <sup>56</sup> 2. Commerce <sup>57</sup> 3. Agriculture <sup>58</sup> et Hôtels et restaurants <sup>59</sup> 4. Autres <sup>60</sup>
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	100	37	61	58	30	52	33	1. Construction 2. Commerce 3. Hôtels et restaurants 4. Industries 5. Autres
Serbia												
Albania	NI	NI	NI	NI	15	30	16	42	29	37	33	1. Construction <sup>61</sup> 2. Commerce <sup>62</sup> 3. Hôtels et restaurants <sup>63</sup> 4. Autres <sup>64</sup> 5. Agriculture <sup>65</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre].

<sup>55</sup> Source: Labour Ministry, General Labour Directorate (DGT), Tadees application - ticketing of illegal work by year of charge sheet closure. Data from Tadees is reported by the secretariat of the CODAF (responsible for the fight against illegal work), to the DGT, which prepares the statistics.

<sup>56</sup> Construction: Residential and non-residential building construction; Electrical installation work, plumbing, and other installation work; Finishing work; Other specialist construction work.

<sup>57</sup> Commerce: Commerce of automotive equipment; Wholesale commerce of domestic goods; Retail commerce of other household equipment in specialist stores.

<sup>58</sup> Agriculture: Forestry.

<sup>59</sup> Hotels and restaurants: Fast-food type restaurants.

<sup>60</sup> Others: Others without further indication - not specified.

<sup>61</sup> Construction: Residential and non-residential building construction; Demolition and site preparation; Electrical installation work, plumbing, and other installation work; Finishing work; Other specialist construction work.

<sup>62</sup> Commerce: Commerce of automotive equipment; Maintenance and repair of automotive vehicles; Wholesale commerce of domestic goods; Other specialist wholesale commerce; Food retail commerce in specialist stores; Retail commerce of fruit and vegetables in specialist stores; Retail commerce on stalls and markets.

<sup>63</sup> Hotels and restaurants: Hotels and similar accommodation; Traditional restaurants; Fast-food type restaurants; Drinks outlets.

<sup>64</sup> Others: Others - unknown sector of activity - not specified; Others without further indication - not specified.

<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	16	18	14	12	23	4	11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction</li> <li>2. Commerce<sup>66</sup></li> <li>3. Hôtels et restaurants<sup>67</sup></li> <li>4. Transport<sup>68</sup></li> <li>5. Autres<sup>69</sup></li> </ol>
<b>Moldova</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	18	72	33	24	27	74	33	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction<sup>70</sup></li> <li>2. Transport<sup>71</sup></li> <li>3. Autres<sup>72</sup></li> <li>4. Hôtels et restaurants<sup>73</sup></li> <li>5. Activité de service administratif et de soutien<sup>74</sup></li> </ol>
<b>Georgia</b>	NI	NI	NI	NI	5	7	9	10	7	7	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction</li> <li>2. Commerce<sup>75</sup></li> <li>3. Autres<sup>76</sup></li> <li>4. Industries<sup>77</sup></li> <li>5. Transport<sup>78</sup></li> </ol>
<b>Ukraine</b>					63	67	52	40	28	39	30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction<sup>79</sup></li> <li>2. Agriculture<sup>80</sup></li> <li>3. Hôtels et restaurants<sup>81</sup></li> <li>4. Industries<sup>82</sup></li> </ol>

<sup>65</sup> Agriculture: Non-perennial crops; Perennial crops; Agriculture support activities and primary processing of harvests; Forestry

<sup>66</sup> Commerce: Commerce of automotive vehicles; Maintenance and repair of automotive vehicles; Commerce of automotive equipment; Other specialist wholesale commerce; Retail commerce on stalls and markets.

<sup>67</sup> Hotels and restaurants: Hotels and similar accommodation; Traditional restaurants; Fast-food type restaurants.

<sup>68</sup> Transport: Transport of passengers by taxis.

<sup>69</sup> Others: Other personal services; Others - unknown sector of activity - not specified.

<sup>70</sup> Construction: Residential and non-residential building construction; Demolition and site preparation; Electrical installation work, plumbing, and other installation work; Finishing work; Other specialist construction work.

<sup>71</sup> Transport : Road freight transport; Removal services.

<sup>72</sup> Others: Recovery - Dismantling of wrecks; Other personal services; Others - unknown sector of activity - not specified; Others without further indication - not specified.

<sup>73</sup> Hotels and similar accommodation; Traditional restaurants; Fast-food type restaurants; Drinks outlets.

<sup>74</sup> Administrative service and support activity: Worker placement agency activities; Temporary employment agency activities; Travel agent and tour operator activities. .

<sup>75</sup> Commerce: Commerce of automotive vehicles; Maintenance and repair of automotive vehicles; Commerce of automotive equipment; Other specialist wholesale commerce; Retail commerce on stalls and markets.

<sup>76</sup> Others: Recovery - Dismantling of wrecks; Other personal services.

<sup>77</sup> Industries : manufacturing baked products and pastas ; furniture manufacturing.

<sup>78</sup> Transport : Road freight transport; Removal services.

<sup>79</sup> Construction : Residential and non-residential building construction; Demolition and site preparation; Electrical installation work, plumbing, and other installation work; Finishing work; Other specialist construction work; real estate development ; Construction of power lines and network ; .

<sup>80</sup> Agriculture: Non-perennial crops; Perennial crops ; mixed farming.

<sup>81</sup> Hotels and restaurants: Hotels and similar accommodation; campsites and vehicule / trailer parks ; Traditional restaurants; Fast-food type restaurants.

											5. Autres <sup>83</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>145</b>			
<b>Total number of third-country nationals found in illegal employment</b>	NI	5 322	5 444	5 786	5 462	4 169	3 659	3 850			
<b>Total number of salaried employees found in illegal employment</b> (France, EU, third-country nationals)	NI	24 310	23 742	24 869	22 258	22 403	28 278	26 199			

Source: DGT, Ministry of Labour.

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:

2007-2010 data too fragmented for use.

No separate data for Serbia and Montenegro as the data entry tool was created before Montenegro's independence in 2006. An update to the tool is planned for the near future.

<sup>82</sup> Industries : manufacturing baked products and pastas ; Manufacture of structural metal products; Manufacture of other fabricated metal products .

<sup>83</sup> Others: Other personal services; Others - unknown sector of activity - not specified.



Table 3.2.6: Total number of smuggled persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>84</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of <u>smuggled</u> persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI											
Montenegro												
Serbia												
Albania												
Bosnia and Herzegovina												
Moldova												
Georgia												
Ukraine												
Total												
Total number of <u>smuggled</u> persons from third countries (final court rulings) <sup>85</sup>												

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:

The number of victims by nationality is not recorded (see table 3.2.6. bis).

<sup>84</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>85</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of smuggled persons from third countries.

Table 3.2.6bis: total number of networks dismantled by nationality of trafficking victims (including human trafficking)

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of networks dismantled	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	2	2	1	1	NI	NI	
Montenegro	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	1	
Serbia	NI	NI	1	NI	1	1	1	NI	NI	1	1	
Albania	NI	1	3	2	3	6	9	8	9	5	16	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	NI	NI	NI	2	NI	NI	1	1	NI	4	1	
Moldova	NI	NI	NI	2	NI	NI	1	2	1	1	2	
Georgia	NI	NI	NI	NI	1	NI	2	1	NI	NI	NI	
Ukraine	NI	1	1	NI	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>N/A</b>											

Source: DGPN / DAV et DCPAF / Ucoltem, Ministry of the Interior.

The networks with the main nationality of the victims are recorded.

The total per year has not been completed as sometimes a network benefits several nationalities, and it would not be a good indicator.

Table 3.2.7: Total number of trafficked persons from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>86</sup>

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
	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
<b>FYROM</b>	NI											
Montenegro												
Serbia												
Albania												
Bosnia and Herzegovina												
Moldova												
Georgia												
Ukraine												
<b>Total</b>	NI											
<b>Total number of <u>trafficked</u> persons from third countries (final court rulings)<sup>87</sup></b>										386	266	Sexual Exploitation
										6 victims of forced labour 8 victims of slavery 88 victims of exploitation for begging	8 victims of forced labour / 12 victims of slavery / 137 victims of exploitation for begging	Labour Exploitation

<sup>86</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>87</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of trafficked persons from third countries.

*Source: OCRTEH / OLCTI, Annual EMN reports (number of victims identified in affairs for which the qualification of human trafficking has been retained and not the total number of victims of sexual exploitation or exploitation by work for the year under consideration), Ministry of the Interior.*

Table 3.2.7 bis: Total number of trafficked persons from the visa-free countries (residence permits issued)

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of residence permits issued to <u>trafficked</u> persons from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
FYROM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Resident permits issued at 31 December of each year.
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Serbia	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	4	
Albania	0	0	1	1	4	3	6	10	11	11	14	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	0	0	4	3	2	5	5	4	4	2	4	
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Ukraine	0	1	1	4	3	4	2	1	2	1	2	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>26</b>	
<b>Total number of residence permits issued to <u>trafficked</u> persons from third countries</b>	0	19	91	145	152	186	204	254	264	317	377	

Source: DVSA – DSED, DGEF, Ministry of the Interior.

This data includes resident permits issued to vulnerable people admitted for stay as victims of human trafficking or pimping. Two types of resident permit are issued:

- a temporary one-year "private and family life" resident permit is issued to the foreign national that has lodged a complaint against a person accused of having committed against him/her the infractions listed in articles 225-4-1 to 225-4-6 and 225-5 to 225-10 of the Criminal Code or who testifies in a criminal proceedings against a person accused of these infractions, and who has severed all relations with the people suspected of these criminal infractions. This resident permit is renewed for the duration of the proceedings.
- A ten-year resident permit is issued to the victim that has lodged a complaint or testified in the event that the person involved is finally convicted.

Table 3.2.8: Total number of identified facilitators<sup>88</sup> of unauthorised entry, transit and residence<sup>89</sup> from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)<sup>90</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence from the visa-free countries (final court rulings)	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NI	The data opposite presents the number of final convictions pronounced by the French criminal jurisdiction for aiding the entry, circulation or irregular stay of a foreign national in France. These infractions are stipulated in articles L.622-1 and L.622-5 of the CESEDA.
Montenegro	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NI	
Serbia	2	3	7	1	2	0	3	1	3	1	NI	
Albania	4	5	6	11	3	19	12	24	27	25	NI	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	NI	
Moldova	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	1	4	4	NI	
Georgia	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	NI	
Ukraine	6	1	0	5	1	0	1	1	3	2	NI	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>33</b>	NI	
Total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence (final court rulings) <sup>91</sup>	1,098	1,487	1,367	1,376	1,361	1,148	1,052	1,082	1,058	1,084	NI	
EU national 1 France	263	397	341	280	310	251	232	250	231	226	NI	

<sup>88</sup> This refer to the nationality of the facilitators. EU nationalities can be provided in the second part of the table.

<sup>89</sup> Facilitators of the unauthorised entry, transit and residence - intentionally assisting a person who is not a national of an EU Member State either to enter or transit across the territory of a Member State in breach of laws on the entry or transit of aliens, or, for financial gain, intentionally assisting them to reside within the territory of a Member State in breach of the laws of the State concerned on the residence of aliens (see Article 1(1)(a) and (b) of Council Directive 2002/90/EC).

<sup>90</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities.

<sup>91</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of identified facilitators of unauthorised entry, transit and residence.

EU national 2 Roumania	22	13	7	11	29	54	43	51	78	102	NI	
EU national 3 UK	9	23	33	22	30	30	29	39	72	71	NI	
EU national 4 Poland	3	6	7	15	16	16	26	27	44	32	NI	
EU national 5 Italy	16	23	9	7	7	21	9	22	28	35	NI	
EU national 6 Lithuania	13	7	3	9	11	5	9	14	27	26	NI	

*Source: Ministry of Justice, DACG, National Criminal Records (Casier Judiciaire national), DACG-PEPP, provisional 2016 data.*

2017 data from the National Criminal Records will only be available in Autumn 2018.



Table 3.2.9: Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries<sup>92</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or <u>at least</u> 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of nationals found to be illegally present from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
FYROM	183	169	103	120	175	145	176	175	137	99	127	The data provided is for irregularly staying foreign nationals: this includes irregular entry, stay, irregular remaining and exit from the territory - whatever the final outcome.
Montenegro	29	97	98	92	102	100	173	201	122	93	81	
Serbia	361	915	648	508	550	511	488	503	521	371	381	
Albania	988	960	716	649	1 687	2 056	3 598	5 451	5 677	4 637	5 094	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	346	299	204	291	156	157	234	292	224	156	212	
Moldova	715	530	330	355	419	980	644	575	435	410	610	
Georgia	548	487	540	616	527	758	880	907	834	617	911	
Ukraine	591	538	445	392	481	424	429	564	948	626	670	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,761</b>	<b>3,995</b>	<b>3,084</b>	<b>3,023</b>	<b>4,097</b>	<b>5,131</b>	<b>6,622</b>	<b>8,668</b>	<b>8,898</b>	<b>7,009</b>	<b>8,086</b>	
<b>Total number of third-country nationals found to be illegally present<sup>93</sup></b>	<b>95,687</b>	<b>101,286</b>	<b>89,637</b>	<b>80,004</b>	<b>85,597</b>	<b>73,457</b>	<b>75,912</b>	<b>102,594</b>	<b>115,620</b>	<b>97,143</b>	<b>119,727</b>	

Source: DCPAF, Ministry of the Interior.

<sup>92</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre].

<sup>93</sup> 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 countries<sup>94</sup>

Indicator	Period of interest (2007-2017)											Additional information
	<i>(insert all available data or at least 2 years prior and after the visa waiver agreement date)</i>											
Total number of overstayers from the visa-free countries	2007	2008	*2009	*2010	2011	2012	2013	*2014	2015	2016	*2017	
<b>FYROM</b>	NI											
<b>Montenegro</b>												
<b>Serbia</b>												
<b>Albania</b>												
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>												
<b>Moldova</b>												
<b>Georgia</b>												
<b>Ukraine</b>												
<b>Total</b>												
<b>Total number of third-country nationals overstayers<sup>95</sup></b>												

France does not currently have a tool to record the number of third-country nationals that remain in the French territory beyond the expiry date of their travel documents or resident permits (overstayers).

<sup>94</sup> Information to be provided by inserting national data as gathered by competent authorities. Also see Eurostat: Third-country nationals found to be illegally present - annual data (rounded) [migr\_eipre].

<sup>95</sup> All nationalities apply, to calculate the proportion out of the total number of third-country national overstayers.

## SECTION 4: MEASURES PUT IN PLACE TO DEAL WITH POSSIBLE MISUSE OF VISA-FREE REGIMES BY (MEMBER) STATES

### DESCRIPTION OF THE 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**.

#### ***Reinforcement of cooperation with the third countries of origin and transit to manage return and reinsertion***

Regular meetings are organised with the consular authorities of certain third countries with which consular cooperation difficulties have been noted. More specifically, and in order to ensure monitoring of the suspension mechanism with regard to the visa liberalisation regime ("emergency brake").

As indicated previously, a dialogue has been put in place with the Albanian and Georgian authorities:

Relations with the Albanian authorities were particularly nurtured in 2017 (visit by the French Minister of the Interior in March and December 2017; visit by the Albanian Foreign Affairs Minister in July 2017), and were accompanied by resolute actions to fight against irregular migration from that country: accelerated processing of asylum applications by redeploying OFPRA resources; increase in police services activity and increase in the number of irregular migration networks dismantled; increase in controls when leaving the territory by the Albanian authorities (action plan launched at the end of July 2017); increased technical cooperation, with the decision to deploy Albanian liaison officers in France for the beginning of 2018.

Cooperation between France and Georgia was strengthened by an action plan to fight against irregular migration from Georgia, additional measures and a bilateral interior security agreement (see Q 2.2.1.).

**A monthly statistical monitoring system for the different criteria defined as part of the revised safeguard mechanism** was also implemented by the French authorities, in order to closely monitor all negative changes likely to lead to a notification to the European Commission.

The criteria subject to monitoring are those defined by the Regulation 2017-371 of 1 March 2017 amending the mechanism to suspend visa liberalisation for a beneficiary country. These criteria are:

- **a substantial increase in the number of nationals of that third country** refused entry or found to be staying in the Member State's territory without a right;
- **a substantial increase in the number of asylum applications** from the nationals of that third country for which the recognition rate is low (3-4 %);
- **a decrease in cooperation on readmission** with that third country, substantiated by adequate data, in particular a substantial increase in the refusal rate of readmission applications submitted by the Member State to that third country for its own nationals or, where a readmission agreement concluded between the Union or that Member State and that third country so provides, for third-country nationals having transited through that third country;
- **an increased risk or imminent threat to the public policy or internal security of Member States**, in particular a substantial increase in serious criminal offences, related to

nationals of that third country.

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

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

***Prevention of irregular migration from third countries:***

**Reinforcement of political and operational dialogue with Albania:** following alerts by the French authorities on the continuous influx of Albanian nationals to the national territory, in August 2017, the Albanian authorities launched a plan to better control departures from Albania. Contact at ministerial level in December 2017 confirmed the desire to reinforce cooperation on the fight against irregular migration. In 2018, Albanian liaison officers were deployed in the zones which are most affected by Albanian irregular migration (Lyon and Metz areas). Two Albanian police officers specialising in dismantling immigration networks were received at the Central Office for the Repression of Irregular Immigration and Employment of Foreign Nationals (OCRIEST) at the beginning of 2018. The Albanian services are currently appointing them in collaboration with the Directorate for International Cooperation (DCI). With regard to the fight against documentary fraud, a five-day assessment mission was carried out mid-December 2017 by an expert from the central office of the DCPAF (DEFDI). It aimed to assess the structures in place in order to create a centralised processing system for information on documentary fraud. An exploratory mission by an Albanian delegation was also organised in November 2017. It involved meetings with the territorial services of the Zonal Directorate of the Border Police (DZPAF South-East, East and North) as well as the Departmental Directorate for Public Security (DDSP), the Interregional Directorate of the Judicial Police (DIPJ) and the Prefectoral cabinets. The installation project for the Albanian liaison officers on the national territory was discussed, with three assigned to the General Directorate of the National Police (DGPN) and one for the General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie (DGGN). Two will be assigned to the DCPAF, where they will be positioned with the decentralised services in Metz and Lyon, where the Albanian migratory pressure is the strongest. One will go to the Sub-Directorate for the fight against organised criminality and financial delinquency (SDLCODF), the Central Directorate of the Judicial Police (DCPJ) - this sub-directorate coordinates the central officers, notably those competent in terms of drug, human and arms trafficking. The General Directorate of the National Gendarmerie (DGGN) asked to receive an Albanian liaison officer, who was placed with the Central Office for the Fight against itinerant crime (OCLDI) and made available to the intelligence services if required, for cases relating to serial theft committed by itinerant Albanian criminal groups. France also contributed to the consulting mission on border controls carried out by Frontex in November 2017 with the Albanian authorities.

Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

See Q.4.1.

**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.

A general promotion policy towards all countries has been in place for two years, with the renewal of communication tools, and local promotions by the territorial directorates of the OFII, notably in dedicated accommodation and as part of the mechanisms to prepare return aid. Returns were carried out on chartered flights to Albania in 2017 and 2018 (departures from Lyon and Strasbourg). These chartered flights were organised by OFII. In 2017, 1,555 Albanian nationals accepted voluntary return aid (ARV) of €300 offered to return to their country. This represented almost a four-fold increase compared to 2016 which had recorded 419 aided returns.

**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.

No

**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.

No

**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.

No

**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.

See Albania Action Plan and cooperation with Georgia (Q2.2.1.).

**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.

See above: Albania Action Plan implemented since 2017 and in parallel, measures taken by Tirana.

**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.

We need to remain cautious in the absence of sufficient perspective with regard to the Albanian Action Plan and its first encouraging results (notably on departure prevention). A more complete report should be made at the end of 2018.

**Q4.2.** Did your (Member) State implement measures to deal with administrative burdens since the introduction of the visa-free regime?<sup>96</sup> If yes, please list and explain these measures, their impact / effectiveness and add any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

Specifically, measures have been taken at the OFPRA, with a reinforced headcount once again in 2017, to prioritise the examination of Albanian applications. Thus, as soon as the application is filed, the applicants are summoned rapidly for a hearing, the examination of these requests is "pooled" (protection officers from all geographical divisions are called on to process them), and suitable processing has been put in place to simplify the examination. The assessment capacity for these applications is now 1,000/2,000 files per month, the stock has been absorbed and the target of a regulatory processing time of 15 days (undermined by the increase in asylum applications in France) may be progressively achieved, by anticipating summons and other acceleration measures.

**Q4.3.** Did your (Member) State implement measures to deal with the possible misuse of visa liberalisation?<sup>97</sup> If yes, please list and explain these measures, their impact / effectiveness and add any good practices / lessons learned you have identified.

See Q4.1.

**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?

France has not implemented specific measures on this item for the nationals targeted by this study.

**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.

France has not implemented specific measures for the removal procedure of the nationals targeted by this study.

**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.

France has not implemented specific measures for the nationals targeted by this study.

---

<sup>96</sup> For example: significant increase of residence permit applications, increased demand for work permits, more time-consuming border control procedure due to the lack of visas. etc.

<sup>97</sup> For example, dealing with cases when persons enter the country legally but later become illegally employed, are staying in the country legally, but are working without a work permit or apply for asylum without reasonable grounds.

**Q4.4.3** 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?<sup>98</sup> Please provide a short description and specific examples of your national situation disaggregated by region and third countries of interest.

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

See Q2.2.1. 4.1., 4.1.1.

Eastern Partnership – Moldova, Georgia, Ukraine:

See Q2.2.1. 4.1., 4.1.1.

**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?

The implication of the central Albanian authorities, who have responded to the French Action Plan with their own, constitutes without a doubt a cooperation model to follow. However, Albania is a candidate for EU membership, which is not a situation transposable to other countries.

**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.<sup>99</sup>

The measures taken by France to respond to an influx of asylum seekers from visa-waiver countries, and particularly Albania since 2016-2017, come under the framework of and compliance with applicable European standards in terms of asylum resulting notably from the Directive 2013/32/EU ("procedures") and the Directive 2013/33/EU ("reception").

In this respect, full use has been made of the accelerated examination procedure for these applications, provided by the law and made possible by the entry of these countries onto the national list of "safe countries of origin".

Specifically, measures have been taken at the OFPRA, which once again reinforced its headcount

<sup>98</sup> For example, in terms of information campaigns in the third countries working on the elimination of 'push factors' – unemployment, poverty, poor conditions in the national health system, assistance to visa-free countries from Member States and reintegration assistance to returnees.

<sup>99</sup> For example, using the concept of safe country of origin.

in 2017, to prioritise the examination of Albanian applications (see Q4.2.).

Since 2013, the OFPRA has organised processing missions in the regions in response to requests from the public authorities as well as certain local associations. These missions show the Office's desire to reduce processing times and, in particular, to meet the concentration of asylum applications filed by nationals of the Western Balkans in certain regions of France, such as Lyon and Metz. The mobile missions also avoid requiring certain vulnerable people to travel to the OFPRA's head office in Fontenay-sous-Bois.

From around three missions each year between 2013 and 2015, the OFPRA's missions to process protection applications from Western Balkan nationals in the regions increased to eight in 2016 then 18 in 2017, in up to six different cities.

Similarly, a specific effort has been made to ensure rapid decision making for requirements to leave France, following asylum application rejections. More specifically, whenever possible, asylum applications and applications for resident permits for another reason (sick foreign nationals) are examined in parallel to accelerate processing times.

Given the significant increase in Georgian demands since mid-2017, it has been agreed that the OFPRA should prioritise processing of these applications, along the same model as that for Albanian applications. Mobile missions have also been organised (Strasbourg in May 2018 and Bordeaux in June 2018).

**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.

The measures taken by the French authorities indicated above have contributed to better management of the influx of asylum seekers from visa-waiver countries and to containing the increase in demands.

It is interesting to look specifically at Albanian demands. Over the first five months of 2018, 2,560 requests were made, i.e. a 38% increase compared to the same period in 2017. Albanian demands remain at a high level, in second place for applications in France, although in most cases, the request does not result from a need for protection. These applications clog up the asylum system and weigh heavily on the reception and accommodation system, to the detriment of people in real need of protection.

Thus, the measures taken to manage the flow of asylum applications, which require a sustained effort by authorities, may partly limit the impact of liberalisation, although they are not sufficient to completely counter it.

**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.

N/A

**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.



The OFPRA benefited from European financing through the European Refugee Fund (ERF) to organise an information collection mission in Albania in 2013.

The costs relating to the increase in interpreting needs in Balkan and Caucasian languages were co-financed by the EU as part of a FAMI project prepared in 2014 for a duration of three years.

**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?<sup>100</sup>

NI

---

<sup>100</sup> For example, in relation to Ukraine or Georgia for which the visa waiver agreement entered into force in 2017.

## SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

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

This study which aims at analysing the **impact of visa liberalisation in France over the period 2007-2017** considers France's policies and practices following changes in migration flows generated by visa waiver agreements in the Western Balkan and Eastern Partnership countries.

The information provided by quantitative and qualitative data shows that the visa liberalization impacts particularly asylum applications and irregular migration.

After an **increase in asylum applications in some Western Balkan countries** during the two years after the start of the visa waiver agreement, it was noted a trend towards stagnation or a downward trend until 2015-2016, and then a new increase as from 2016.

Regarding irregular migration, **Albania, one of the countries of origin where a large part of irregular migrants** comes from, is a major challenge.

For Eastern Partnership countries, it is difficult to analyse asylum data from **Georgia and Ukraine** since the visa waiver agreement came into force only in 2017. However we can notice an **increased migratory pressure** from these two countries. That's why France remains particularly vigilant with regard to the evolution of indicators set by the visa liberalisation suspension clause.

Not many residence permits for economic or family migration are issued to nationals of these eight countries. However **student migration** is more important especially in Serbia, Albania, Ukraine and Georgia, countries with which France has been developing a **policy to support French language and to attract students. Trade is quite modest** since these countries trade traditionally with other European countries. However France has established a significant **cultural, scientific and technical cooperation** with these countries for several years.

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

**Main challenges** identified after the visa liberalization are increased asylum applications from Albania and Georgia, as well as a strong irregular migration pressure from both countries.

In order to tackle these challenges, France has **reinforced its political and operational cooperation** with the consular authorities of these countries and implemented an **action plan (with Albania in 2017 and Georgia in 2018) in order to fight against irregular migration.**

From its part, the French Office for Immigration and Integration (OFII) has led a **reinforced promotion policy for voluntary return process.** The OFPRA has been organizing **processing missions in the regions where the asylum pressure is the highest** (especially regarding Albania) and has reinforced its staff in order to give priority to asylum applications from nationals of this safe country of origin.

The first feedback regarding the action plans is quite positive and encouraging, like the cooperation with the authorities of these countries. However because of its recent implementation, it is too early to draw definite conclusions.

## **ANNEXES**

### **ANNEX 1: LIST OF INTERVIEWS CARRIED OUT OR PEOPLE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE STUDY**

*The interviews and questionnaires were carried out between May and July 2018 by Christelle Caporali-Petit (Coordinator of the French National Contact Point of the EMN), Tamara Buschek-Chauvel, Anne-Cécile Jarasse (policy officers at the French National Contact Point of the EMN) and Vincent Maubant (intern at the EMN).*

#### **List of interviews carried out:**

### **Ministry of the Interior, General Directorate for Foreign Nationals in France - DGEF**

#### **Asylum Directorate - DA**

- Frédérique DOUBLET, Head of Department for the right to asylum and protection (*Chef du département du droit d'asile et de la protection*)
- Sophie CHABRIDON, Assistant Head of Section (*Adjointe au chef de section*) - National Law, Law and Asylum Procedures Section, Department for the right to asylum and protection

#### **Immigration Directorate – DIMM**

- Patricia LARROUY, Policy Officer reporting to the Assistant Director for the fight against irregular immigration
- Estelle MULOT, Head of Section on the fight against identity fraud, Office for the fight against illegal work and identity fraud (BLTFI), Sub-directorate for the fight against irregular immigration

#### **Department for Statistics, Studies and Documentation - DSED**

- Thierry PATRON, Head of the Division for the development of administrative sources (DVSA)
- Samia GUESMI, Research Officer, DVSA
- Philippe LAURAIRE, Research Officer, DVSA
- Éric PECOUL, Database administrator, DVSA

### **Ministry of the Interior, General Directorate for the National Police – DGPN**

#### **Central Directorate of the French Border Police – DCPAF**

- Philippe RENAUD, General Staff, Cabinet of the Central Director of the Border Police

- Roger BALIMA, General Staff, Cabinet of the Central Director of the Border Police

#### **Delegation for Victims – DAV**

- Sylvie VIOLAS, Police Major, Cabinet of the Central Director of the National Police

#### **French Office for Immigration and Integration – OFII**

- Ingrid NORMAND, Director for immigration, return, reinsertion and international affairs

#### **French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons – OFPRA**

- Rachel MORIN, Head of mission for European and International Affairs

#### **Ministry of Justice, Directorate of Criminal Matters and Pardons (DACG)**

- Morgane BAUDIN, Magistrate, Assistant to the Head of the Criminal Policy Assessment Division

#### **Labour Ministry, General Employment Directorate (DGT)**

- Jean-Henri PYRONNET, Director of the project to fight against illegal work (LTI)

## 1. Texts, reports and studies

- Ministry of the Interior, DGEF, Report to Parliament on the 2016 data, p.78, <https://www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/content/download/110133/878313/file/Rapport-DGEF-2017-web.pdf>
- OFPRA, 2007 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2007.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2007.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2008 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2008.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2008.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2009 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2009.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2009.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2010 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2010.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2010.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2011 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2011.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2011.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2012 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2012\\_0.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2012_0.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2013 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2013.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2013.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2014 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_2014.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_2014.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2015 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_ofpra\\_2015\\_hd.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_ofpra_2015_hd.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2016 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport\\_dactivite\\_ofpra\\_2016\\_1.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/rapport_dactivite_ofpra_2016_1.pdf)
- OFPRA, 2017 Activity Report, [https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/ra\\_ofpra2017\\_web\\_0604.pdf](https://ofpra.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/atoms/files/ra_ofpra2017_web_0604.pdf)
- Directorate-General for Competitiveness of Industry and Services (*Direction générale de la compétitive de l'industrie et des services* - DGCIS) which became Directorate-General for Enterprise (*Direction Générale des Entreprises* - DGE) on 15 September 2014, Review of Tourism in 2012 (*Bilan du tourisme en 2012*), [https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions\\_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/bilans/2013-07-bilan-tourisme2012.pdf](https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/stats-tourisme/bilans/2013-07-bilan-tourisme2012.pdf)

- OECD, 2018 Tourism Trends and Policies, <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/tourism/2018-Tourism-Trends-Policies-Highlights-FR.pdf>
- DGE, *Les 4 pages de la DGE*, 87 million foreign tourists in France in 2017, N°84 June 2018, [https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions\\_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2018-07-4p-N84-EVE.pdf](https://www.entreprises.gouv.fr/files/files/directions_services/etudes-et-statistiques/4p-DGE/2018-07-4p-N84-EVE.pdf)

## 2. French Legislation

- **Codes**

- Code on Entry and Residence of Foreign Nationals and Right of Asylum (*Code de l'entrée et du séjour des étrangers et du droit d'asile*), <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006070158>

- **Laws**

- Law no. 2015-925 of 29 July 2015 on the reform of the right of asylum, <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/loi/2015/7/29/INTX1412525L/jo>