



# **MEETING OF THE NETWORK OF MISEP CORRESPONDENTS**

**Prague Congress Centre, Prague, Czech Republic**

**Migration of workers within the EU and from Third  
Countries – trends and successful policy approaches**

**5<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> March 2009**

**MEETING REPORT**



## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>KEY EU INITIATIVES REGARDING MIGRATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>MAIN MIGRATION TRENDS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Introduction.....	4
3.2	Intra-EU migration .....	5
3.3	Third country migration .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>RECENT TRENDS IN MIGRATION POLICY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	General trends .....	8
4.2	Tackling undeclared work by migrants without work permit .....	9
4.3	Tackling brain drain.....	10
<b>5</b>	<b>MAIN POLICY CHALLENGES AND POLICY LESSONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>



# 1 INTRODUCTION

A meeting of the MISEP network took place on 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2009 at the Prague Congress Centre, Prague, Czech Republic, focussing on successful policy approaches regarding the migration of workers within the EU and from Third Countries.

Four key themes were at the heart of the discussion:

- Trends and approaches to intra-EU migration (describing trends in intra-EU migration, its impact at national and regional level and policy approaches for example in relation to transition regimes; the role of EURES in encouraging greater intra-EU migration; pull and push factors for migration and the motivation of migrants; and the impact of the economic slow-down on intra-EU migration).
- Trends in migration from third countries and policies to manage such migration. The impact of EU enlargement and the global economic slowdown on third country migration.
- Tackling illegal migration and undeclared work (describing trends and measures aimed at dealing with clandestine work carried out by illegal migrants).
- Successful approaches to dealing with brain drain (trends in migration of tertiary qualified workers; measures to prevent the negative impact of brain drain, such as policies to encourage the return of skilled workers).

This report summarises background information and the presentations and discussions at the MISEP meeting under the following headings:

- Key EU initiatives regarding migration;
- Main migration trends (intra-EU and third country);
- Recent key trends in migration policy; including tackling undeclared work by migrants without work permits, tackling brain drain and assisting the integration of migrants; and
- Main policy challenges and policy lessons.

Background information prepared for this meeting and copies of overhead slides used by the speakers can be found on the EEO website.

[http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/en/documents/doc04\\_01.aspx?year=2009](http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/en/documents/doc04_01.aspx?year=2009)

Readers should also refer to the Czech EU Presidency website:

<http://www.eu2009.cz>

***Additional related documents and activities include:***

- The EEO Spring 2007 Review on Undeclared Work, available at:

<http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/resources/reviews/EN-ReviewSpring07.pdf>



- MISEP Meeting, May2007, Mainz, Germany. Theme: Enhancing Labour Market Integration of Migrants. Report available at:  
<http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/resources/meetings/MISEPMtgRpt-Germany07-FINAL-EN-2.pdf>
- MISEP Meeting, November 2006, Hämeenlinna, Finland. Theme: Labour Mobility. Report available at:  
<http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/resources/meetings/MISEPFinland-Nov06-MtgReport-EN.pdf>
- Mutual Learning Programme Thematic Review Seminar. Theme: Improving access to the labour market for people at its margins, with a special focus on people with a migrant or minorities background, Brussels, 29 April 2008. Report available at:  
<http://www.mutual-learning-employment.net/thematicreviews/>
- Mutual Learning Programme Peer Review Meeting. Theme: The assistance system for employment of Ukrainians in the Czech Republic.  
<http://www.mutual-learning-employment.net/peerreviews/czechrepublic/index.html>
- Mutual Learning Programme Peer Review Meeting. Theme: Management of economic migration, to be held, 11th and 12th of June 2009, Tallinn, Estonia.



## 2 KEY EU INITIATIVES REGARDING MIGRATION

Free movement of labour is one of the fundamental freedoms provided by the European Union in its Treaties. Unlike with former enlargements of the EU (for example with the entry of Spain and Portugal into the European Communities), where some significant flow of workers had already pre-dated accession, this was not the case with the Union's eastern enlargement in 2004. **Timo Baas** (IAB, Germany) reminded participants that the movement of individuals from the countries of the former Eastern bloc had previously been restricted by the Iron Curtain. As a result of this, as well as the significant differences in the economic situation and standard of living between East and West, there were concerns among many EU-15 Member States that enlargement would lead to large flows of migrants from the EU-8 (without Malta and Cyprus) and subsequently from the EU-2. This led to the adoption of various transition arrangements in different Member States, restricting access to the labour market for workers from Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Hungary in most Member States for a number of years. Only Ireland, the UK and Sweden immediately opened up their labour markets to workers from the EU-8 in 2004.

All transition arrangements for these countries have to come to an end in 2009, unless Member States can show that they expect significant labour market imbalances resulting from the full opening of their labour markets. Only Denmark, Germany and Austria are seeking to make use of further transition arrangements for the EU-8 post 2009. The situation is different for workers from Romania and Bulgaria, for whom restrictions remain in place in 15 countries. These are due to be lifted by 2011, unless evidence of likely significant labour market distortions can be presented.

In relation to third country migrants, the EU is pursuing a policy of managed labour migration based on two core policy strands: measures to deal with illegal migration, and measures to facilitate access to the EU labour market for migrants with skills required on Member States' labour markets (in particular, highly skilled migrants).

In September 2008, EU Ministers signed a European Pact on Immigration and Asylum. The Pact sets out principles for managing migration, fighting illegal migration and setting up partnerships with key sending or transit countries. It also seeks to improve border controls and building improved asylum policy arrangements.

Legislation adopted with deterrent effect for illegal economic migrants and their employers include Directive 2008/115/EC which sets out common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third country nationals and a Directive on Sanctions against Employers of illegally staying Third Country migrants (COM(2007)0249) which was approved by the European Parliament in February 2009.

Speaking on behalf of the European Commission at the MISEP meeting, **Egbert Holthuis** (DG EMPL) also pointed to a number of draft Directives aimed at facilitating access to third country workers whose skills are in particular demand on the EU labour market, including a 'Blue card' scheme for highly skilled workers, a draft Directive on establishing a single application procedure for residence and work permits and a common set of rights for third country workers legally residing in a Member State. In addition, the Commission plans to bring forward measure easing access to specific groups of migrants such as seasonal workers.



## 3 MAIN MIGRATION TRENDS

### 3.1 Introduction

Migrants into the EU are mainly active in sectors with significant labour or skill shortages. Prior to the economic downturn, these sectors included in particular ICT, agriculture, horticulture, construction, hotels and catering, domestic services, transport, retail, health and social care. Shortage sectors vary from country to country, as do trends in migration flows, which often follow historically established routes. As pointed out by **JUDr. Ladislava Steinichova** in her keynote presentation on behalf of the Czech Presidency, in the Czech Republic, the main migration flows have been to meet labour shortages in science and engineering and in the car industry in particular, followed by the construction sector. The Czech Republic, in 2008, the majority of migrants came from Slovakia and the Ukraine.

The economic crisis is beginning to change the position in most Member States, largely because some of the sectors most affected by the slowdown are those in which migrants are most active.

On the whole, reliable and comparable data regarding the impact of the economic downturn are not yet available. However, the background material provided by the MISEP correspondents (<http://www.eu-employment-observatory.net/>) provides a first tentative picture of the early effects on migrants in particular. As highlighted in the presentation by **Timo Baas**, migration is generally considered to act as a 'shock absorber' for asymmetric economic crises. However, as the current downturn is of a global (or symmetric) nature, this is less likely to be the case. It was argued that if indeed anyone was benefitting from the mediating effect of migration flows in this situation, it would be the EU-15. Return flows of migrants from the EU-8+2 to their own countries, where the economic situation is in many cases also deteriorating, poses more serious concerns for these countries than for the Western European economies.

The MISEP background information for this meeting shows some evidence of a return flow of migrants from West to East (e.g. from Spain and Italy back to Bulgaria and Romania; from the UK back to Poland, etc.), as well as a movement of EU-8 migrants away from countries in the EU-15 more seriously affected by the crisis to others where the recession is yet to bite on the same way (e.g. from the UK and Ireland to the Netherlands).

Similarly, early indications are emerging of the policy measures being taken to manage migration in times of economic crisis. A number of countries have reduced quotas and the number of work permits issued, whereas others have changed the sectors and occupations which appear in their lists of 'hard to fill occupations'. Such examples include:

- Spain has changed its catalogue of hard to fill occupations as well as introducing a 90 % reduction in the quota for third country workers for 2009. The severity of the country's economic difficulties is also mirrored in the introduction of a 'voluntary return programme' which pays unemployed migrants returning to their home country 40 % of the unemployment benefit in Spain and the remaining 60 % when they reach their home country (with a clause of undertaking of non-return for a set period of time).
- Lithuania has seen at 13 % reduction in the number of work permits issued in the second half of 2008 alone.



- Slovenia has reduced its quota for third country migrants by 25 % in 2009.
- The UK has gathered anecdotal evidence of a return flow of workers from the financial services sector to 'old Commonwealth countries'.
- In Turkey one of signs of a worsening economic situation is the increase in workers in agriculture and family businesses.
- Norway and Iceland have also witnessed a significant reduction in the number of work permits issued.
- In the Czech Republic, there has been a decline of 8000 foreign workers since the start of the crisis and labour market service statistics indicate that a further 4000 foreign migrants are likely to be affected by redundancy by the end of March 2009.

The nature of the sectors affected and the types of measures being implemented in response make it likely that the economic downturn will have a more significant impact on third country migrants, particularly those in precarious employment situations. The question being raised is whether this will lead to greater return flows or an increase in illegality and undeclared work.

### 3.2 Intra-EU migration

The most important feature of intra-EU migration is that movement between Member States remains modest despite enlargement. Between the years 2003-2007 the average population share of EU-10 nationals in the EU-15 increased from 0.2-0.5 % and the share of EU-15 nationals in the EU-15 rose from 1.6-1.7 %. At the same time, the share of third country nationals in the EU increased from 3.7-4.5 % demonstrating that third country migration still provides the main feature of migration flows in the EU.

However, this does not mean that intra-EU movements have been inconsiderable. Nearly one million individuals from the EU-8 and 900 000 individuals from Romania and Bulgaria moved to the EU-15 in a relatively short space of time. The UK, Ireland, Spain, Italy and to some extent Germany and Austria have been the main destination countries. The impact of migration is also more strongly felt in particular localities, where such population movements are having an impact in particular on public services (schools, social services etc.).

The impact is also not inconsiderable for the main sending countries, where emigration has led to brain drain and skill shortages in some areas and sectors, leading variously to wage rises or the need to recruit workers from other EU countries or from outside the EU.

Research presented by **Timo Baas** has shown that the overall impact of migration on the GDP of receiving countries has been positive. Although there has been some short term negative impact on unemployment and wage developments (particularly among the lower skilled occupations), the long term impact of migration here has been positive. However, there is also evidence that 'brain waste' remains an issue with many migrants working in occupations below their level of skills and qualifications.

In terms of the nature of the individuals migrating intra-EU, evidence presented by **Egbert Holthuis** and **Timo Baas** indicated that migrants tend to be young (average age of 29, although the age structure depends on the sending and receiving country). Levels of unemployment - in particularly youth unemployment - and wage differentials provide significant push and pull factors, most particularly in border regions. In most EU countries, the number of male immigrants is higher than the number of female immigrants (with the



exception of Italy, Poland, France, Belgium, Malta, Portugal and Cyprus). Female migrants tend to be younger than male migrants.

### 3.3 Third country migration

As indicated above, third country migration remains the dominant trend in most EU Member States, although there are very different experiences from country to country depending on language, cultural and economic factors as well as historical migration flows. Third country migration has seen a three-fold increase between the years 1995-2005.

A change can be noted in the make-up of the key sending countries with an increasing number of migrants from Central and South America entering the European Union - in particular the southern Member States of the EU.

On the whole, third country migration is also considered to have a positive economic impact on the receiving countries. Research from the World Bank, presented by **Misha Bonch-Osmoloviski**, contends that there is no evidence to support the populist assumption that migrants pay less tax and consume more benefits than the native born population. Indeed, the research finds them to be net contributors to the tax and benefit system. Data collected by the World Bank show that in the 13 EU countries covered by the research, the gross earned income by households is higher in households with migrants than in households without migrants. It was pointed out that the data sets used are likely to only take into account first generation migrants, which can be an issue as second generation migrants often face significant integration problems. Within the figures provided by the World Bank, the amount of taxes paid by households with migrants is higher and the level of benefits received by households with migrants is lower. This may be influenced by the fact that first generation migrant households in the sample may not have reached pensionable age and, if they originate from outside the EU, may not have access to certain benefits. The only types of household which consumes greater benefits than it pays taxes are households with citizens born in other EU countries.

Evidence also indicates that third country migrants tend to have complementary skills to those offered by EU citizens and enter sectors where demand is greatest and the supply of national born labour may be limited (the extent to which this may be linked to salaries and working conditions was not explored in significant detail). Some crowding out of national workers was found in the lower skilled sectors.

As with intra-EU migrants, there was also significant evidence of 'brain waste' among third country migrants for whom it is often even more difficult to have their qualifications recognised and to find work in occupations which matched their educational qualifications.

A presentation by **Ummuhan Bardak** of research by the European Training Foundation showed the significant variations in the skill levels of migrants from different countries (also depending on their destination countries). The majority of third country migrants in this survey (covering Albania, Moldova, Egypt, Tunisia and the Ukraine) were medium or high skilled. However, almost regardless of their skill level, these migrants worked as unskilled workers in their receiving countries (with the exception of Egyptian workers, where arrangements tend to exist with countries of the Middle East on the basis of government agreements). Female migrants from the countries under study were most likely to work in the domestic service sector, even though they often held degree level qualifications.

However, this did not appear to impact on their intention or otherwise whether to migrate again once returning home, nor did it significantly impact on their perception on whether their experience abroad had provided them with valuable additional learning. Very few





received any training while living and working abroad. Where such training was provided, it largely related to language training.

Third country migrants also tend to have higher unemployment rates, are more likely to work in precarious employment relationships and are therefore more exposed in times of economic downturn.



## 4 RECENT TRENDS IN MIGRATION POLICY

### 4.1 General trends

Prior to the onset of the current economic downturn, the main trends in migration policy were three-fold, mirroring the direction of EU migration policy and the implementation of free movement policies:

- Gradual lifting of restrictions on labour migration by EU-8 nationals;
- Easing of access to highly skilled migrants; and
- Increasingly stringent sanctions and enforcement measures to tackle illegal migration and undeclared work by individuals without a valid work permit.

Over the last five years, a number of EU countries have gradually lifted their restrictions on workers from the EU-8 and, in some cases, the EU-2 countries, as initial transition arrangements come to an end.

Furthermore, many countries have introduced simplified procedures to provide access for skilled third country workers to enter 'bottleneck' occupations, strategic sectors, or to cover particular seasonal shortages. In many cases, these new arrangements are similar to the proposed EU measures on the Blue Card and the combined process for the application for work and residence permits.

Some countries have introduced salary requirements either to define the 'high skilled segment' which will qualify for eased entry conditions, or in some cases to protect national labour markets. Other countries have increased the validity of work permits or increased quotas. Some of the latter measures show signs of being reversed during times of economic downturn. It remains to be seen how migration policy in general will respond, but the intention behind managed migration systems is to be able to adapt quickly to such changes in demand. The new Swedish migration policy, presented by **Emma Wajnbloom** (MISEP, Sweden), implemented in December 2008, focuses entirely on demand driven migration, with permits granted to employers for the recruitment of specific individuals to specific vacancies only, which demonstrates a particular example of a managed demand-driven migration policy, which is also largely self-regulatory.

Another focus of migration policy at national and EU level has been on the more successful integration of migrants. Broad strands of such policies included:

- Improved and early language training;
- Better access to training and labour market integration measures;
- Improved provision for the recognition of qualifications and non-formal and informal learning;
- Improved access to social housing;
- Anti-discrimination and anti-racism measures;
- Improved cultural integration and awareness raising; and



- Improved access to services.

These and many other measures were among those presented by **Angela Costa** (MISEP, Portugal) which emphasised the strong progress in the implementation of a migrant workers integration plan.

#### 4.2 Tackling undeclared work by migrants without work permit

More than half of the background reports provided by the MISEP correspondents argued that undeclared work performed by individuals without a valid work permit was an important issue to be tackled. Many of these countries had taken some measures in recent years seeking to address a problem which is rather difficult to quantify with any degree of certainty.

The high magnitude of the issue is demonstrated in the tentative data available from initiatives such as the 'CLANDESTINO' project, some of whose results were presented by **Dušan Drbohlav** (Charles University, Prague). Its findings indicate that between 30-50 % of migrants in Western Europe are illegal and that there are between 2.8-6 million illegal workers in the EU.

Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Spain are some of the countries in which the problem is considered to be of the greatest magnitude.

There are many different push and pull factors tempting individuals into entering or remaining in a country and to work illegally (unemployment, poverty, higher wages, better working conditions, family ties, etc.) and many different ways into illegality. A significant number of illegal workers in the EU will have entered one of the countries of the Union legally, have subsequently moved to another country or overstayed their work permit. There are some concerns that the latter situation will become more prevalent during the economic crisis, also leading such workers into the underground economy.

In addition, there are a number of illegal practices such as people trafficking and smuggling, for example, the case of migrants from the Ukraine working in the Czech Republic, which was presented by **Martina Kalinova**, and which require different policy approaches.

It is clear that illegal migration and undeclared work pose risks for the individuals involved (risk of detection and deportation, lack of basic health and safety and social security protection at work, lack of pension provision etc.), their employers (risk of detection and sanction), society in the receiving country, as well as in the sending country.

**Professor Drbohlav** proposed that there have been a number of policy failures which have contributed to the rise in illegal migration and economic activity such workers, including understaffing at border controls; inflexible and bureaucratic rules leading to long waiting times for work permits, during which time many migrants begin to work to make a living; excessively restrictive third country migration policies; lack of enforcement of sanctions and a lack of action to address push factors to migrate.

The controversial suggestion that migration policies for third country migrants are too restrictive was discussed, with many countries arguing that third country migration should indeed remain marginal, with skill and labour shortages first being met by labour market and training measures for nationals, followed by recruitment of EU citizens.

**Pavel Čížinský** from the Counselling Centre for Citizenship, Civil and Human Rights, an NGO working with migrant issues in the Czech Republic, called for the greater use of decisions made on an individual basis to allow illegal migrant workers to step out of the



shadow into the regular economy and to obtain rights to access public services. Clearly, a number of countries which have in the past received a significant influx of migration (particularly in the Southern European Member States) have practiced mass regularisation in order to deal with this issue and found such measures successful in integrating migrants into society and into the regular economy. Supporters of regularisation policies also argued that detection and eviction was significantly more costly than regularisation, since the latter would allow migrant workers to contribute to the tax base of the economy.

However, other participants expressed a concern that such significant regularisation drives would create additional pull factors for future migrants.

When looking at policy measures taken to address undeclared work by illegally staying migrants, it is clear that the policy focus in recent years has been on the tightening and better implementation of sanctions against employers of - and illegal workers themselves. Such measures have also often emphasised better co-operation between different agencies (police, border control, labour inspectorates etc.). Such measures have been at the core of policy initiatives in the Czech Republic, France, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Austria and the United Kingdom.

Having said that, other flanking measures are also being employed to deal with illegal migration by specific groups, in specific sectors where illegal working is prevalent, for key sending countries of illegal migrants, and for trafficking and other illegal practices (as demonstrated by the Czech assistance system for the employment of Ukrainian migrants).

It is important to note that in the measures currently being taken maybe the least focus is being placed on addressing push factors and work with the main sending countries to improve the economic and social situation which might prevent significant migration from taking place.

### 4.3 Tackling brain drain

Migration by highly skilled or tertiary qualified workers is of particular concern in a number of countries. It is currently mostly perceived as an important policy issue in the EU-8 but also remains a concern a number of EU-15 countries which had traditionally been emigration countries in the past (e.g. Ireland).

The main occupations affected by brain drain of skilled workers to other EU and third countries are scientists and engineers, doctors, nurses, ICT specialists and construction sector specialists.

In some countries brain drain has lead to significant skill shortages, as shown in the presentation by **Rasa Malaikiene** (MISEP, Lithuania). This either results in efforts to recruit from third countries, or in wage rises to attract and retain staff. One of the issues discussed in the relevant workshop was the extent to which low salaries and poor working conditions are main motivating factors behind the exit of some highly skilled workers and whether measures can and ought to be taken to address such push factors. More generally, there was perceived to be a lack of measures working towards the improvement of conditions in the sending countries, although some Member States had set up reciprocal arrangements either providing aid to sending countries (usually countries outside the EU) or made arrangements to ensure a circular flow of workers who would then share the experienced gained abroad when they returned to their Member State. This is also the idea behind some of the initiatives in University sector presented by **Tomás Kostelecký**, such as the Fulbright scholarship programme. He also presented other 'retention' efforts in this sector providing, for example, subsidies for the participation of domestic researchers in international scientific programmes; tuition waivers for graduates who work for a certain



period of time in their home countries; and grants for foreign experts who build a laboratory in the country and work with local post-doctoral students. However, evidence shows that with many of the initiatives encouraging return, scientists did return home for the required period of time, only to leave again when their required period of stay expires. The main reasons for returning and staying in their home country were in fact personal and family reasons (rather than financial or professional motivations). The main reasons for moving abroad in the first place are generally to improve professional experience and qualifications but also to improve working conditions.

**Kevin Quinn** (MISEP, Ireland) provided another example of a circular initiative emphasising the importance of ethical recruitment and exploiting the skills of migrants workers gained abroad once they returned home.

A number of countries indicate that they have implemented programmes to encourage the return of skilled workers to their home country with measures such as the provision of information on job opportunities, working conditions and funds available to promote business start ups to the ex-patriot community. Such initiatives, as well as efforts to boost links with home through the use of the media have been promoted in Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania, which have seen a significant exit of skilled workers to countries of the EU-15. However, little evaluation evidence is so far available on the success or otherwise of such measures. It is, however, clear that the coordination of such initiatives at the European and/or bilateral level (including between sending and receiving countries) could be further improved. In the context of a changing economic situation, it is also difficult to assess clearly the reasons for return and the impact of specific policy initiatives.

Discussion in the working group also highlighted that little labour market and skills planning is being carried out for the period of upswing following the economic crisis to ensure that individuals with the right skills will be available to meet again increasing labour market demands.



## 5 MAIN POLICY CHALLENGES AND POLICY LESSONS

In the context of the European Union, with freedom of movement as its main pillars, policy challenges relating to intra-EU and third country migration are clearly separate issues. Similarly, legal and illegal migration pose different questions to policy makers, although it was argued in the conference that the general migration framework implemented in a particular country could have a significant impact on the incidence of illegal migration.

It is undeniable that migration plays an important role in addressing policy challenges in relation to demographic change; the successful construction of a 'knowledge society'; the implementation and planning of the Lisbon and post-Lisbon strategies; and measures to address the current economic crisis.

In this context it is important to bear in mind the balance of powers of initiative as set out in the Treaties and the resulting role of the EU and the individual Member States in formulating migration policy and strategy.

It has been acknowledged by the Commission as well as by the Member States that migration is not a solution to Europe's demographic ageing, but can only be a contribution to addressing the labour and skill shortages which may arise as a result. Other internal policies are of equal if not greater importance:

- Labour market, skills foresight and training measures to ensure that the domestic labour force is utilised to its full potential (the New Skills for New Jobs Strategy is an important EU initiative in this regard);
- Training and other measures to increase occupational mobility, including the mutual recognition of qualifications and recognition of informal and non-formal learning;
- The promotion and implementation of active ageing initiatives;
- The implementation of work-life balance measures to ensure that women and men are able to combine their desire to have a family with the demands of working life;
- The better exploitation of EURES as a cross border recruitment and jobs mediation tool (many Member States stated that knowledge of, as well as the use of EURES by employers had increased significantly in recent years); and
- The implementation of other flanking measures to encourage geographical mobility, including measures to assist in the integration of migrants (housing, access to services, language training, anti-discrimination measures, cultural awareness etc.).

As the current economic context demonstrates, migration cannot always be balanced to act as a 'shock absorber' for the economic ups and downs in different regions, as in a globalised economy, not all economic crises affect all regions equally. Nonetheless, measures which are already emerging in a number of Member States demonstrate that in order to regulate national labour markets it must be possible to manage migration in a meaningful way without resorting to protectionism which could harm labour market prospects in the long-term.

Further work and data collection will be required to assess the impact of the economic downturn on migrants. A particular focus needs to be placed on the impact of more



restrictive migration policies and more limited employment opportunities on the level of undeclared work being performed by migrants without a valid work permit.

Views are clearly divided between supporters of systems which offer amnesties or regularisation to illegal immigrants in order to allow them to escape their clandestine existences and those who fear the potential incentive impact of such measures. It appears that further research as well as cost benefit analysis is required in this area. The same is also true of measures to increase sanctions and enforcement being implemented in the majority of Member States to combat illegal work. In particular, the long-term deterrent impact of such measures should be assessed more clearly in order to be able to weigh up different policy measures.

At the same time, targeted measures are clearly needed to address particularly damaging illegal practices such as human trafficking and people smuggling, which are supported by powerful criminal networks and are particularly harmful to the individuals affected.

In relation to brain drain, further evaluation is also required for measures seeking to encourage emigrants to return or to encourage skilled workers to stay in order to assess whether such measures tackle the relevant push and pull factors effectively. It appears that further emphasis needs to be placed on 'circular' or 'ethical' recruitment initiatives which enable the migration of highly skilled workers, but at the same time seek to ensure that the home labour market benefits in a significant way from the return of individuals having gained experience in other Member States or third countries (turning brain drain into brain gain).

Finally, the full integration of migrants into their host country's labour market and society remains a significant challenge. The issue of 'brain waste' in particular requires further initiatives in the field of mutual recognition of qualifications and competences. Within the EU, advance in this field are being made with the design and implementation of the ECVET and EQF initiatives and in some occupations similar mutual recognition arrangements exist with countries also outside the EU.