1 STUDY AIMS AND RATIONALE

1.1 STUDY AIMS

The aim of the 2016 EMN Focussed Study is to compare national practices on family reunification between the different Member States plus Norway, with the purpose of informing the target audience on current developments and national policies in this field.

The Study will describe the policy and practice of (Member) States in the area of family reunification, including (Member) States’ implementation of the minimum standards set in Directive 2003/86/EC. The Study will also report on the changes in (Member) State policy and practice since the implementation of the Directive, inter alia any changes with regard to the family reunification of third-country nationals (TCNs) who are beneficiaries of international protection, whose number in the EU as a whole has increased over the past couple of years, as well as any changes resulting from the 2014 Communication on guidelines for implementing the Directive. The study will also review how (Member) States have implemented the requirements laid down in Article 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC, as well as which integration measures are foreseen under national law (as per Article 7(2)). The Study will also report on any existing evidence (if available) of effects of certain provisions of Directive 2003/86/EC as applied in different (Member) States on the exercise of the right to family reunification, the integration of TCNs, and/or the prevention of forced marriages or any misuse of family reunification.

In particular, the Study will:

★ Map and compare (Member) States' policy and practice on family reunification with regard to:
  ▪ The possible extension of this right to other relatives than the spouse and minor children;
  ▪ The methods used to verify family ties;
  ▪ The requirements for family reunification foreseen by the Directive and, where relevant, the integration measures as established in national law.

★ Map the relevant jurisprudence from the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), and the impact of this jurisprudence on the development of national policies and practices.


★ Map the recent planned, proposed or implemented changes in national family reunification policies and practices in response to the increased number of applications for international protection in some (Member) States.
If available, compile existing evidence from evaluations/studies, NGOs reports, etc. of effects of requirements and measures on the exercise of the right to family reunification and integration of TCNs, prevention of forced marriages, etc.

Identify good practices of national institutions dealing with family reunification applications, as well as any obstacles encountered.

1.2 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

During the 1970s, while labour migration policy in Europe was registering a more restrictive turn, family reunification started to become a more important migration channel. Since then, the share of family-based migration flows has continued to increase. Today, overall in the EU, family reasons drive the relative majority of incoming TCNs: in 2014, 29% (680,204) of all first-time residence permits were issued to family members, while 25% (572,827) were issued for remunerated activities, 20% (476,615) for study and 26% (595,432) for other reasons. In 21 Member States, family reunification amounted to more than 30% of the new arrivals, exceeding 50% in some Member States (BE, EL, ES, HR, LU and SI). In the last 7 years, family-based migration peaked in 2010, when it increased by 15% compared to the previous year.

One of the main migration-related challenges the EU is currently tackling is the rise in the number of asylum seekers: in 2014, 626,960 requests for asylum were received in the EU as a whole, rising substantially to 1,321,600 in 2015. The increase of permits issued for protection reasons in some Member States may lead to an increase in the number of family reunification requests as beneficiaries of international protection are generally entitled to ask for family reunification and, among them, refugees enjoy particularly favourable conditions for obtaining it. In this context, the Commission’s goal is to promote safe and legal avenues for migration and thereby discourage people from embarking on risky journeys to reach Europe. To achieve this objective, in the EU Agenda on Migration, the Commission has called for the full use of the legal avenues for migration, including family reunification. In light of these developments, some Member States have introduced private sponsorship programmes which are similar to family reunification arrangements (EMN, 2016 Synthesis Resettlement and Humanitarian Admission Programmes in Europe – what works?).

The data cited above show the importance of family reunification as an entry channel to the EU. The main EU legislative instrument in this policy area dates back to 2003 when the Council adopted the Directive on the Right to Family Reunification (2003/86/EC) mentioned above. The Directive, which was the first EU instrument in the legal migration area, determined the conditions under which family reunification is to be granted to family members of legally staying TCNs, as well as the rights of the family members concerned. In 2008, the Commission found that the Directive had a relatively low impact and led to a low level of harmonisation, due to the degree of discretion given to (Member) States when setting certain requirements ('may-clauses') and to instances of incorrect transposition or misapplication across (Member) States. Transposition issues were identified with regard to the implementation of the income requirement in relation to the number of family members, as well as when to ask the sponsor to comply with the integration measures foreseen at the national level. Moreover, the Implementation Report highlighted issues in the transposition of more favourable provisions for refugees and of the principle of the best interests of the child, as well as the provisions in Art. 17 of Directive 2003/86/EC whereby Member States shall take account of the individual circumstances when making a negative decision on an application. As a consequence, in 2012 the Commission launched a public consultation on the Green Paper on family reunification and, two years later, issued a Communication providing guidance for the application of the Directive. The impact of the Communication has not been assessed yet and one of the present study’s aims is to do so.

Recently, as a response to the increased number of asylum applications, there have been indications that several (Member) States have started or planned to change their policies towards refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection. A compilation of these recent or planned changes has not been carried out at EU level yet. In particular, there has been no investigation whether the divergence in rights and procedures available to refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection in different (Member) States has widened in the last few years. This is relevant for the EU, as these divergences may encourage migration status ‘shopping’ and this present Study aims to fill this particular information gap.
Moreover, the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) regarding the right to family reunification is growing and has had an impact on national policies. Therefore, this Study further aims at providing a comprehensive and timely evaluation of the effect that the European jurisprudence has had at national level.

2 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The Study’s main scope includes the family members of TCNs residing legally on the territory of the EU and Norway (=sponsors), who come to Member States and Norway through the channel of family reunification with the sponsor or at a later stage. The sponsor is a TCN who resides in the EU plus Norway as a beneficiary of international protection (refugee, beneficiary of subsidiary protection) or is a holder of another permit (e.g. as a worker, student, etc.). The relevant family members are the spouse and minor children14 (of the sponsor and/or the spouse), as per the Directive, and any other family members as defined by (Member) States’ national legislation, such as parents, adult children or civil partners. Conditions for family reunification for non-mobile EU nationals15, which are governed by national law, are not the primary focus of the Study, hence the Common Template includes only one general question on this type of sponsors. Family reunification for mobile EU nationals16 is not covered by the study; thus no questions are asked concerning this group.

Figure 1. Scope of the Study

The Study examines (Member) States’ policies and practices in the field of family reunification, most notably:

- Eligibility criteria for the sponsor: for example, which categories of migrants are eligible for family reunification (e.g. refugee, beneficiary of subsidiary protection, student, researcher, worker or long-term resident) and after which period of residence (waiting period), whether the permit the sponsor holds needs to be of a minimum duration and whether the sponsor’s prospects of obtaining permanent residence (as per Art. 3 of Directive 2003/86/EC) are assessed;

- Eligibility criteria for family members: for example, which family members are eligible for reunification, especially in relation to those mentioned in Art. 4 of Directive 2003/86/EC (dependent first-degree relatives, adult unmarried children, unmarried partners, second spouses, spouses under the age of 21, children above the age of 15), when the marriage needs to have taken place, what kind of evidence is required, etc.;

- Requirements for family reunification, as per Art. 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC, i.e. family-size accommodation meeting health and safety standards, sickness insurance, stable and regular resources: whether (Member) States implement them and if there are any exemptions;
Integration measures, as per Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC, including any integration and language tests that family members may be required to sit as a pre- or post-departure measure; and conditions for exemptions to complying with these measures, if any;

Procedural aspects of the application for family reunification: for example, how the evidence is checked, which methods of investigation are used, how long the procedure takes by law and in practice, whether applying from inside the territory is allowed, and whether the applicant is the sponsor or the family member, etc.

Rights granted: in particular, whether the access to employment/ self-employment is in any way restricted (as allowed by Art. 14 of Directive 2003/86/EC), and when a family member can acquire an autonomous residence permit (as per Art. 15 of Directive 2003/86/EC), etc.

Policies and practices regarding non-renewal and withdrawal of the residence permit of family members, as allowed by Art. 16 of Directive 2003/86/EC.

3 EU LEGAL AND POLICY CONTEXT

Since the Conclusion of the Tampere Programme (1999), the EU has been working towards the "approximation of national legislations on the conditions for admission and residence of third country nationals".17

In 2003, the Council approved the Directive on the Right to Family Reunification (2003/86/EC), which determined the conditions under which family reunification is granted to family members of legally staying TCNs, as well as the rights of the family members concerned. The Directive, by which Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom are not bound, is without prejudice to more favourable provisions laid down in the national law and bilateral or multilateral agreements with third-countries.18

On the basis of this legislative instrument, legally residing non-EU nationals (sponsors) holding a residence permit for a period of validity of one year or more, who have "reasonable prospects of obtaining the right of permanent residence" (as per Art. 3 of Directive 2003/86/EC), have the right to bring their family members to the (Member) State in which they are residing. The Directive lays down provisions for the members of the ‘nuclear family’, i.e. the spouse and the minor unmarried children of the sponsor and/or the spouse. (Member) States may however include first-degree dependent relatives, adult unmarried children unable to provide for themselves due to their state of health, unmarried partners and registered partners. The Directive does not specify the treatment of same-sex couples, which means that they enjoy rights under the Directive according to the status they have under the national law of each (Member) State. However, recital (5) in the preamble affirms the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

The Directive includes three requirements for family reunification that (Member) States may ask the sponsor to meet: accommodation suitable for the size of the family and meeting health and safety standards, sickness insurance for the sponsor and his/ her family, and stable and regular resources sufficient to maintain the family without recourse to social assistance (Art. 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC). Moreover, (Member) States may require TCNs to comply with some pre-departure or post-departure integration measures, according to national provisions (Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC). The sponsor may also be required to have been resident for a maximum period of 2 years, or exceptionally 3 years, before reuniting with the family (Art. 8 of Directive 2003/86/EC).

Once in the EU, eligible family members shall receive a residence permit entitling them to equal treatment with the sponsor in multiple areas, such as access to education, vocational training and guidance, employment and self-employment, which may be however restricted for 1 year after carrying out labour market analysis (Art. 14 of Directive 2003/86/EC).

The family reunification of refugees is subject to specific, more favourable rules in Directive 2003/86/EC. For example, refugees shall not be asked to meet the requirements set out in Art. 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC for a period of three months after the granting of the refugee status, whilst the integration measures set out in 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC shall not be applied as a pre-condition to grant family reunification to them. In addition, the waiting period does not apply to sponsors who are refugees (as per Art. 9 of Directive 2003/86/EC).

Beneficiaries of subsidiary protection are not within the scope of application of the Directive, thereby falling under national law in this regard. However, Member States may choose under their national law to extend to this
Family members of highly skilled workers (holding an EU Blue Card), researchers and intra-corporate transferees enjoy more favourable conditions for family reunification laid down in other directives (in the Member States bounded by them). For instance, family reunification is not dependent on the sponsor’s perspective to obtain permanent residence, or on the fulfilment of specific integration measures (referred to in Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC). Moreover, processing time is shorter and family members of researchers and highly skilled workers have the right to immediately access the labour market.

In 2014, the First Implementation Report of the Directive highlighted several issues of incorrect transposition or misapplication and noted that the impact of the Directive on harmonisation had been limited, due to the high number of discretionary clauses. As a consequence, the Commission launched a wide public consultation, in the form of a Green Paper, which received 120 contributions. To ensure the full implementation of the existing rules and to guide the application of the Directive, the Commission published in 2014 the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on guidance for application of Directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification. The Communication, following CJEU case law, emphasised that “derogations must be interpreted strictly [and] the margin of appreciation […] must not be used in a manner that would undermine the objective of the Directive, which is to promote family reunification and the effectiveness thereof”.

4 RELEVANT CASE LAW

The right to family life is expressed in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and in international human rights law (e.g. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the European Convention on Human Rights). During the last decade, relevant case law has been produced by the CJEU and international courts. The CJEU was initially referred to by the European Parliament in C-540/03, European Parliament v Council of the European Union, which asked for the annulment of some provisions of Directive 2003/86/EC on the basis of their incompatibility with fundamental rights, in particular the principles of non-discrimination and respect of family life. Specifically, the contested provisions (of Directive 2003/86/EC) were: Art. 4(1), whereby a child over 12 years arriving to a Member State independently might be asked to meet integration conditions; Art. 4(6), whereby a Member State might decide to issue permits for family reasons only to children above 15 years; and Art. 8, whereby the sponsor may be required to wait for a period of up to three years before s/he can apply for family reunification. The CJEU ruled that the Directive, as well as other integrational instruments, posed negative and positive obligations on (Member) States, towards which they enjoy a margin of appreciation. The CJEU ruled that the contested provisions fell within this margin of appreciation and do not infringe the fundamental rights.

Below are the preliminary rulings that the CJEU has issued on Directive 2003/86/EC, specifically on Art. 7(1)(c) (minimum resources) and Art. 4(5) (minimum age of the sponsor and the spouse); and the rulings that the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has issued on the right of family reunification, in relation to Art. 8 of the Charter:

★ CJEU - Case C-558/14 Khachab v Subdelegación del Gobierno en Álava

In this case, a long-term resident saw his application for family reunification refused on the ground that he did not present evidence of sufficient resources to maintain his family, as per Art. 7(1)(c) of Directive 2003/86/EC. The CJEU ruled that verifying the evidence of “stable and regular resources” required analysing the past pattern and future perspectives of such resources, and it was not limited to the resources available at the time of the application. The CJEU ruled that considering a period of 6 months to 1 year, before and after the application, to assess the past and perspective resources of the sponsor is compatible with EU law.

★ CJEU - C-153/14, Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken v K and A

This case involved a request for exemption submitted by a TCN who was asked to sit a civic integration exam in the country of origin, whose cost amounted to €350. The CJEU recognised that the (Member) States could impose integration measures to TCNs, as per Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC; however, it also noted that these measures should be in proportion to serving their objective, i.e. integration of TCNs, and should not undermine the possibility
of family reunification itself. In particular, passing integration tests may be required as a condition to grant a residence permit, provided that the conditions to comply with it do not make compliance excessively difficult.

★ CJEU - Case C 338/13, Marjan Noorzia v Bundesministerin für Inneres

This case was about the minimum age condition that the spouse and the sponsor may be required to satisfy before applying for family reunification, as per Art. 4(5) of Directive 2003/86/EC. The CJEU ruled that the Member States that have implemented such a requirement may equally decide to require the sponsor or the family member to meet it at the time the application is lodged or when the decision (on the application) is taken.

★ CJEU - C-578/08, Rhimou Chakroun v Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken

The case involved a TCN living in a Member State for several years and finding himself unemployed at the moment of lodging an application for family reunification. The TCN received unemployment benefits which entitled him to receive social assistance. The income requirement for family reunification was set at 1.2 times higher than the minimum wage in the Member State (and the TCN could not meet this with the unemployment benefit received). The CJEU ruled that the income requirement in Directive 2003/86/EC should not be interpreted in a way that prevents a sponsor showing stable and regular resources sufficient to maintain himself/ herself and his/ her family from being granted a positive decision, even when the level of resources entitled the sponsor to social assistance. Moreover, in this case, the CJEU also ruled that Member States were not allowed to make a distinction based on when the marriage was concluded with respect to the entrance of the TCN in the territory of the Member State.

★ CJEU - O. S en L, in joined cases C-356/11 and C-357/11

In these cases, the Court explained that Article 7(1)(c) of Directive 2003/86 must be interpreted as meaning that, while Member States have the discretion to require proof that the sponsor has stable and regular resources which are sufficient to maintain himself and the members of his family, that discretion must be exercised in the light of Articles 7 and 24(2) and (3) of the Charter, which require the Member States to examine applications for family reunification in the interests of the children concerned and also with a view to promoting family life, and avoiding any undermining of the objective and the effectiveness of the Directive.

★ CJEU - CGIL Case C-309/14, CGIL and INCA

In this case, the Italian court requested the Court of Justice which level of fees for the application of the Long Term Residence status (on the basis of Directive 2003/109/EC) can be considered proportional. The Court referred to its judgment in Commission v Netherlands, C-508/10, EU:C:2012:243, in which it ruled that, even if the Directive does not include a provision on fees, the discretion left to Member States is not unlimited and that they may not apply national rules which are liable to jeopardise the achievement of the objectives of the Directive and therefore, deprive it of its effectiveness. The Court ruled in CGIL and INCA that the requirement of paying a fee in amount between €80 and €200 for the issue or renewal of a residence permit in the Member State concerned, is disproportionate in the light of the objective pursued by that Directive and is liable to create an obstacle to the exercise of the rights conferred by the instrument. In its ruling, the Court paid attention to the duration of the residence permit. In the judgment C-309/14, the Court had also taken into account the amount of fees required for the identity card for nationals, arguing that a too big difference between those two levels can amount to disproportionality. The Dutch Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State decided that although both judgments relate to fees on the basis of the Long Term Residents Directive, the reasoning is identically applicable to the Family Reunification Directive (ABR v S, ECLI:NL:RVS:2016:1831, 24 June 2016 and ABR v S, 201008782/1/V1, LJN:BY0145, 9 October 2012).

★ ECtHR - Tuquabo-Tekle And Others v The Netherlands, Application no. 60665/00, 1 March 2006

The case involved an application lodged by the spouse (first applicant) of a refugee recognised in the Netherlands in order to reunite with her daughter. The first applicant had previously received a permit on humanitarian grounds in Norway, and the Norwegian authorities had approved her request to reunite with her son. Once the first applicant married a refugee in the Netherlands and the Dutch authorities granted her a residence permit, the first applicant lodged an application in the Netherlands for family reunification with her daughter who was still living in Eritrea. The Dutch authorities rejected her application. The ECtHR ruled in favour of the first applicant, referring to Art. 8 of the Convention and arguing that leaving the child behind when settling in the new country did not amount to renouncing the right to family unity.
The case was about a request for family reunification lodged by a Rwandan national who was recognised as a refugee in France. The French authorities rejected the application as the children who were to be reunited with the refugee were considered to be too old for family reunification. This was decided on the basis of an age assessment examining the children’s mouth cavity, which contradicted the age stated on the birth certificate. The third-country national appealed to the Council of State, asking to deal with the request urgently, in consideration of his children being unaccompanied and having suffered psychological trauma in Rwanda. The Council of State, taking in consideration the age of the children, ruled against the applicant. The case was then brought before the ECtHR who ruled that, in view of the applicant’s refugee status, the application needed to be examined rapidly and with particular attention, taking into account the events that led to the disruption of family unity. The Court noted that the applicant experienced several difficulties in following the application process and in providing other elements to certify the children’s age. The Court also noted that the medical examination, on which the final decision depended, was not sufficiently accurate and that the five-year time to reach the decision was excessive.

In this case, a third-country national who obtained refugee status in the UK saw his request for family reunification with his wife in Djibouti denied, on the ground that the marriage was held after the applicant was recognised as a refugee. According to a rule in force in the UK until 2011, the applicant who formed his/ her family after receiving a residence permit would need to wait 5 years before reuniting with his/ her family members. The Court ruled that the ground to discriminate between refugees who contracted marriage before or after receiving the residence permit lacked an objective and reasonable justification, and therefore ruled in favour of the applicant.

The case concerned the complaint by a naturalised Danish citizen of Togolese origin, Ousmane Biao, and his Ghanaian wife that they could not settle in Denmark. Notably, the Danish authorities refused to grant them family reunion, as the couple did not comply with the requirement under the relevant domestic law (the Aliens Act) that they must not have stronger ties with another country, in this case Ghana, than with Denmark (known as the “attachment requirement”). They also complained that an amendment to the Aliens Act in December 2003 – lifting the attachment requirement for those who held Danish citizenship for at least 28 years – resulted in a difference in treatment between those born Danish nationals and those, like Mr. Biao, who had acquired Danish citizenship later in life. The Court concluded that the Government had failed to show that there were compelling or very weighty reasons unrelated to ethnic origin to justify the indirect discriminatory effect of this 28-year rule. That rule favoured Danish nationals of Danish ethnic origin, and placed at a disadvantage, or had a disproportionately prejudicial effect on persons, such as Mr. Biao, who acquired Danish nationality later in life and who were of ethnic origins other than Danish.

5 PRIMARY QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE STUDY

The primary questions the Study will address include:

- Under which rules and through which procedures do the different Member States grant family reunification, both in policy and practice? Has EC Communication COM(2014)2010’s guidance for application of Directive 2003/86/EC led to any policy changes in the Member States bound by the Directive? If so, which ones?
- How has the more favourable treatment of refugees as required by Chapter V of Directive 2003/86/EC been implemented?
- Have there been changes in policy and/or practice due to jurisprudence from ECtHR and CJEU? If so, which ones?
- How has family reunification policy and practice been affected by the increased number of asylum applications since 2015?
- What good practices and obstacles to family reunification can be identified?
- To what extent are family reunification rules covered solely by national law more or less favourable than family reunification rules covered by Union law (e.g. beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, own nationals)?
To what extent is the policy and practice on the non-renewal or withdrawal of the residence rights of family members influenced by Directive 2003/86/EC, the guidelines of the Commission and the case-law of the Court of Justice?

6 RELEVANT SOURCES AND LITERATURE

EMN Studies

The following 2015 EMN study looked at how Member States allowed TCNs to change their status without leaving the country; changes from and into family are particularly relevant for this study.

- EMN (2016) Changes in immigration status and purpose of stay: an overview of EU Member States' approaches (forthcoming) - The Study examines the different legal frameworks, procedures and practices in place in the Member States to enable third-country nationals to change their migration status, as well as the conditions and rights associated with such changes. It also looks at existing obstacles and good practices. One of the findings is that all Member States participating in the Study allow changes from the family status, and this is the only migration status which can be changed from in the whole EU. However, it is also one of the least frequent changes: between 2010 and 2014 each year only 1% of third-country nationals with a valid residence permit for family reasons changed their status.

The following 2014 EMN study looked at the policies and practices that Member States developed on unaccompanied minors and provided for data that described the size and characteristics of the phenomenon.

- EMN (2015) Policies, practices and data on unaccompanied minors in the EU Member States and Norway – This Study provided a description of the phenomenon of unaccompanied minors (UAMs) in the (Member) States, the different motivations and circumstances that led UAMs to enter the EU, as well as the procedural safeguards for this vulnerable group from the moment of entry into the territory, through to reception conditions and integration arrangements, to any arrangements taken by the (Member) States when the minors turned into adults.

The following 2012 EMN study described Member States’ policies and practices on family reunification misuse, in particular marriage of convenience and false declaration of partnerships:

- EMN (2012) Marriages of convenience and false declarations of parenthood – This Study, which is the result of 24 national contributions, provided some relevant information on the scale and the scope of two instances of misuse of family reunification, namely marriages of convenience and false declarations of parenthood. This is relevant as Art. 16 of the Directive laid down that “Member States may conduct specific checks and inspections where there is reason to suspect that there is fraud or a marriage, partnership or adoption of convenience.” The Study further illustrates the national measures for preventing misuses, including involving the embassies in countries of origin, undertaking interviews, inspections and DNA tests and the circumstances in which checks are triggered.

Other relevant, though less recent, EMN studies include:

- EMN (2010) The different national practices concerning granting of non-EU harmonised protection statuses
- EMN (2008) Family Reunification

EMN Ad-Hoc Queries

The following recent EMN AHQs (2014 onwards) are relevant to this Study:

- Content of integration programmes for applicants for/ beneficiaries of international protection (2016.1097), requested by IT on 11th August 2016
- Waiting period for family reunification for beneficiaries of subsidiary protection (2016.1096), requested by BE on 10th August 2016
- Checking identity and family relationships in case of family reunification with a beneficiary of international protection (2016.1074), requested by NL on 8th June 2016
- Required resources in the framework of family reunification (2016.1070), requested by BE on 27th May 2016
Other relevant studies and reports

The following study presents an overview of the most prominent legal issues in family reunification for beneficiaries of international protection:

- **ELENA (European Legal Network on Asylum)/ ECRE (2016), Information Note on Family Reunification for Beneficiaries of International Protection in Europe** – The study reviews the international and EU law framework and the applicable rights and principles in family reunification, and discusses some controversial issues, such as the status of the sponsor, the definition of family members, the documentation and evidentiary requirements, the length of the procedure, and the relevance of Dublin family unit case law.

The following book identifies the key elements of the right to family unification:

- **Klaassen, M.A.K. (2015), The right to family unification: between migration control and human rights** – This book contains a comparative analysis of family reunification legislation in Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK.

The following tool compares family reunification policies across 38 states in the world and assesses how easy it is to reunite with family members:

- **MIPEX 2015 – Family Reunion** – This index is built upon several indicators, divided into four policy dimensions of family reunion: eligibility, conditions for acquisition of the status, security of the status and rights associated with it. It describes the best and worst practices and provides the reunion rate in 2013.

The following report offers an overview from a practitioners’ perspective on the national practices in relation to family reunification for beneficiaries of international protection:

- **Red Cross EU and ECRE (2014), Disrupted flights. The Realities of Separated Refugees Families in the EU** – This report describes the procedural obstacles to family reunification faced by refugees both in countries of destination and origin.

The following working paper analyses the patterns of differentiated access to the right of family reunification and their rationale:
**Reinhard Schweitzer (2014), A Stratified Right to Family Life? Patterns and Rationales behind Differential Access to Family Reunification for Third-Country Nationals Living within the EU** – This paper describes the most common diversities in accessing family reunification and finds that instances of unequal treatment are more common in countries that regulate family reunification more restrictively.

The briefing below provides information on Central European Member States’ (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia) family reunification patterns and practice:

**Huddleston, T. (2013) Family reunion policies in Central Europe**

The following study provides an overview of the legislative framework on family reunification in six Member States (Austria, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom), describes the implementation of the procedures, analyses the policies’ development and the extent to which the changes made to policy were evidence-based; it also reports on the relevant case law and assesses the impact of family reunification policies on family life and integration:

**Strik, T, de Hart, B., Nissen E. (2013), Family Reunification: A Barrier or Facilitator of Integration? A Comparative Study** – This study finds that over the last decade, the conditions for family reunification have become more restrictive and the number of applications decreased. The study differentiates between groups of third–country nationals, Member States and practices and finds out that neutral rules in practice lead to discrimination against certain groups of migrants, based for example, on their level of education and gender.

The following study discusses some requirements and conditions for family reunification, with a special focus on migrant women:

**European Network of Migrant Women (2011), Family Reunion Legislation in Europe: Is It Discriminatory Against Migrant Women?,– The report argues that family migration policies are often the result of negative stereotyping that sees migrants as a homogeneous group that struggle to integrate. In particular, the criteria that migrants have to meet are designed to limit and select migrants. To serve the best interest of women, an autonomous residence permit to family members should be issued at the earliest occasion.**

The following study provides a thorough overview of the policy for family reunification in nine selected Member States (Belgium, France, Germany, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands):

**Pascouau Y. and Labayle H. (2011), Conditions for Family Reunification under Strain. A comparative study in nine EU member states. – The report provides a detailed analysis of the legislation and practices at the national level and concludes that the jurisprudence and the rights enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights should be taken into account for future development in the area of family reunification; that further harmonisation is needed across Member States; that the underlined rationale of family reunification is to promote integration rather than to manage migration flows, and that this rationale must be safeguarded.**

The following ICMPD study describes the patterns of family-related migration in the EU, the policy framework and the impact of the policy on the third-country nationals trying to reunite, with a gender perspective:

**Kraler A. (2010), Civic Stratification, Gender and Family Migration Policies in Europe, – The report concludes that the way dependency has been constructed as the basis for family reunification has changed over time, and compared to the post-war period has formally become gender-neutral. In practice, however, family reunification rules have gender-related implications in practice. The principle of selection has come up while family has become an important channel of migration. Finally, the report argues that the reality of family has been only poorly captured by the concept of family employed in migration law.**

**Strik T., Böcker A., Luiten M. and Van Oers R. (2010), “The INTEC Project: Integration and Naturalisation Tests: the New Way to European Citizenship” – Synthesis Report – The report is an analysis of the results of a comparative research on the effects (intended and unintended) of integration and language tests on the integration of migrants. The research distinguishes between pre-entry measures (applied for family reunification), integration requirements for permanent residence and integration requirements for naturalization. The research identifies the groups of migrants facing the most difficulties with meeting the requirements, and gives recommendations on how to ensure the promotion of integration while applying integration measures.**
7 AVAILABLE STATISTICS

EU level

The following statistics are available through Eurostat, and may be indicative of the scale of the phenomenon (i.e. the number of family members reunited).

- Number of first residence permits by reason, length of validity and citizenship [migr_resfirst]
- Number of first permits issued for family reasons by reason, length of validity and citizenship [migr_resfam]
- First permits by reason, age, sex and citizenship [migr_resfas]
- Number of changes of immigration status permits by reason and citizenship [migr_reschange]
- Number of valid permits by reason, length of validity and citizenship on 31 December of each year [migr_resvalid]
- Single Permits issued by type of decision, length of validity [migr_ressing]
- Admitted family members of EU Blue Cards holders by type of decision and citizenship [migr_resbc2]

National level

The following data would be very useful for this Study, and should be included insofar as possible:

- The total number of applications for family reunification in 2011-2015 and, where available, the first half of 2016, disaggregated by the ground of residence of the sponsor (beneficiaries of international protection (i.e. refugees, BSPs, UAMs), persons admitted for remunerated activities, etc.) and sex;
- The total number of accepted/rejected applications for family reunification in 2011-2015, and where available, the first half of 2016, by status of the sponsor.

NB: The EMN Statistics Working Group is kindly invited to comment on the inclusion of statistics in the Common Template and to trial the collection of statistics in their (Member) State.

8 DEFINITIONS

The following key terms are used in the Common Template. The definitions are taken from the EMN Glossary v3.0.31

'Adoption of convenience': is defined as "an adoption (of a child) contracted for the sole purpose of enabling the person adopted to enter or reside in a Member State".

'Adult': is defined as "every human being aged 18 years or more unless, under the law applicable to the adult, majority is attained later".

'Applicant for international protection': is defined as "a third-country national or a stateless person who has made an application for international protection in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken".

'Application for international protection': is defined as "a request made by a third-country national or a stateless person for protection from a Member State, who can be understood to seek refugee status or subsidiary protection status, and who does not explicitly request another kind of protection, outside the scope of Directive 2011/95/EU, that can be applied for separately".

'Beneficiary of International Protection': is defined as "a person who has been granted refugee status or subsidiary protection status".

'Civil Partnership of Convenience': is defined as "a civil partnership contracted for the sole purpose of enabling the person concerned to enter or reside in a Member State".

'False declaration of parenthood': is defined as "an untruthful declaration of a relationship of parenthood which does not actually exist either (a) between a minor who is an EU citizen or settled third-country national and a third-country national adult, where the adult claims to be the parent in order to obtain or legalise their residence in a..."
Member State, or (b) between a third-country national minor and a union citizen adult or a settled third-country national adult where the adult declares themselves parent of the minor in order to obtain or legalise the residence of the child and / or possibly the residence of the other parent”.

*Family formation*: is defined as “the entry into and residence in a Member State of a third-country national on the basis of the establishment of a family relationship either (a) after their third-country national sponsor has gained legal residence in a Member State; or (b) with an EU national”.

*Family member*: is defined as “in the general migration context, a person either married to, or having a relationship legally recognised as equivalent to marriage, to a migrant, as well as their dependent children or other dependants who are recognised as members of the family by applicable legislation. In the context of the Family Reunification Directive, a third country national, as specified in Art. 4 of Directive 2003/86/EC (normally members of the nuclear family – i.e. the spouse and the minor children), who has entered the territory of the European Union for the purpose of family reunification”.

*Family migration*: is defined as “in the global context, a general concept encompassing family reunification, family formation, and migration of an entire family at the same time. In the EU context, a concept which refers explicitly to family reunification and family formation”.

*Family reunification*: is defined as “the establishment of a family relationship which is either: (a) the entry into and residence in a Member State, in accordance with Council Directive 2003/86/EC, by family members of a third-country national residing lawfully in that Member State (‘sponsor’) in order to preserve the family unit, whether the family relationship arose before or after the entry of the sponsor; or (b) between an EU national and third-country national established outside the EU who then subsequently enters the EU”.

Synonymous: family reunion

*Forced marriage*: is defined as “the union of two persons, at least one of whom has not given their full and free consent to the marriage”.

*Highly qualified migrant*: is defined as “in the global context, a person falling within ILO ISCO-88 Classes 1, 2 and 3, e.g. a person qualified as a manager, executive, professional, technician or similar, who moves within the internal labour markets of transnational corporations and international organisations, or who seeks employment through international labour markets for scarce skills. In the EU context, a third-country national who seeks employment in a Member State and has the required adequate and specific competence, as proven by higher professional qualifications”.

*Integration*: In the EU context, a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.

*Intra-corporate transferee*: is defined as “a third-country national subject to a temporary secondment from an undertaking established outside the territory of a Member State and to which the third-country national is bound by a work contract to an entity belonging to the undertaking or to the same group of undertakings which is established inside this territory”.

*Labour market test*: is defined as a “mechanism that aims to ensure that migrant workers are only admitted after employers have unsuccessfully searched for national workers, EU citizens (in EU Member States this also means EEA workers) or legally residing third-country nationals with access to the labour market according to national legislation”.

*Long-term resident*: is defined as “a third-country national who has long-term resident status as provided for under Arts. 4 to 7 of Council Directive 2003/109/EC or as provided for under national legislation”.

*Marriage of convenience*: is defined as “a marriage contracted for the sole purpose of enabling the person concerned to enter or reside in a Member State”.

*Refugee*: is defined as “in the global context, either a person who, owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership of a particular social group, is outside the country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country, or a stateless person, who, being outside of the country of former habitual residence for the same reasons as mentioned before, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to return to it. In the EU context, either a third-
country national who, owing to a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership of a particular social group, is outside the country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country, or a stateless person, who, being outside of the country of former habitual residence for the same reasons as mentioned above, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to return to it, and to whom Art. 12 (Exclusion) of Directive 2011/95/EU does not apply”.

'Researcher': is defined as “in the EU migration context, a third-country national holding an appropriate higher education qualification, which gives access to doctoral programmes, who is selected by a research organisation for carrying out a research project for which the above qualification is normally required”.

'Right to family life': is defined as “a principle enshrined in Arts. 7, 9 and 33 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Art. 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)”.

'Right to family unity': is defined as “in the context of a refugee, a right provisioned in Art. 23 of Directive 2011/95/EU and in Art. 12 of Directive 2013/33/ EU obliging Member States to ensure that family unity can be maintained”.

'Seasonal worker': is defined as “a third-country national who retains their principal place of residence in a third country and stays legally and temporarily in the territory of a Member State to carry out an activity dependent on the passing of the seasons, under one or more fixed-term work contracts concluded directly between that third-country national and the employer established in that Member State”.

'Sponsor': is defined as “in the global context, a person or entity which undertakes a (legal, financial or personal) engagement, promise or pledge, on behalf of another. In the EU context of family reunification, a third-country national residing lawfully in a Member State and applying, or whose family members apply, for family reunification to be joined with them”.

'Student': is defined as “in the EU migration context, a third-country national accepted by an establishment of higher education and admitted to the territory of a Member State to pursue as their main activity a full-time course of study leading to a higher education qualification recognised by the Member State, including diplomas, certificates or doctoral degrees, which may cover a preparatory course prior to such education according to its national legislation”.

'Subsidiary protection': is defined as “the protection given to a third-country national or a stateless person who does not qualify as a refugee but in respect of whom substantial grounds have been shown for believing that the person concerned, if returned to their country of origin, or in the case of a stateless person to their country of former habitual residence, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm as defined in Art. 15 of 2011/95/EU, and to whom Art. 17(1) and (2) of Directive 2011/95/EU do not apply, and is unable or, owing to such risk, unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of that country”.

'Unaccompanied minor': is defined as “a minor who arrives on the territory of the Member States unaccompanied by the adult responsible for them by law or by the practice of the Member State concerned, and for as long as they are not effectively taken into the care of such a person. It includes a minor who is left unaccompanied after they have entered the territory of the Member States”.

'Third-country national': is defined as “any person who is not a citizen of the European Union within the meaning of Art. 20(1) of TFEU and who is not a person enjoying the Union right to free movement, as defined in Art. 2(5) of the Schengen Borders Code”.
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**NL EMN NCP**: [hpm.lemmens@ind.minvenj.nl](mailto:hpm.lemmens@ind.minvenj.nl); cc: [EMN@ind.minvenj.nl](mailto:EMN@ind.minvenj.nl); [H.Wormann@ind.minvenj.nl](mailto:H.Wormann@ind.minvenj.nl); [L.Seiffert@ind.minvenj.nl](mailto:L.Seiffert@ind.minvenj.nl); [L.Cleton@ind.minvenj.nl](mailto:L.Cleton@ind.minvenj.nl)
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### 10 TIMETABLE

The following timetable has been proposed for the Study going forward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20th July 2016</td>
<td>Circulation of Version 1 of the Common Template to AG members to provide comments (by 29th July 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th August 2016</td>
<td>Circulation of Version 2 of the Common Template to AG members to provide comments (by 24th August 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd September 2016</td>
<td>Circulation of Version 3 of the Common Template to EMN NCPs to provide feedback in writing (by 9th September 2016) or at the 81st NCP Meeting taking place in Brussels on 12th September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of 12th September 2016</td>
<td>Finalisation of the Common Template and official launch of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th December 2016</td>
<td>Completion of the National Reports by EMN NCPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th January 2016</td>
<td>First draft of the Synthesis Report&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st January 2016</td>
<td>Finalisation of the Synthesis Report and National Contributions for publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 TEMPLATE FOR NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The template provided below outlines the information that should be included in the National Contributions of EMN NCPs to this Focussed Study. The indicative number of pages to be covered by each section is provided in the guidance note. For National Contributions, the total number of pages should **not exceed 35 pages**, including the questions and excluding the Statistical Annex. A limit of 35 pages will apply to the Synthesis Report, in order to ensure that it remains concise and accessible.
EMN FOCUSSED STUDY 2016
Family Reunification of TCNs in the EU: National Practices

Top-line “Factsheet” (National Contribution) [maximum 1 page]

Overview of the National Contribution – introducing the Study and drawing out key facts and figures from across all sections of the National Contribution, with a particular emphasis on elements that will be of relevance to (national) policymakers.

Please also provide a concise summary of the main findings of Sections 1-6 below, for example:

- Evolution of the phenomenon of family reunification in your (Member) State over time and latest figures;
- Key changes to policy and/or practice on family reunification in recent years (i.e. since 2011)33 or being planned currently – including EU or national-level factors driving changes to policy and/or practice, for example, the increased number of TCNs seeking asylum in the EU, the European Agenda on Migration,34 and/or relevant EU and/or national case law, etc.;
- Whether policy and/or practice on family reunification in your (Member) State has become more or less restrictive over time;
- Any challenges as well as good practices in the field;
- Any suggestions for EU level action(s) in family reunification that might be useful for your (Member) State.

In Luxembourg, family reunification is one of the main reasons for immigration of third-country nationals. In fact, during the last three years, “family member” and “private reasons (family links)” residence permits (first deliveries and renewals) represented more than a third of all residence permits issued during the last three years.

While the right to family reunification was solely provided by international law and regulated by administrative practice until 2008, the transposition of Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification led to a much more precise and detailed legal framework.

A notable change in legislation has been proposed with the introduction of bill no 699235, namely the harmonisation of the conditions that apply to third-country national employees with those of Blue Card holders and researchers. Thus, family reunification requirements for certain categories of applicants36 shall be alleviated through the abrogation of the 12-month residence requirement for the sponsor.

In order to apply for family reunification in Luxembourg, sponsors have to meet a number of requirements for exercising the right to family reunification, which include the provision of suitable accommodation for the size of their family, meeting health and safety standards; health insurance; as well as stable and regular resources to provide for himself/ herself and his/ her family members. As recommended by the Directive 2003/86/EC, Luxembourg sets out more favourable conditions to beneficiaries of international protection for the exercise of their right to family reunification. Thus, they do not have to comply with the above-mentioned requirements in case they apply for family reunification within 3 months of being granted the status.

Family members who have come to Luxembourg under family reunification have access to education, orientation, vocational training, lifelong learning and professional retraining once their residence permit has been issued. Family members furthermore have access to the labour market. In case the family member has resided in Luxembourg for less than one year when the application is submitted, it will be submitted to the
Family Reunification of TCNs in the EU: National Practices

A precise and detailed legal framework regulating family reunification in Luxembourg has only been established in 2008, with the entering into force of the amended law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration (Immigration Law). Until then, the right to family reunification was solely provided by international law and regulated by administrative practice. Provisions concerning family reunification, in particular, essentially

Executive Summary (Synthesis Report) [maximum 3 pages]

Executive Summary of Synthesis Report: this will form the basis of an EMN Inform, which will have EU and national policymakers as its main target audience.

Section 1: Overview of the situation on family reunification [maximum 2 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will provide an up-to-date overview of the national situation with regard to family reunification of TCNs, including figures on the scale of family reunification, e.g. number of residence permits issued on grounds of family reunification, number of unaccompanied minors (UAMs) reunited with family in (Member) States, etc. The section sets out the context for the Study by providing information on the approaches of (Member) States to family reunification, as well as recent (since 2011) changes to law, policy and/or practice. The section will be drafted on the basis of data available from Eurostat or other relevant sources and complemented by national data provided by EMN NCPs.

Q1. Please briefly describe the basis for developing legislation/ policy on family reunification in your (Member) State (e.g. Directive 2003/86/EC, Art. 8, ECHR on the right to respect private and family life, etc.). (If your (Member) State distinguishes between family formation and family reunification, please provide further information here and if applicable, make such a distinction in the subsequent questions).
derive from the transposition of the Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification and which enabled to address this legal shortcoming.

Luxembourg considers family reunification to be one of the principal sources of migration into the country and to be a contributing factor to a better integration of migrants in the host country. Family reunification is considered as the right to establish, and where appropriate, the right to work, which can benefit certain family members of a third-country nationals legally residing in the country. Furthermore, national law implements the principle established in article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights according to which every person has the right to a protected private and family life in accordance with principles of public policy of the host country.

The Immigration Law takes into consideration different forms of family life to the extent that they are compatible with national law (e.g. same sex marriages, partnerships, extended family, legal guardian or another family member of an unaccompanied minor, etc.). However, polygamous marriages and marriages with underage children are forbidden. The family formation is not specifically foreseen in national law. In principle, the third-country national family member of a third-country national legally residing in Luxembourg has to follow the normal procedures of entrance for a long-term stay. This includes if required obtaining a D visa. In the case of a third-country national who is a family member of an European Union citizen, s/he would only need a C-visa if required to enter the Schengen area.

Q2. Please provide an overview of recent (since 2011) changes to law, policy and/or practice in the field of family reunification in your (Member) State, covering the following:

- Current public debate on family reunification in your (Member) State (e.g. on requirements for exercising the right to family reunification or other issues);
- Whether family reunification is a national policy priority currently;
- Any planned changes to law, policy and/or practice on family reunification;
- Any changes to policy and/or practice as a result of the Commission Communication COM(2014)2010’s guidance for application of Directive 2003/86/EC? If no, please specify why not;
- If your (Member) State has introduced a private sponsorship programme, which requires the beneficiary to be a family member of the sponsor. If yes, briefly elaborate in what ways the requirements, eligibility and access to rights differ.

Please support your answers by providing qualitative evidence, e.g. from (media) reports, political debate, etc. (Quantitative evidence is requested in the subsequent question so should not be covered here).

The Law of 8 December 2011 transposing Directive 2009/50/EC known as the « European Blue Card » Directive introduced several provisions regulating family reunification:

a) Family reunification is extended to partnerships in accordance with the Law of 9 July 2004 on legal effect of certain partnerships as amended by Law of 3 August 2010;

b) The exception that the family members of a highly qualified worker are allowed to join him/her from the moment s/he enters the territory without being subject to the waiting period of 1 year required for salaried workers if the requirements of family reunification are fulfilled;

c) The authorisation of stay of family members of an European Blue Card holder is granted in a maximum delay of 6 month after the filing of the application.

d) The duration of the authorisation of stay of the family member of a highly qualified worker is the same as the one of the highly qualified worker.

With the introduction of bill n° 6992, the government further foresees to alleviate family reunification requirements, namely by harmonising the conditions that apply to third-country national employees with those of Blue Card holders and researchers. Thus, the 12-month residence requirement for the sponsor shall be abrogated. However, this requirement is still required in cases foreseen by article 70 (5) of the Immigration Law (first degree ascendants, adult unmarried depending children, legal guardian or any other family member of...
an unaccompanied minor who is beneficiary of international protection). The aim of this article is to guarantee the family unity and to enable family members to enter the country with the sponsor.

The bill also reduces the time limit for deciding on the application of a family member of an intra-corporate transferee (ICT) from 9 months to 90 days.

In recent years, public and media debate has been rather limited with regard to issues relating to family reunification. Yet in 2015, the Luxembourgish civil society organisations urged the government on several occasions to remove the 3-month period within which beneficiaries of international protection may introduce an application for family reunification without having to satisfy the general conditions relating to regular and sufficient resources as well as appropriate accommodation (see answer to Q.4 and Q.6).

3. a. Please complete the Excel document in Annex 1 below (including data, as well as metadata) if you have national statistics on:

- The total number of applications for family reunification in 2011-2015 and, where available, the first half of 2016, disaggregated by the ground of residence of the sponsor (beneficiaries of international protection (i.e. refugees, BSPs, UAMs), persons admitted for remunerated activities, persons admitted for study purposes, etc.) and sex;
- The total number of accepted/rejected applications for family reunification in 2011-2015, and where available, the first half of 2016, if available disaggregated by the grounds for rejection of applications.

Please do not here include the Eurostat data mentioned above in Section 7 above, as this information is available publically and can therefore be analysed centrally for the Synthesis Report.

b. Please supplement the data provided above with a narrative on the profiles of TCNs residing in your (Member) State and asking for family reunification, i.e. are the sponsors mostly beneficiaries of international protection and/or other TCNs, e.g. workers, students, etc.?

In Luxembourg, family reunification is one of the main reasons for immigration of third-country nationals. “Family member” and “private reasons (family links)” residence permits (first deliveries and renewals) represented more than a third of all residence permits issued during the last three years. With regard to the first issuance of residence permits in 2015, the highest number of residence permits were issued for the categories “family member” and “private reasons (family links)” cumulatively. In fact, the 1546 permits issued in these categories represented 41.2% of all permits issued in 2015.

Data regarding temporary authorisations of stay

- The number of applications for family reunification has known a constant rise during the reference period, rising from 374 in 2011 to 1271 in 2015, which represents a growth rate of 240%.
- 2/3 of persons applying for an authorisation of stay are female, the share of women in the reference period lying between 65 and 68%. This thus illustrates the ‘classic’ image of family reunification, in which the male sponsor is later joined by his female spouse/partner.
- In the reference period, ¾ to 4/5 of all applications made (between 76.1% and 81%) refer to situations in which the sponsor was engaged in a remunerated activity. The status “other” regroups on average 16% of all applications. Other statuses of sponsors are not represented frequently. In 2015, and above all 2016, one can however observe an important rise in applications for family reunification for beneficiaries of international protection (12% of all applications submitted between January and October 2016).

Data regarding decisions

- The number of decisions on authorisations of stay as family member or private reasons (family ties) has been rising constantly from 2011 to 2015, progressing from 352 decisions in 2011 to 1235 in 2015, corresponding to a growth rate of 251%.
- During the period in question, the recognition rate (share of positive decisions in the total number of decisions taken) was always higher than 90%. This rate concerns decisions taken during the reference
period, regardless of the date of submission of the application. In other words, the number of applications made over one year is not identical to the total number of decisions taken (positive and negative) during the same year.

Section 2: Definition of sponsor and family members [maximum 5 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will aim to provide information on the understanding of family members entitled to family reunification across the (Member) States. The definition of family members is prescribed in Art. 4 in Chapter II of Directive 2003/86/EC. The section will also aim to clarify who is eligible to be a sponsor to an application for family reunification (Art. 3 in Chapter I of Directive 2003/86/EC). If applicable, please distinguish to what extent any of the provisions apply to certain/all groups of migrants (see Figure 1 above) applying for family reunification in your (Member) State depending on the grounds of residence of the sponsor (e.g. refugee, BSP, worker, student, etc.). If the provisions vary across different groups of migrants, please describe the variations.

Q4. a. Who can be a sponsor to an application for family reunification in your (Member) State (e.g. UAMs, students, workers, etc.)?

The Immigration Law foresees three different types of family reunification depending on the sponsor:

a) Luxembourgish national;

b) EU citizens who have not used free movement (i.e. a Portuguese person born in Luxembourg who applies for family reunification for his Cape Verdean spouse);

c) Third-country national. In this case, the sponsor must fulfil the following conditions:

- hold a residence permit that is valid for at least one year (this requirement is not necessary if the applicant is a highly qualified third-country national, a beneficiary of international protection, an intra-corporate transferee or a researcher);
- have a perspective to obtain permanent residence;
- have legally resided in Luxembourg for at least 12 months;
- provide proof that s/he has stable, regular and sufficient resources (salary, wages, income from assets) to support him/herself and the family members under his or her care, without having to resort to social welfare (See answer to Q.6).
- have appropriate accommodation to host the family member(s) (See answer to Q.6);
- have health insurance cover for him/herself and the family member(s) (health insurance certificate covering their stay in Luxembourg issued by a Luxembourg or foreign social security authority and/or by a private insurance company) (See answer to Q.6).

In the case of Luxembourgish nationals, none of the above mentioned conditions apply (See answer to Q.11).

If they fulfil the general conditions outlined above, family reunification is granted to the following categories of sponsors:

1. Salaried worker;
2. Independent worker;
3. Highly qualified worker: In this case the applicant has to fulfil the conditions of sufficient resources, health insurance cover and housing but not the condition of the 1-year waiting period. Family members can enter the territory with the applicant;
4. Athlete.
5. Researcher: The sponsor must fulfill all the conditions mentioned above with the exception of the 1-year waiting period. Family members can enter the territory with the applicant;

6. Intra-corporate transferee: The sponsor must fulfill all the conditions mentioned above with the exception of the 1-year waiting period. Family members can enter the territory with the applicant;

7. Beneficiary of international protection (refugee status and subsidiary protection status): If the application is made within the three months following the granting of the status, the sponsor does not have to fulfill any of the requirements relating to one year waiting period, stable, regular and sufficient resources, appropriate accommodation and health insurance established in article 69 (1) of the Immigration Law. If the application is made after the three-month period, the applicant must fulfill these conditions.

8. Unaccompanied minor, beneficiary of international protection (See answer to Q.10.a).

The main reason for not allowing family reunification to the student; pupil; trainee; volunteer; au pair; posted worker and seasonal worker categories of residence permits is that these permits are temporary in nature and their holders do not have the perspective to obtain permanent residence.

b. Does the national law of your (Member) State allow beneficiaries of subsidiary protection (BSPs) to apply for family reunification? Yes.

If yes, please elaborate below. If no application procedure is made available to BSPs, how does your (Member) State ensure that the right to family life (Art. 8, ECHR) of BSPs is respected?

Article 56 (1) of the Law of 18 December 2015 on international protection and temporary protection (hereafter Asylum Law) in accordance with article 68 a) and 69 (2) of the Immigration Law allows beneficiaries of subsidiary protection to apply for family reunification under the same conditions as beneficiaries of refugee status.

Q5. Does your (Member) State extend the scope of family reunification beyond nuclear/ core members of the family, i.e. parents, adult children, non-married partners, etc.? Yes.

If yes, does your (Member) State extend the scope of family reunification to the following family members:

- Parents? Yes.

The Immigration Law allows the family reunification of first-degree relatives in the direct ascending line of the sponsor or of his/her spouse or partner, if they are dependent on them and do not enjoy proper family support in their country of origin. Besides the core family (nuclear family), the law grants the Ministry a discretionary power to authorise a family reunification of ascendants in the first degree, who are dependent on the sponsor.

- Adult children? Yes.

The Immigration Law allows the family reunification of unmarried adult children of the sponsor and/or of his/her spouse or partner, provided that they are objectively incapable to provide for themselves due to their health condition.

- Same-sex partners who are married? Yes.

Same-sex marriages are recognised by the Luxembourgish law. Family reunification of married same sex-partners is allowed in accordance with article 143 of the Civil Code and article 70 (1) a) of the Immigration Law.

- Same-sex partners who are registered? Yes.
The Immigration Law allows the family reunification of a same-sex partner with whom the third-country national has entered into a registered partnership in accordance with amended Law of 9 July 2004 on the legal effects of certain partnerships.

Any person legally resident in Luxembourg may register a civil partnership. The future partners must be living together and be aged 18 and over.

To begin the preliminary formalities, they must present themselves to the civil registrar of their place of residence and make a personal and joint declaration. They will then be given a list of documents to provide. All documents must be in French, German or English, documents in any other language must be translated by an official translator. Foreigners may have to provide additional documents.

Documents required:

1) Identity card or passport.
2) Residence certificate established by the Municipality of the place of residence.
3) Full birth certificate (Acte de naissance intégral), less than 3 months old if supplied in Luxembourg, or less than six months old if supplied abroad.
4) A certificate of single-status (certificat de célibat) less than three months old.
5) An affidavit stating that neither of the future partners is related in any way. A template is available at the Municipality and is generally filled in and signed at the time the partnership is registered.
6) Luxembourg residents (whether or not Luxembourg nationals) have to provide a certificate declaring that they are not already in a partnership contract, issued by the Répertoire Civil – Public prosecutor office (Parquet Général) in Luxembourg. Foreigners must provide a "certificat de coutume" or a certificate from the appropriate authorities in their country of origin (usually their Embassy) stating that they are not already in a civil partnership of any kind. If either of the couple has been divorced or widowed they should supply proof in the form of a certified copy of the final divorce decree or an “acte de décès” (in the case of widowhood).

Procedure:

Once the documents have been verified by the civil registrar the declaration can be registered immediately by the civil registrar. However, it is possible to make an appointment for the declaration to take place at a set time in the room that is used for marriages.

Following the declaration each partner receives a certificate stating that they are officially registered in a partnership. The civil registrar sends a copy of the declaration to the public prosecutor office (Parquet Général) within three days.

If the partnership was concluded abroad, both parties must address a request of registration to the public prosecutor office.

- Non-married partners? No.
- ‘Dependent’ persons, i.e. persons receiving legal, financial, emotional or material support by the sponsor or by his/ her spouse/ partner (other than those mentioned above)? Yes
  If yes, please specify how the concept of dependency is defined in the relevant provisions/ practice.

Besides first-degree relatives in the direct ascending as well as unmarried adult children (see above), there is no possibility of family reunification for dependent persons.
However, the Immigration Law allows the granting of an authorisation of stay for private reasons to third-country nationals who do not meet the conditions for family reunification, but whose personal or family ties, assessed by reference to, in particular, their closeness, the length of time for which they have existed and their stability, are such that a refusal to authorise their stay would disproportionately affect their right to privacy and family life as measured against the grounds of such refusal.100

According to national stakeholders, it is not uncommon that rejected applicants for family reunification apply for this authorisation of stay.101 Nevertheless it is important to note that they have to provide proof that they have sufficient resources as defined by Grand-ducal regulation102, which makes access to such an authorisation of stay much more difficult in practice. This can be particularly difficult for beneficiaries of international protection (refugee status and subsidiary protection) who do not apply for family reunification within the three-month period after being granted the status and thus have to fulfil all the conditions established in article 69 (1). Beneficiaries of international protection benefitting of the RMG, cannot fulfil the sufficient resources threshold established in article 69 (1) 1 of the Immigration Law because the RMG is of 1348,18 €/month103 for an adult and the minimum monthly salary required for a 12-months’ period is of 1922,96/month.104

- Other (please specify, e.g. foster children, applicants in polygamous and/ or proxy marriages, etc.)?

If yes, please elaborate on each of the categories mentioned above.

Formally adopted children may apply for family reunification, if judicial proof for the adoption can be provided (i.e. in the frame of the Convention on the Protection of Children and Co-operation in respect of Intercountry Adoption of 29 May 1993).105 Foster children, for whom no formal adoption procedure has taken place, do not fall into the scope of article 70 of the Immigration Law. However, a residence permit for private reasons can be granted to a foster child if the Ministry assesses the personal ties with the sponsor as well as their closeness, the length of time for which they have existed and their stability and the fact that such refusal to authorise their stay would disproportionately affect their right to privacy and family life.106 In general, the Directorate of Immigration is cautious to avoid any risk of child abduction.107

With regard to proxy marriages, national law108 does not authorise them. In consequence, persons in such marriages may not apply for family reunification.

Applications for family reunification of spouses in the context of polygamous marriages are rejected on the basis of article 70 (3) of the Immigration Law, which states that family reunification of a spouse shall not be authorised in the case of a polygamous marriage if the sponsor already has a spouse living with him/her in Luxembourg.109 Until now, there have not been any attempts to apply for family reunification one spouse at a time. However, the Minister in charge of Immigration110 indicated that these applications will be refused on grounds of article 70 (3). The only possibility for the new spouse to be authorised to enter the territory under family reunification would be for the sponsor to divorce the first spouse and to have the second marriage legally recognised.111 The Minister was clear that under Luxembourgish Criminal Law, bigamy is a crime punished with imprisonment from 5 up to 10 years.112

Whereas no provision within the Asylum Law explicitly relates to polygamous marriages, in the event of an application for international protection by a polygamous family, solely one of the spouses will be considered the spouse, based on grounds of public security.113

Section 3: Requirements for exercising the right to family reunification [maximum 5-10 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will report on the requirements for exercising the right to family reunification (referred to in Art. 6-8 in Chapter IV of Directive 2003/EC/86). If applicable, please distinguish to what extent any of the provisions apply to certain/ all groups of migrants applying for family reunification in your (Member) State depending on the grounds of residence of the sponsor (e.g. refugee, BSP, worker,
If the provisions vary across different groups of migrants, please describe the variations.

Q6. Does your (Member) State (plan to) impose the following requirements for exercising the right to family reunification (please also indicate if exemptions can be made in individual cases based on e.g. hardship clauses):

- Accommodation suitable for the size of the family, as well as meeting health and safety standards? **Yes.**

The Immigration Law requires that the sponsor has appropriate accommodation to host the family member(s) (e.g. rental contract, proof of property ownership/title deed). This accommodation must have a floor area of at least 12 m² for the first occupant and 9 m² per additional occupant, natural light entering through windows that can be opened and closed properly and which measure at least 1/10 of the floor area, heating, running water, electricity, etc. Beneficiaries of international protection who apply for family reunification within 3 months of being granted the status do not have to comply with this requirement.

- Healthcare insurance? **Yes.**

The Immigration Law establishes that the sponsor must have health insurance cover for him/herself and the family member(s). The sponsor must join to his/her application a health insurance certificate issued by a Luxembourg or foreign social security authority and/or by a private insurance company, covering their stay in Luxembourg. Beneficiaries of international protection who apply for family reunification within 3 months of being granted the status do not have to comply with this requirement.

- Sufficient financial resources to provide for the sponsor and his/her family? **Yes.**

The Immigration Law establishes that the applicant must produce evidence showing that s/he has stable and regular resources which are sufficient to meet his/her own needs and those of his/her family members for whom s/he is financially responsible (e.g. salary slips, tax declaration), without recourse to the social aid system. In practice, the sponsor must provide proof that her/his resources are equivalent to the monthly average rate of the social minimum salary of a non-qualified worker (1922,96 € per month) for a duration of 12 months anterior to the application.

When the sponsor cannot meet this threshold, the Minister in charge of Immigration can issue a positive decision taking into consideration the favorable evolution of the economic situation of the applicant in regard to the stability of his/her employment and income, taking into consideration that s/he is the owner of the property s/he inhabits or that her or his accommodation is free of charge.

In the evaluation of the resources, the Minister in charge of Immigration takes into consideration income from salaried work or independent activity, as any other replacement income and income coming from assets of the applicant. The Minister also takes into consideration the income of the spouse who participates in the budget of the household in a stable manner.

Beneficiaries of international protection who apply for family reunification within 3 months of being granted the status do not have to comply with this requirement.

Q7. a. Does the national law of your (Member) State require TCNs to comply with any integration measures before and/or after admission? **No.**

If yes, are TCNs required to comply with the following integration measures:

- Civic integration exams? **N/A.**

If yes, please specify:

- When the civic integration exam(s) takes place (i.e. before admission, after admission, before and after admission):
- What knowledge and skills are required from applicants in order to pass the exam(s): N/A.

- If any support is provided to them during preparation (e.g. preparatory classes): N/A.

- If/ What costs are incurred by applicants: N/A.

- Language tests? No. If yes, please specify:
  - When the language test(s) takes place (i.e. before admission, after admission, before and after admission): N/A.

- What knowledge and skills are required from applicants in order to pass the test(s): N/A.

- If any support is provided to them during preparation (e.g. preparatory classes): N/A.

- If/ What costs are incurred by applicants: N/A.

- Other integration measures (please specify)? No. If yes, please specify what these measures entail and when they take place: N/A.

- If the national law of your (Member) State does not currently require TCNs to comply with any of the above measures – any planned changes? No. If yes, please provide further information below:

There are currently considerations, although at a very early stage, to require International protection seekers to comply with certain integration measures (i.e. language courses). However, these compulsory measures would in no way impact on their right of residence nor their right, in case they are eventually granted status, to apply for family reunification.129

b. Please specify if any negative consequences (e.g. refusal to issue a permit or withdrawal of the existing permit) are foreseen for family members not complying with the above-mentioned integration measures – both according to law, as well as how this is applied in practice.
See above.

**Q8.** Does your (Member) State set a **waiting period** before a sponsor’s family members can reunite with him/her? **Yes.**

If yes, how long is the waiting period? Can an application be submitted before the period has expired? Are there any exemptions granted in individual cases?

The Immigration Law requires that a third-country national who holds a residence permit valid for at least one year, who has a reasonable perspective to obtain permanent residence and who has been residing on Luxembourg territory for at least twelve months can apply for family reunification. An application cannot be submitted before the period has expired. Bill n° 6992 that is currently in the Chamber of Deputies foresees the abrogation of the 12-month residence requirement for the sponsor.

The condition of a minimal period of time of legal residence in Luxembourg does not apply in the following cases:

- the sponsor who would like to bring his/her minor children and holds the sole custody;
- the sponsor who holds a residence permit “European Blue Card”, of transferred worker, of researcher or holder of a long-term resident status in another Member State of the EU and wishes to come to Luxembourg, accompanied by his/her family that was already constituted in the first EU country. These persons can be accompanied by their spouse/partner as well as by their unmarried minor children;
- the beneficiary of international protection who introduces a family reunification application within three months of being granted the status.

**Q9.** Does the national law of your (Member) State provide for a **rejection of an application** for entry and residence of family members on grounds of public policy, public security or public health? **Yes.**

If yes, please provide data (if available) on the number of times your (Member) State has invoked this provision(s) since 2011.

Article 70 (1) of the Immigration Law foresees that an application for entry and residence of family members can be rejected based on being a threat to public policy, public security or public health. As the reason for the rejection of an application is not registered, no data is available. However, the rejection on grounds of public policy, public security or public health is rare.

**Q10. a.** In addition to any information you have already provided above, does your (Member) State apply the following provisions concerning the **more favourable family reunification rules for refugees**?

- Application and possible extension of the grace period of (minimum) three months before the requirements for exercising the right to family reunification apply? **Yes.**

  If yes, is this grace period of (minimum) three months extended and if so, for how long? **Y/N**

  For how long? **No**

  **N/A.**

- Restriction to relationships established before entry into the (Member) State? **No.**

  If yes, please specify:

  **N/A**

- Application of a wider definition of family members (going beyond parents) when it comes to UAMs? **Yes.**

  If yes, please specify:
The Immigration Law\textsuperscript{143} establishes that the Minister in charge of Immigration authorises the entry and stay, for the purposes of family reunification, of first-degree relatives in the direct ascending line of an unaccompanied minor enjoying international protection. In this case the conditions of sufficient resources and dependency are not applied.\textsuperscript{144}

Furthermore, the Immigration Law\textsuperscript{145} foresees that the minister may allow family reunification of the legal guardian or any other member of the family of an unaccompanied minor enjoying international protection, if the minor has no relatives in a direct ascending line or no such relatives can be traced.

- Have any of these family reunification rules for refugees been changed recently?? \textbf{No.}

If yes, please provide further information on these changes below:

No. In the exposition of motives of bill n° 6779 on international protection and temporary protection\textsuperscript{146} it is expressly mentioned that chapter four of the bill reproduces in its integrity the dispositions contained in articles 25 to 55 of the amended law of 5 May 2006 (abrogated Asylum law) adding that the law of 19 June 2013 adapted the content of these articles when transposing the Directive n° 2011/95/EU.\textsuperscript{147} There is also no intention of the Government to review the transposition of the directive and the content of the articles remains as established by the law of 19 June 2013.\textsuperscript{148}

\paragraph{b.} If applicable, does your (Member) State apply \textbf{similar rules for the family reunification of BSPs} as refugees, i.e. in relation to eligible family members, waiting period and requirements for family reunification? \textbf{Yes.}

If yes, please cross-refer to the information you have provided previously on the more favourable rules applicable to refugees, stating that similar rules apply to BSPs.

If no, please explain how the rules differ for BSPs referring to the different topics covered previously (e.g. eligible family members, waiting period and requirements for family reunification).

According to article 56 (1) in regards with article 1 paragraph 1 of the Law of 18 December 2015 and article 69(2) of the Immigration Law, the same rules for family reunification apply to beneficiaries of refugee status and to beneficiaries of subsidiary protection.

\textbf{Q11.} Are there any differences in the requirements to be met for exercising the right to family reunification (under Directive 2003/86/EC or national law in some cases) in comparison to a similar request governed by national law by a \textbf{(Member) State national who has not exercised his/ her free movement rights} (non-mobile EU nationals)? Overall, to what extent are these requirements for exercising the right to family reunification under national law more or less favourable than those covered by Directive 2003/86/EC?

Yes. In the case of Luxembourgish nationals, none of the requirements established by article 69 (1) of the Immigration Law apply. In this regard, the Council of State considered in its legal opinion of 20 May 2008\textsuperscript{149} that it was against article 11 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, which guarantees the constitutional right to a family, to require a Luxembourgish national to fulfill the conditions established in article 6 of the Immigration Law assimilating a Luxembourgish national to an EU citizen in this context. This position has been ratified by the Administrative Courts.\textsuperscript{150}

\textbf{Q12. a.} Please indicate any \textbf{challenges} experienced by i) sponsors and/ or family members associated with accessing the right to family reunification, and/ or ii) your (Member) State in the implementation of any of the above requirements for family reunification (e.g. based on existing studies/ evaluations/ other sources or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders) and how these can be overcome.

\textbf{Challenges experienced by the sponsors}

\begin{enumerate}[a)]
  \item Finding appropriate accommodation: Although this is a general issue in Luxembourg\textsuperscript{151}, it may be an all the more concerning factor for third country national sponsors who apply for family reunification in the frame of Article 69 (1) 2 of the Immigration Law as well as those BIP’s who file their application for family reunification
\end{enumerate}
three months after being granted international protection status (see Q.6). For both categories of applicants it represents a requirement for eligibility. All national stakeholders consulted within the frame of this study noted the difficulties in practice for these persons to be able to meet the requirements in that regard. Finding appropriate accommodation is particularly difficult for larger family household as well as third-country nationals who have residence permits for a limited duration and/or limited working contracts (which does not enable permanent resources). Furthermore, landlords tend to avoid tenants who benefit from RMG, which can for instance be the case for sponsors benefitting from international protection having applied for family reunification within the 3-month period.

b) The requirement of stable and regular resources: Third country nationals receiving minimum guaranteed income (RMG) or any other type of social aid cannot apply for family reunification (See Q.15.a.). In the case of BIP beneficiaries of the guaranteed minimum income, the latter does not prove to be sufficient in practice to meet the criteria.

Challenge experienced by the family members

The financial cost of reunifying family members: this can be a challenge for the family member and the sponsor, and can cause delays in the family reunification procedure. These challenges can occur during the application for family reunification, for instance financing legalisation and/or translation of documents, as well as after a positive decision has been issued, for instance financing the procurement of passports, a visa and/or other travel documents, the cost of the journey to the diplomatic or consular body that issues needed documents and the journey to Luxembourg. Caritas Luxembourg and the Luxembourgish Red Cross have in some cases resorted to private donations to help applicants cover the costs of family reunification.

b. Please provide any examples of proven (e.g. through studies/ evaluations) good practices that might help to overcome the above-mentioned challenges or otherwise. Please specify the source (e.g. based on existing studies/ evaluations/ other sources or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders).

There are no good practices proven through studies or evaluations that allow to overcome the challenges mentioned above. However, a good practice was identified by stakeholders:

NGOs in the field of migration and asylum inform applicants for international protection of the documentation needed for and procedure of family reunification before having been given the status of international protection. Thereby they contribute to the beneficiary’s ability to enter an application for family reunification within the 3-month period in which s/he does not have to comply with the conditions for accommodation, income and health insurance.

Q13. Is any research (conducted by relevant authorities, academics, NGOs etc.) on the following available in your (Member) State:

- Effects of the requirements for family reunification as applied in your (Member) State on the right to family reunification and integration of TCNs?
  
  No research has been conducted on this issue.

- Effects of the integration measures as applied in your (Member) State on the right to family reunification and integration of TCNs?
  
  N/A. Compulsory integration measures are not required in Luxembourg.

- Effects of the minimum age requirement as applied in your (Member) State on the prevention of forced marriages or any misuse of family reunification (e.g. marriages of convenience)?
  
  No research has been conducted on this issue.
Although no research has been conducted on the effects of the requirements for family reunification on the right to family reunification and integration of TCNs, several national stakeholders highlighted that while the sponsor awaits the realisation of the reunification, integration into the host society remains a secondary preoccupation.\textsuperscript{160}

In Luxembourg, no person aged less than 18 years can contract a valid marriage. A civil registrar may refuse to recognise the validity of a foreign marriage if, at the time the marriage was celebrated, one of the contracting parties was aged less than 18 years.\textsuperscript{161} Accordingly, a marriage so contracted is null, void and of no effect.\textsuperscript{162} The guardianship judge can lift the prohibition in case of weighty reasons taking into consideration the superior interest of the child.\textsuperscript{163} The main objective of these articles is to combat early and forced marriages.\textsuperscript{164}

The Immigration Law requires that the sponsor and the family members in the case of marriage or legal partnership must be 18 years old when filing the application for family reunification. Also, the Minister of Immigration and Asylum will not recognise a marriage celebrated abroad when one of the parties was minor at the moment of the celebration.\textsuperscript{165} In case of doubt, the Public prosecutor is asked for advice or the marriage has to be registered first at the Luxembourg municipality of residence of the sponsor.\textsuperscript{166} There are no statistics with regards to marriages contracted by minor refugee brides in the country of origin. According to the Public Prosecutor office there have been no more than three applications per year for the recognition of marriages involving minors. These numbers have not been increased by the important numbers of refugee arrivals during the last years.\textsuperscript{167}

Section 4: Submission and examination of the application for family reunification [maximum 5-10 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will report on the process for submitting and examining an application for family reunification in the (Member) States or abroad covered by Chapter III of Directive 2003/86/EC, including the procedures for verifying the fulfilment of the requirements/ measures listed in Section 3 above. You may wish to include flow chart(s) visually illustrating the application process for family reunification in your (Member) State. If applicable, please distinguish to what extent any of the provisions apply to certain/ all groups of migrants applying for family reunification in your (Member) State depending on the grounds of residence of the sponsor (e.g. refugee, BSP, worker, student, etc.). If the provisions vary across different groups of migrants, please describe the variations. Please note that emphasis should be on the application of these provisions and where applicable, relevant national case law should be provided.

Q14. Please describe the procedure(s) that apply to the sponsor or his/ her family members when an application for entry and residence for the purpose of family reunification is submitted, as follows:

a. Who is the formal party to an application for family reunification in your (Member) State: the sponsor or his/ her family members?\textsuperscript{169}

The application for an authorisation to stay for family reunification must be submitted by the family members before they enter the country.\textsuperscript{170} The sponsor can also introduce the application.\textsuperscript{171} The applicant has to provide all the required documents of the sponsor.\textsuperscript{172} The application will be declared inadmissible in case the family members are on the territory when the application is submitted.\textsuperscript{173} However, the Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum, in exceptional cases duly motivated, can accept that the family members are already on the territory at the moment the application is filed.\textsuperscript{174} The third country national may confer mandate to a third person so as to submit the application on his/her behalf. In this case, the appointed person, except for lawyers, must present a duly signed and dated mandate from the third country national. The signature must be preceded by the handwritten phrase «good for power of attorney».

These rules apply to all categories of residence permits mentioned in answer Q.4.a (See above).
b. If the sponsor’s family members must submit an application for family reunification, where can this application be submitted (e.g. consulate of the (Member) State abroad, possibility to submit the application in the (Member) State, etc.)?

Third country nationals wishing to come to Luxembourg as a family member must submit an application for a temporary authorisation to stay (on plain paper) from their country of origin. The application can be submitted:

- to the Directorate of Immigration of the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (through a legal representative in Luxembourg (i.e. attorney);
- to a Luxembourg diplomatic or consular body or to a diplomatic or consular mission representing Luxembourg in the country of origin or in the closest neighboring country if there is no representation in the country of origin.175

c. What documentary evidence is required from the applicant to confirm i) his/ her identity and ii) the family relationship?

The applicant must file the application with the following documents to prove his/her identity:

- a full copy of his or her passport, certified as true to the original;
- a birth certificate;
- an extract of the criminal record or an affidavit.

In order to prove the family relationship, the applicant must provide the following documents:

1. In case it’s the spouse or the registered partner of the sponsor:
   - a document attesting of the existence of the marriage or the registered partnership (e.g. marriage certificate, partnership declaration, family booklet);
   - a certified copy of the valid passport of the spouse/partner, in its entirety;
   - a birth certificate of the spouse/partner
   - a recent extract from the criminal records or a sworn affidavit by the spouse/partner, issued in their country of residence

2. In case it’s the descendant (minor) of the sponsor or of his/her spouse/partner:
   - a certified copy of the child's valid passport, in its entirety
   - a document attesting the family relationship with the sponsor (e.g. birth certificate of the child, family book);
   - in case of divorce (for minors only):
     - the judgment conferring the custody of the minor child to the parent living in Luxembourg and
     - if the other party has a visitation right: the notarial authorisation of the parental party living abroad to prove this party's agreement that the minor child is allowed to reside in Luxembourg (a copy of the identity document of the parental party living abroad has to be enclosed);
   - in case of joint custody (for minors only): the notarial authorisation of the parental party living abroad to prove this party's agreement that the minor child is allowed to reside in Luxembourg (a copy of the identity document of the parental party living abroad has to be enclosed);

3. In case it’s an ascendant (parent) of the sponsor or the spouse/partner:
   - a certified copy of the parent's valid passport, in its entirety
• a document attesting of the family relationship (e.g. a birth certificate of the sponsor or the sponsor’s spouse/partner)
• a document attesting of the civil status and the family situation of the ascendant as well as proof that he/she is deprived of the necessary family support in the country of origin (e.g. family booklet, any other equivalent document issued by the competent authorities of the country of origin);
• a proof that s/he is depending on the sponsor before filing the family reunification application (i.e. bank statements which prove regular money transfer to the first-degree ascendant)
• a document stating the financial situation of the family member in his/her country of origin (i.e. proof of salary, pension, property, etc.)\footnote{176}

In case of beneficiaries of international protection, the law foresees that they may prove family bonds by every type of document if they cannot provide official documents.\footnote{177} Thus, the Directorate of Immigration may accept, in principle, all types of documents that can serve to establish the identity and/or nationality of the family member, and/or that can prove the veracity of the applicant’s statements. I.e. official travel documents such as passport and identity cards, birth certificates, marriage licenses, birth and divorce certificates, driver’s license, military record, municipal identification, qualification certificates, journal extracts (articles or photos claiming the identity of the applicant and the relationship with the family member).

In principle, official identity documents and travel documents prevail over other administrative documents, i.e. driver’s license.\footnote{178}

d. What methods of investigation are employed by the competent authorities in your (Member) State in the absence of (reliable) documentation?

See answers to Q.14.c and Q.15

To obtain proof of the existence of family relationships, the minister or the agent of the diplomatic or consular post representing the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in the country of origin of the family member may carry out interviews with the sponsor or family members and any examination or investigation considered appropriate.\footnote{179}

The law does not foresee DNA testing, but if there are no other means to prove the family ties, the Directorate of Immigration may suggest to the sponsor to undergo a DNA test to prove the family ties, especially for establishing paternity.\footnote{180}

It should be noted that the national authorities also take into account the information provided by the sponsor during his/her interview within the international protection procedure, in order to verify the identity and family relationships of beneficiaries of international protection and their family members.\footnote{181}

Q15. Please describe the procedure(s) that apply to family members when an application for entry and residence for the purpose of family reunification is submitted, as follows:

a. What is the procedure in place in your (Member) State to verify that any extended family members have fulfilled the requirements for family reunification (e.g. dependency)? At what stage(s) of the examination procedure is this verified?

Are there any exemptions from fulfilling these conditions and if yes, on what grounds are they granted?

In cases of dependency the Immigration law requires that the sponsor proves that the family members (first-degree ascendants) are dependent of the sponsor and that they do not enjoy proper family support in their country of origin.\footnote{182} In practice, the sponsor must prove that s/he has been sending money (e.g. wire transfers via a bank or Western Union) in a continuous manner for a certain period of time. Also, the sponsor must prove that the family member does not have any financial support in the country of origin and does not have sufficient resources to support himself/herself.\footnote{183}

In the case of adult unmarried children of the sponsor or of his/her spouse or partner the sponsor must prove that the family member is objectively unable to provide for their own needs on account of his/her state of health.\footnote{184} In this case, it is required that the sponsor provides medical certificates which prove that the family member is
incapable to provide for his/her own needs because of his/her health condition and that s/he depends on the sponsor or spouse.

There are no exemptions from fulfilling these conditions because the burden of proof lies with the applicant.

b. Please describe the procedure in place in your (Member) State to verify that the following requirements for family reunification have been fulfilled:

- Please specify how the health and safety standards, as well as the size of the accommodation are determined as suitable in practice:

The applicant must join the lease agreement or a document of the land register proving that s/he has a proper accommodation in order to receive the family members. The Directorate of Immigration can verify with the land register if the property fulfils the conditions (see answer to Q.4.a). If there is any doubt, the Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum can request additional information and request to the Grand Ducal police to conduct a verification of the property.¹⁸⁵

- Please specify the conditions under which sponsors have access to healthcare insurance (e.g. by having employment/ self-employment or is this access automatic)?

The sponsor must prove that s/he has a health insurance cover for himself/herself and the family member(s) (health insurance certificate covering their stay in Luxembourg issued by a Luxembourg or foreign social security authority and/or by a private insurance company). In Luxembourg any legally resident third-country national who is a salaried worker or independent worker is insured by the National Health Fund automatically (it is a contributory system¹⁸⁶).

- Please specify the following in relation to the minimum income requirement sponsors must meet in your (Member) State:

  - The amount of the minimum income requirement in the relevant currency and year:

As mentioned above (Q.6.), the applicant must produce evidence showing that s/he has stable and regular resources which are sufficient to meet her/his own needs and those of her/his family members for whom s/he is financially responsible, without recourse to the social aid system. In practice, the sponsor must provide proof that her/his resources are equivalent to the monthly average rate of the social minimum salary of a non-qualified worker (1922,96 € per month) for a duration of 12 months anterior to the application.¹⁸⁷ The Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum, in his appreciation of the financial resources, takes into account the income coming from a salaried or independent activity, including replacement income (i.e. unemployment benefits, compensatory income coming from work-related accident, guaranteed minimum income and severely disabled persons income¹⁸⁸) as well as any permanent income (i.e. rent, capital income, etc.). Other sources of income of the sponsor as well as any resources of the spouse of the sponsor which contributes steadily to the family budget are also taken into account.¹⁸⁹

  - If your (Member) State sets a different income requirement depending on the type of family member being reunited (e.g. minor children):

    No.

  - The reference period over which this requirement is considered:

    The reference period covers the 12 months preceding the filing of the application.¹⁹⁰

  - How any past/ future income of the sponsor is evaluated in practice:
Usually the sponsor must prove his/her income through salary slips, bank statements, income tax returns. If the applicant is a salaried worker, ICT or highly qualified worker, the sponsor must join his/her work contract. The Immigration Law authorises the Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum to carry out checks and controls. He may access the following databases:

(a) the general register of natural and legal persons;

(b) the file in respect of visa applicants, operated on behalf of the Passports, Visas and Legalisations Office of the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs;

(c) the file in respect of business permits, operated on behalf of the Minister responsible for small and medium-sized enterprises;

(d) the file in respect of affiliations of salaried workers, self-employed persons and employers, managed by the Centre commun de la sécurité sociale [Joint Social Security Centre].

(e) the file in respect of registered jobseekers and the file in respect of notices of vacant posts, managed by the Agence pour le développement de l’emploi [Agency for the Development of Employment];

(f) the file in respect of recipients of the guaranteed minimum income, managed respectively by the Fonds national de solidarité [National Solidarity Fund] and the Service national d’action sociale [National Social Action Service].

- Whether any exemption grounds apply and to what extent non-compliance has consequences for the right to family reunification:

The law foresees that in case the resources of the sponsor do not reach the established threshold, the Minister can grant a positive decision taking into account the evolution of the economic situation of the sponsor, especially in regards to the stability of his/her employment and his/her income or in regards to the fact that s/he is owner of the property or that s/he benefits of it free of charge.

- At what stage(s) of the examination procedure are the above requirements verified?

After the application is filed and considered completed by the Directorate of Immigration, the different requirements are verified.

c. Please describe the procedure in place in your (Member) State to ensure integration measures have been complied with, for example, if an application form for civic integration exam(s)/language test(s) must be submitted to the authorities, etc. Please specify what exemption grounds apply and to what extent non-compliance has consequences for the right to family reunification.

N/A.

d. If the above conditions are not (completely) fulfilled, how does your (Member) State guarantee that individual circumstances are taken into account (e.g. nature and solidity of the person’s family relationship)?

N/A.

e. What is the procedure in place in your (Member) State to verify whether or not the family member(s) constitute a threat to public policy, public security or public health?

Once the application is completed the complete file is transmitted to an agent in the Directorate of Immigration who will begin the examination of the application. The security checks are conducted by the Directorate of Immigration using the SIS database, the criminal records and by consulting duly habilitated authorities if needed.

There is no definition on which actions constitute a danger to the community (public order). The Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum has a discretionary power of appreciation in this issue, on a case by case basis.
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Even though there is no definition of “public order” (public policy) in the Asylum Law nor in the Immigration Law, the concept of “public order” has been interpreted by the Criminal Courts and the European Court of Justice (CJEU). The Court of Appeal establishes that a trouble to public order requires that criminal offences must be sanctioned in the country where the offence was committed, meaning that the criminal offence must be committed in Luxembourg. In this context, serious crimes can be considered (e.g., fraud, grand theft, etc.).

There is no definition of state security. The threat is analysed on a case by case basis by the Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum who has wide discretion in the appreciation. Actions that can be considered as a threat to national security are the criminal offences established in articles 101 to 136 of the Criminal Code:

a. Threats and complots against the Grand Duke and the grand ducal family as well as against the Government;
b. Threats to individuals benefiting of international protection (article 112-1);
c. Crimes committed against the external security of the State (article 113 to 123; eg. Treason, collaboration with an external power to make war against the Grand Duchy, espionage, providing military intelligence on military installations, etc.)
d. Crimes committed against the internal security of the State (articles 124 to 135; eg. To stir civil war, killing, destroying or looting of municipalities or villages, raise a militia without the previous authorisation of the Government, taking control of property of the State, etc.)
e. Terrorist acts (articles 135-1 to 135-17)
f. Serious violations of international humanitarian law

The threat to public health can only be detected once the family member has arrived in the territory, with the exception of the individual showing evident signs of a serious and infectious disease. Before obtaining the residence permit the family member has to pass a medical test, which has to be practiced by a certified physician in Luxembourg.

f. How does your (Member) State define the term ‘minor child’ and how are the best interests of the child taken into account during the examination of the application for family reunification?

The Civil Code defines a minor as an individual of any sex below the age of 18 years. The Asylum law defines a “minor” as a third-country national or stateless person below the age of 18 years. The Immigration law does not define the term “minor child” but the definition of the Civil Code applies.

The ‘best interest of the child’ in regards to family reunification is applied in accordance with the Convention of New York and the European Court of Justice decision WAGNER AND J.M.W.L. v. LUXEMBOURG that establishes:

"119. According to the principles set out by the Court in its case-law, where the existence of a family tie with a child has been established, the State must act in a manner calculated to enable that tie to be developed and establish legal safeguards that render possible the child's integration in his family (see, mutatis mutandis, Kroon and Others v. the Netherlands, judgment of 27 October 1994, Series A no. 297-C, § 32).

120. The Court considers that the positive obligations that Article 8 lays on the Contracting States in this matter must be interpreted in the light of the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989 (see, mutatis mutandis, Maire v. Portugal, no. 48206/99, § 72, ECHR 2003-VII). ...

133. Bearing in mind that the best interests of the child are paramount in such a case (see, mutatis mutandis, Maire, cited above, § 77), the Court considers that the Luxembourg courts could not reasonably disregard the legal status validly created abroad and corresponding to a family life within the meaning of Article 8 of the Convention. However, the national authorities refused to recognise that situation, making the Luxembourg conflict rules take precedence over the social reality and the situation of the persons concerned in order to apply the limits which Luxembourg law places on full adoption. ...

Since then, the Luxembourg authorities and the Luxembourg courts have applied the above mentioned decision, especially taking into consideration the ties between the child and the sponsor and trying not to interfere with
g. Please describe what is involved in an assessment for family reunification where children are concerned, for example, DNA testing, etc. At what stage(s) of the examination procedure is this assessed?

Family ties between the sponsor and the child can be proved by documentary evidence. This lacking, they will be established by any means possible. The law does not foresee DNA testing but if there are no other means to prove the family ties, the Directorate of Immigration may suggest to the sponsor to undergo a DNA test to prove the family ties.

Q16. Taking the different steps above into account, what is the duration of the procedure deciding on an application for family reunification in your (Member) State – both according to law and in practice:

- Legal time limit for deciding upon an application (if any)?

The legal time limit for deciding a family reunification application is of 9 months from the moment the file is considered complete. However, in exceptional circumstances this legal time limitation can be extended.

- Average duration of the procedure in practice?

The procedure of decision officially starts from the moment the application has been completed; the time limit of 9 months applies from this moment onwards.

In practice, the average duration of the procedure is between one and three months from the moment the file has been completed. Collecting the documents necessary to complete the file can in some cases be a lengthy process and is considered a challenge (see Q.17.a)

- Have any specific measures been taken by your (Member) State to shorten processing times?

When an applicant for family reunification has submitted his or her file to the Directorate of Immigration, the submitted documents are examined upon receipt, even if the file is not yet complete.

Q17. a. Please indicate any challenges experienced by i) sponsors and/ or family members throughout the above-mentioned procedure(s), and/ or ii) your (Member) State in the implementation of the examination procedure (e.g. based on existing studies/ evaluations or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders) and how these can be overcome.

According to national stakeholders, the provision of proof of identity and family links is a major challenge that family members of beneficiaries of international protection face. The inability to provide documentation can be caused by the difficult situation in the country of origin, or the differing administrative practices and/or lack of cooperation of institutions in the country of origin. Applicants for family reunification are free to take a DNA test. Administrative Courts consider DNA testing a legal solution, especially since the burden of proof is on the applicant when the family link is not otherwise documented. The Directorate of Immigration accepts DNA results as proof when the process is framed and supervised by credible partners (eg. Via a Belgium embassy). However, since DNA testing is not foreseen in the Law, the Directorate cannot demand a test.

Providing proof of dependency can be a challenge, particularly for beneficiaries of international protection having applied for the status as UAMs, but having reached adulthood during the period of examination of their file. Their parents will not be eligible for family reunification unless proof of dependency can be established. However, the Minister for Immigration and Asylum also takes into account the principle foreseen in article 8 of the EHCR and the best interest of the child when taking a decision.

Luxembourg has only a restricted number of diplomatic representations abroad. In order to file the applications and to get the required visa, the family member must present him/herself at one of the diplomatic missions of another Member State, which represents Luxembourg’s interest in the country of origin. It is very difficult to
obtain information or make an evaluation in situ. However, applications can also be introduced directly to the Directorate of Immigration. 

Challenges relating to income and accommodation requirements are outlined in the answer to Q.12.a.

b. Please provide any examples of proven (e.g. through studies/ evaluations) good practices that might help to overcome the above-mentioned challenges or otherwise. Please specify the source (e.g. based on existing studies/ evaluations/ other sources or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders).

There are no good practices proven in studies or evaluations that might help to overcome challenges of family reunification. However, a few good practices have been identified by stakeholders:

a. Luxembourg opted for a strict transposition of Article 12 (1) of the Directive 2003/86/EC providing more favourable conditions to refugees only in a limited time period of three months. However, in practice, if the applicant can only produce commencement of proof of the existence of family links during the first three months, the application will, in principle, be analysed according to article 69 (2) of the Immigration Law. This practice enables beneficiaries to submit an application within the 3-month period while allowing them to finalise their application after the deadline of three months has passed.

b. Family members of beneficiaries of international protection who cannot obtain a travel document can be granted a «laisser-passer», if they can provide some proof of identity. UNHCR as well as different national stakeholders welcomed this practice as an advance facilitating family members’ ability to join their sponsor. UNHCR also received this practice positively, indicating that the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg thereby contributes in a significant manner to facilitating the arrival of resettled refugees and their family members on its territory in the context of family reunification. The first experiences have taken place with the resettlement of Syrians in Turkey.

c. In some cases, tracing of family members to be reunified may prove to be difficult. ‘Restoring Family Links’ (Service de Rétablissement des Liens Familiaux) is a service provided by the Luxembourgish Red Cross that can help migrants and refugees with tracking family members abroad. When the Luxembourgish Red Cross receives a request for tracing, it will launch the search by using its international network of national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies or by contacting the International Committee of the Red Cross. The latter is generally contacted for a search in a country affected by war or by internal conflict. Applicants for international protection who wish to trace a family member can make a request for tracing from the moment they have applied for international protection (refugee or subsidiary protection status). The Luxembourgish Red Cross informs the individual having applied for family tracing of the results of its investigation.

Section 5: Access to rights following family reunification [maximum 5 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will provide a comparative overview of the rights that follow on from family reunification in the (Member) States, notably access to education, employment, vocational guidance and training, and right to apply for autonomous right of residence. The aim of this section is to report on measures available specifically to persons admitted for the purpose of family reunification and not duplicate information covered in other EMN studies on general integration measures. If applicable, please distinguish to what extent any of the provisions apply to family members of persons belonging to all groups of migrants, or only certain groups (e.g. family members of refugees, BSPs, workers, students, etc.). If the provisions vary for family members of persons belonging to different groups of migrants, please describe the variations.

Q18. Are family members entitled (in the same way as the sponsor) to access the following rights in your (Member) State (please also comment on any planned changes in the national legislation/ policy/ practice):

If yes, please indicate whether any special measures to support access to education are available specifically to family members, e.g. language assistance, guidance regarding the national education system, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family members who come to Luxembourg under family reunification have access to education and orientation from the moment that the residence permit is issued.238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every child living in Luxembourg and having reached the age of four before 1st September must attend school. This obligation, extending over twelve consecutive years, exists for nationals and foreigners, regardless of the status of the child’s parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While children aged under 12 are enrolled within the school services of their municipality of residence, respectively at the secretariat of the municipality, children of migrants aged between 12 and 18 years apply at the Cellule d’accueil scolaire pour élèves nouveaux arrivants (CASNA)239 in order to obtain an orientation interview as well as a test that assesses the child’s scholastic aptitude.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly arrived children of primary school age are generally speaking enrolled in a ‘homeroom’ class (classe d’attache) in a cycle that corresponds to their age and their preceding school career. However, there are intensive German, French and Luxembourgish courses in the context of a reception course several times per week outside of the framework of the « homeroom class ».241 There are furthermore reception classes that familiarise the student with the languages used in the Luxembourgish educational system.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary and vocational secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly arrived foreign pupils who have sufficient knowledge of the required vehicular languages are integrated into regular classes. However, most newly arrived pupils do not master any of the vehicular languages and cannot be integrated into regular or francophone classes.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classes with specific linguistic regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classes with a specific linguistic regime (classes à régime linguistique spécifique- RLS) that exist in the medium and higher cycle of vocational secondary school do not solely cater to newly-arrived pupils. However, they are also used in this situation. The RLS classes allow pupils who fill all admission criteria for a certain study track but do not speak enough German (the language in which the track is generally taught) to enter the track and follow the courses in French.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linguistic support for foreign language pupils and their parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of National Education, Childhood and Youth has expanded its pool of intercultural mediators. The mediators assist teachers in the reception of and interactions with students and parents.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are currently 55 mediators who speak 27 languages in total.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for intercultural mediation are on the rise: for the academic year 2014-2015, 3,148 requests were made, of which 1,372 (43,6%) were for Portuguese and 779 (24,8%) for Serbo-Croat. In 2013-2014, 2,893 requests were made, of which 1,288 (44,5%) for Portuguese and 909 (31,4%) for Serbo-Croat. 2012-2013, 2,821 requests were made, of which 1,441 (51,1%) in Portuguese and 855 (30,3%) in Serbo-Croat.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for teachers of foreign pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A number of initiatives were taken and tools were created in order to better prepare teaching staff for the specific challenges posed by the heterogeneity of Luxembourg’s school population. Over the course of 2015, publications were published on topics such as ‘Welcome and integrate: guide for teachers welcoming newly-arrived pupils’, ‘orientation of recently-arrived pupils’, ‘international teaching, international schooling’. Other initiatives taken include the conception of a common test at the national level for reception classes, and the launch of the translation of teaching manuals into French. Furthermore, teaching staff were able to benefit from targeted training covering a range of issues: ‘reception of applicants for international protection: administrative procedures, social care and integration into school’, ‘the management of pupils’ heterogeneity: differentiation, didactic specialised methods, development of autonomous learning’, ‘linguistic development and language learning of
children aged 3 to 6 in multilingual and plurilingual contexts’ and ‘consistent language learning in secondary school – an approach to promote educational competences of multilingual pupils’.  

- Language assistance:

As other foreigners, family members also have access to the Welcome and Integration Contract (CAI). The CAI is offered to any foreigner of at least 16 years of age, who resides legally on the territory of Luxembourg and wishes to remain on a permanent basis. It is aimed as much at European Union citizens as at third-country nationals; at new arrivals as well as at people, who have been living in Luxembourg for many years.

The general goal is the integration of the target population into the Luxembourgish society.

- Improvement of language proficiency;

The aim is to enable the signatory of the CAI to reach at least Basic User Level A.1.1 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in one or more of the three administrative languages of Luxembourg – i.e. Luxembourgish, French, or German.

- Provision of information and civic orientation;

The CAI provides a 6-hour citizenship training course and information on daily life in Luxembourg during an orientation day. Besides the language training an orientation day, organised at least twice a year, takes place during half a day at a weekend. It includes various partners and is aimed at enabling the signatory candidate to have better knowledge of Luxembourg’s official establishments and organisations, in a casual atmosphere. The citizenship training course aims to provide an insight on integration and on the basic conditions of a harmonious cohabitation in a pluralistic country as well as on the history of Luxembourg, its political organization, and its values and customs. There are special courses for illiterate persons.

The program is stately funded. The participation at the orientation day and the citizenship training are free of charge. The linguistic courses are at reduced rates (at the moment the price for the person who signs the CAI is 5 Euros /10 Euros per course depending on the organiser). This equals with 2 to 5% of the regular price of such courses. Language courses are offered under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, which has within its responsibilities adult and continuous education. This is implemented through contracted providers, who have an agreement with the Department of Adult Education of the Ministry of National Education.

b. Access to employment and self-employed activity? Yes.

If yes, please specify whether the access available to family members is limited in any way, for example, if such access is restricted for up to 1 year and/ or limited to a maximum number of days per year, if this right is automatic or conditional upon obtaining a work permit, etc.

Third-country nationals, family members of a Luxembourgish national and/or and EU/EEA citizen can work without previously obtaining a working permit and without restrictions of economic sector or profession (except the profession which requires the exercise of public force).

Third-country nationals, family members of a third-country national. There is a different procedure when the family member accesses the labour market as an accessory activity as family member that when s/he requests a residence permit as a salaried worker as main activity

a) third-country national holding a residence permit for family members, who wish to carry out a salaried activity on an ancillary basis: A work permit is required for the third-country national before starting work. The application for a work permit must be submitted by the third-country national. However, they may appoint a third party, such as the future employer, to carry out the necessary procedures.

In case the family member resides in Luxembourg for less than one year when the application is submitted, it will be submitted to the labour market test.

In case the person resides in Luxembourg for more than one year at the moment of the application, the labour market test is not required, but the employer must declare the post vacancy before considering the recruitment of the person. The employer must sign a contract with the third-country national. The
contract may include a let-out clause specifying that the employment contract will not take effect until the
work permit has been obtained. The employer must provide proof of the vacant position declaration to
the third-country national, who must attach it to their work permit application.

b) third-country nationals holders of a “family member” residence permit who wish to carry out paid
employment or self-employment as their main activity must apply for a salaried worker residence permit
or for an independent worker residence permit.

Family members must apply for a residence permit which allow them to work in Luxembourg according to the
requirements established for salaried workers\(^\text{253}\), independent workers\(^\text{254}\) or highly qualified workers.\(^\text{255}\)

The access of family members to the labour market is subject to certain conditions during the first year of residence
(it is not a waiting period) after the family reunification. If the family member applies for an authorisation as a
salaried worker, s/he can have access to the labour market but is subject to a labour market test\(^\text{256}\) during the
first year of residence.\(^\text{257}\)

During the first year of his/her legal employment on the territory, the family member holding a “salaried worker”
residence permit shall have access to the labour market, limited to a single sector and a single occupation with
any employer.\(^\text{258}\)

Another possibility is that the spouse can apply as a self-employed worker if s/he fulfils the required conditions.\(^\text{259}\)

If the third-country national family member fulfils the conditions of a highly qualified worker, s/he will not be
subject to the labour market test\(^\text{260}\) and will have immediate access to the labour market.

c. **Access to vocational guidance and training** Yes.

If yes, please describe what the access to vocational guidance and training entails, for example, whether special
guidance and training programmes are provided to family members or whether they have access to the general
measures.

Family members have access to the generally available vocational training, lifelong learning and professional
retraining from the moment their residence permit is issued.\(^\text{261}\)

d. **Right to apply for autonomous right of residence** independent of that of the sponsor (also in case of
dissolution of family ties)? Yes.

If yes, please specify if the access to this right differs depending on the kind of permit the family member receives.

A third-country national holding a ‘family member’ residence permit can be issued an autonomous residence
permit\(^\text{262}\), independent of that of the sponsor in as far as his or her permit as a “family member” was issued for
family reunification reasons.\(^\text{263}\)

It can be granted, on request, to the spouse, unmarried partner or child who has reached majority, and where appropriate to the first degree ascendant or dependant adult child, who has resided in the territory for five years
or whose relationship has suffered a breakdown of cohabitation resulting from:

(a) the death of the sponsor or divorce, marriage annulment or breakdown of the partnership occurring at least
three years after the authorisation to stay was granted by virtue of family reunification, or

(b) particularly difficult circumstances, for instance when cohabitation has been broken off on account of acts of domestic violence.

e. **Any other rights granted to family members in your (Member) State**, for example, healthcare, recourse
to public funds, possibility for family members to apply for long-term residence status or naturalisation, etc.? Yes.

If yes, please specify what such access entails in practice in your (Member) State.
Healthcare: In Luxembourg the sponsor must have a health insurance in order to apply as a sponsor for family reunification (see above). As the sponsor has also to fulfil the sufficient resources requirement and seen that the Luxembourgish social security system is based on a contributory system, the family member of a salaried worker, highly qualified worker or independent worker is immediately covered by the healthcare of the sponsor.

Social assistance: A third-country national family member will be entitled to apply for the Guaranteed Minimum Income (RMG) if the applicant fulfils the requirements established in article 2 (1) or 2(2) of the amended law of 29 April 1999 on the creation of a right to Guaranteed minimum income.

The third-country national is entitled to RMG if:

a) s/he has resided in Luxembourg for at least 5 years in the last 20 years;264
b) s/he is at least 25 years old,
c) s/he has an income below the threshold established by the law; and
d) s/he is prepared to exhaust all possibilities not yet used in Luxembourgish or foreign law in order to improve his or her financial situation. 265

The third country national has to have a valid residence permit. This means that it can be a fixed-term residence permit (salaried worker, self-employed, family member, and researcher) or a long-term residence permit. The condition of continued residence is not needed.

Social aid: In Luxembourg social aid is a right which allows any legal resident or his/her family to live with human dignity.266 It guarantees the people in need the access to goods and services adapted to their particular situation so to allow them to acquire or maintain their autonomy.267 This palliative, curative or preventive aid is based on a social support services.268 However, persons who have obtained an authorisation of stay following an engagement of financial responsibility of a sponsor are excluded from social aid.269 Nevertheless, if the sponsor is in precarious situation, the family can benefit from social aid.

Long-term residence status: Family members who have resided legally in the territory for at least five years are entitled to apply for the long-term residence if they fulfil the requirements of article 81 of the Immigration law.

Citizenship: Family members have the right to apply for nationality if they fulfil the following requirements:

1. Be at least 18 years old;
2. Provide evidence of a having resided in Luxembourg for a minimum of 7 years. This is considered the appropriate period for ensuring that the applicant is sufficiently integrated in Luxembourgish society;
3. Provide proof of a sufficient active and passive level of at least one of the three languages (French, German, Luxembourgish) and have passed an evaluation test in spoken Luxembourgish (oral comprehension and oral expression);
4. Having followed three citizenship courses, enabling applicants to acquire knowledge relating to Luxembourg institutions and fundamental rights;
5. Provide evidence of sufficient guarantees of good repute: establishment of objective criteria, making it possible to assess whether the applicant provides a sufficient guarantee of good repute. This condition grants power to the Minister of Justice to suspend the naturalisation application in the event of a judicial criminal proceeding.270

Q19. Are family members of refugees and/ or BSPs granted refugee/ BSP status in their own right or a ‘derived’ permit (from that of the sponsor)? Please clarify how the type of permit issued differs in terms of its validity and rights attached to it. If possible, please also provide information on the cost of the permit.

Family members of beneficiaries of international protection derive their rights from the status of the sponsor.271 The Asylum law establishes that the Minister in charge of Asylum and Immigration shall ensure that family members of a beneficiary of international protection who do not individually qualify for such protection are entitled...
Q20. a. Do any conditions apply to sponsors and/or family members after admission for the purpose of family reunification in your (Member) State? Yes.

If yes:

- At which stage(s) after admission is examined whether these conditions have been fulfilled?

The conditions will be examined when the renewal of the family member’s residence permit is examined. The conditions that apply are those required during the first issuance of the residence permit.\(^{273}\)

In case there is a withdrawal or refusal to renew the residence permit of the family member or the sponsor, the Minister in charge of Immigration and Asylum takes into account the nature and solidity of the family relationships, of the duration of the stay on the territory and of the degree of integration into Luxembourg society, as well as the existence of family, cultural and social ties with the country of origin when renewing or withdrawing the residence permit.\(^{274}\)

- Does not fulfilling one of these conditions constitute a ground for non-renewal or withdrawal of the residence permit?\(^{275}\) Yes.

- If yes, how are individual circumstances and interests\(^{276}\) taken into account?

Yes. See above (Q.20.a)

- If no, what are the consequences of not fulfilling the conditions (e.g. obligation to pay a fine, exclusion from more favourable residence permits)?

N/A

Q21. a. Please indicate any challenges experienced by family members in your (Member) State with regard to accessing the above-mentioned rights (e.g. based on existing studies/evaluations or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders) and how these can be overcome.

One national stakeholder noted that the family reunification of teenage children joining a parent sponsor can lead to conflictual situations within the family, behavioural problems and issues in school, as the teenagers lack support in the country of origin preparing them for the significant changes engendered by family reunification.\(^{277}\)

b. Please provide any examples of proven (e.g. through studies/evaluations) good practices with regard to the provision of education/access to the labour market and vocational guidance and training/right to autonomous residence for family members in your (Member) State/etc. Please specify the source (e.g. based on existing studies/evaluations/other sources or information received from relevant authorities and stakeholders).

As no measures tailored to family members exist, no good practices can be established.

Section 6: National and international case law [maximum 1 page]

Q22. Has the following CJEU/ECtHR case law led to any changes in policy and/or practice in family reunification in your (Member) State:

- **CJEU - C-540/03 European Parliament v Council of the European Union**;
- **CJEU - C-558/14 Khachab v Subdelegación del Gobierno en Álava**;
- **CJEU - C-153/14, Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken v K and A**;
European Court of Human Rights:

- Wagner and J.M.W.L. v. Luxembourg, No. 76420/01, 28 September 2007

Facts: Under an enforceable Peruvian judgment Ms Wagner, a national of Luxembourg, legally adopted a three-year-old girl in Peru who had been declared abandoned. The applicants brought a civil action to have the Peruvian judgment declared enforceable in Luxembourg for purposes, in particular, of the child's civil registration, acquisition of Luxembourg nationality (she still had Peruvian nationality) and permanent residence in Luxembourg.

The Luxembourgish Court rejected the request on the ground that the Peruvian full adoption judgment had been in contradiction with the laws of Luxembourg, which were applicable under the conflict-of-law rule enshrined in the Civil Code and which prohibited full adoption by a single person. The applicants appealed. Their appeal was declared unfounded, on the ground that the Court had rightly held that the Peruvian decision was in contradiction with Luxembourg legislation on conflict of laws, under which conditions of adoption were governed by the law of the country of which the adopter was a national, which in Luxembourg restricted full adoption to married couples. The Court of Cassation confirmed the decision.

This judgment addressed two major issues:

1. Discrimination: The issue was whether the interference of the State had been “necessary in a democratic society”. A broad consensus existed in the Council of Europe on the issue of adoption by unmarried persons, which was permitted without further restrictions in most of the member States. Full adoption severed a child's links with its birth family and opened the way to full and complete integration into the new family, and the limits placed on it in Luxembourg law were meant to protect the interests of the adopted child. In this case, however, as the second applicant had been declared abandoned and placed in an orphanage in Peru, it would have been in the higher interest of the child not to refuse to enforce the Peruvian adoption judgment.

Since the Luxembourg Courts had not officially acknowledged the legal existence of family ties created by the full adoption granted in Peru, those ties could not take full effect in Luxembourg. As the child's best interests had to take precedence in cases of that kind, the Luxembourg Courts could not reasonably disregard the legal status which had been created on a valid basis in Peru and which corresponded to family life within the meaning of Article 8.

2. Best interest of the child: Ms Wagner had behaved as the child's mother in every respect since the Peruvian adoption judgment, so “family ties” existed de facto between them. The refusal to declare the Peruvian judgment enforceable – which stemmed from the absence of provisions in Luxembourg law enabling a single person to be granted full adoption of a child – amounted to “interference” with the applicants' right to respect for their family life. The aim had been to protect the “health or morals” and the “rights and freedoms” of the child.

In Luxembourg, it had been the practice to automatically recognise Peruvian judgments granting full adoption (several single women had been able to register the judgment without applying for an enforcement order). On arrival in Luxembourg, the applicants had thus been entitled to expect that the Peruvian judgment would be registered. However, the practice of registering judgments had been suddenly abandoned and their case had been
submitted to the judicial authorities. In refusing to declare the judgment enforceable those authorities had let the conflict-of-law rule take precedence over the social reality and the situation of the persons concerned.

European Court of Justice:


The court concluded that "Article 3(1) of Directive 2004/38 must be interpreted as meaning that a national of a non-member country who is the spouse of a Union citizen residing in a Member State whose nationality he does not possess and who accompanies or joins that Union citizen benefits from the provisions of that directive, irrespective of when and where their marriage took place and of how the national of a non-member country entered the host Member State."

This judgment not only changes the outcome in a case before the First instance Administrative Court, 2nd Chamber, n° 23254a of 17 December 2008, but also the policy on family reunification of family members of "non-mobile" EU citizens, namely EU citizens who reside in a MS of which they do not have the nationality and who previously did not exercise their right of free movement.


This case was a request for a preliminary ruling from the Luxembourg Administrative Court by decision of 16 February 2012. The Court concluded that articles 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) “… do not preclude a Member State from refusing to allow a third-country national to reside in its territory, where that third-country national has sole responsibility for her minor children who are citizens of the European Union, and who have resided with her in that Member State since their birth, without possessing the nationality of that Member State and making use of their right to freedom of movement, in so far as those Union citizens do not satisfy the conditions set out in Directive 2004/38/EC … or such a refusal does not deprive those citizens of effective enjoyment of the substance of the rights conferred by virtue of the status of European Union citizenship, a matter which is to be determined by the referring court.”

- CJUE- C-87/12 – Ymegara v. Luxembourg of 8 May 2013.

This case was a request for a preliminary ruling from the Luxembourg Administrative Court by decision of 16 February 2012. In this case the Court ruled that: “Article 20 TFEU must be interpreted as not precluding a Member State from refusing to allow a third-country national to reside in its territory, where that third-country national wishes to reside with a family member who is a European Union citizen residing in the Member State of which he holds the nationality and has never exercised his right of freedom of movement as a Union citizen, provided such refusal does not lead, for the Union citizen concerned, to the denial of the genuine enjoyment of the substance of the rights conferred by virtue of his status as a Union citizen.”

These two last cases address issues of family reunification related to EU citizenship.

**Q23.** Has any national case law led to changes in policy and/ or practice in family reunification in your (Member) State since 2011 onwards? Y/ N

If yes, please briefly describe the changes brought about by this case law. *(For example, in 2013 the Belgian Constitutional Court held that the differentiation of requirements for family reunification between refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection is unlawful, hence the latter were exempted from the condition of sufficient income even after the period of one year when the sponsor is joined by his/ her minor children. As well, in 2015, the Slovenian Constitutional Court held that in specific factual circumstances the scope of family life should include non-nuclear family members who perform a similar or same function as the nuclear family, allowing for an individual examination of specific circumstances and leading to an amendment of the national legislation on family reunification.)*
No. The Judgment of the Administrative Court, n° 28952CA of 11 July 2013 following the decision of the CJEU C-87/12 ratifies that the sponsor must prove the family links and the financial dependency of his parents in order to grant family reunification.

Section 7: Overview of the international and EU legislative framework on family reunification (Synthesis Report) [maximum 3 pages]

This section of the Synthesis Report will briefly outline the EU legal framework guiding national legislation on family reunification. It will provide a mapping of the substantive and procedural provisions in the EU acquis that regulate family reunification. The section will also highlight how the EU acquis relates to the broader international legal framework in this area.

Section 8: Conclusions (Synthesis Report) [maximum 3 pages]

The Synthesis Report will outline the main findings of the Study and present conclusions relevant for policymakers at national and EU level. Member States should include any overall conclusions in the Top-line Factsheet at the beginning of the Common Template rather than duplicate information in this Section.

Annex 1 Statistical Annex

Q24. With reference to Question 3.a. above, please complete the following table with national statistics on the (estimated) number of applications for family reunification, if available.

Please provide here a brief explanation of the metadata, describing for example the population covered, the method used to reach the estimates, any caveats as to their likely accuracy etc. It should be noted, given the differences in methods used to make the estimates, that it will not be possible to synthesise this information to produce a 'total EU estimate' for the Study.

Methodological notes:

- The data refers to applications for temporary authorisations of stay and linked decisions (granted or denied) and not to applications for residence permits and linked decisions (first deliverances and renewals).
- The data refers to persons (adults and children) and not to files (households).
- The data regarding applications / decisions takes into account authorisations of stay for family members and for private reasons (family ties).
- The data for 2016 covers the period up to 31/10/2016.
- The applications of family members wanting to join a sponsor admitted for educational reasons are not treated as family members but as authorisations of stay for private reasons on the basis of existence of family links. The sponsors are for instance PhD students who have a working contract and who benefit from a remuneration that is superior to the social minimum wage.
- Due to the nature of the organisation of the database, it is possible for one person to be indexed multiple times within the same year, according to the processing status of the application (for example: to be treated, to be printed, delivered).
- The decision was taken to retain each single person only once over the course of the year, this in accordance with the most recent processing status of the application.
• If a person was denied the authorisation of stay as family member in 2014 (most recent status) and was granted an authorisation of stay as family member in 2015, the person will appear in the application statistics of 2014 and 2015, considering that the authorisation of stay was granted based on a new application.

• If a person was denied an authorisation of stay as family member in 2014 and after a requalification of his or her application was granted an authorisation of stay for private reasons in 2015, the person will be included in the statistics only once, in 2015 (most recent status of the application). In this case, it is considered to be one single application.

• Positive decisions include persons who, after having been denied an authorisation of stay as family member have later been granted an authorisation of stay for private reasons. A person having been denied the authorisation of stay as family member and later was granted authorisation of stay for private reasons was accounted for only once, in the category of positive decisions.
1 The target audience is composed of: policy makers at national and EU level; practitioners at national level working with family reunification; policy makers and practitioners concerned with the implications that the current policies on family reunification have on the processes of integration of third country nationals in host societies, including prevention of forced marriage; researchers and support groups (NGO’s) active in the field; politicians.


3 See Section 1.2.


5 “Requirements” refers to the conditions listed in Art. 7 (1) while "integration measures" refers to the measures set out in national law mentioned in Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC.


7 Eurostat, First permits by reason, length of validity and citizenship [migr_resfirst], accessed on 04.07.2016. These data include persons joining EU citizens.

8 AT, CZ, DE, EE, FI, FR, HU, IT, LV, NL, NO, PT, RO, SE, SK.

9 Eurostat statistics are available only as of 2008.

10 The more favourable treatment of refugees is required in Chapter V of Directive 2003/86/EC.

11 “In addition, Member States should use to the full the other legal avenues available to persons in need of protection, including private/non-governmental sponsorships and humanitarian permits, and family reunification clauses”. European Commission (2015), A European Agenda on Migration, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/docs/communication_on_the_european_agenda_on_migration_en.pdf.

12 IE, UK, DK are not bound by Directive 2003/86/EC.

13 The Second Implementation Report is expected in 2017 and main implementation/application issues will be covered in the 'fitness check' of the legal migration acquis which is ongoing in the Commission.

14 The age up to which a child is considered minor is defined at the national level.

15 Non-mobile nationals are nationals that have not exercised their right to free movement within the EU (e.g. a German national residing in Germany).

16 Non-mobile nationals are nationals that have not exercised their right to free movement within the EU (e.g. a German national residing in the Netherlands).


18 Recitals 17 and 18; Art. 3(5).

19 Defined by national legislation according to Art. 4(1) of the Directive.


23 Articles 7, 9 and 33 of the Charter.

24 Articles 12 and 16.

25 Articles 17, 23 and 24.

26 Articles 10, 16 and 22.

27 Article 8.

28 Although extensive case law has been produced also on the right of family reunification for EU nationals (e.g. case C-34/09 - Gerardo Ruiz Zambrano v Office national de l’emploi, and its follow-up case law, such as C-256/11 - Murat Dereci and Others v Bundesministerium für Inneres, and the joined cases C-356/11 and C-357/11, O, S, Maahanmuuttovirasto and Maahanmuuttovirasto), in consideration of the scope of this Study, only case law on family reunification for TCNs residing in the EU is covered.


30 This includes persons who are employed, self-employed, business owners, highly qualified workers under Directive 2009/50/EC (EU Blue Card Directive), highly qualified workers under national labour permits for (highly) skilled workers, seasonal workers and intra-corporate transferees (based on definitions in the recent EMN study on changes of status).


32 Provided that at least 20 EMN NCPs have submitted a National Contribution in time for the synthesis stage of the Study.

33 The proposed reference period of the Study is 2011 onwards with some flexibility if (Member) States believe there to be a significant change to law, policy and/ or practice outside this period.

34 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions A European Agenda on Migration, available at http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/index_en.htm

35 Parliamentary document n° 6992/00 of 18 May 2016. Bill n° 6992 amending 1) the amended Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration ; 2) amended law of 28 May 2009 on the Detention Centre ; 3) the law of 2 September 2001 regulating the access to the professions of craftsman, merchant and industrial.

36 The 12-month period is still required in cases foreseen by article 70 (5) of the Immigration Law (first degree ascendants, adult unmarried depending children, legal guardian or any other family member of an unaccompanied minor who is beneficiary of international protection).

37 See Parliamentary document n° 5802/17 of 3 July 2008, p.23


39 See Parliamentary document n° 5802/17 of 3 July 2008, p.23

40 See Parliamentary document n° 5802/00 of 7 November 2007 on free movement of persons and immigration, p. 7. See also Parliamentary document no 5802/17, p. 23.

41 Ibidem.

42 European Convention of Human Rights of 4 November 1950. See also Parliamentary document no. 5802/17, p. 22.

43 Parliamentary document n° 5802/00 of 7 November 2007, p. 7.

44 Article 70 (1) b) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration in accordance with the amended law of 9 July 2004 on legal effects of certain partnerships.

45 Article 70 (5) c of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

46 Article 70 (3) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

47 Article 70 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, 2 December 2016.


Article 1 (1) and 1 (18) 1 of the Law of 8 December 2011 amending article 70 (1) b of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.


Parliamentary document n° 6992/00 of 18 May 2016. Bill n° 6992 amending 1) the amended Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration; 2) amended law of 28 May 2009 on the Detention Centre; 3) the law of 2 September 2001 regulating the access to the professions of craftsman, merchant and industrial.

Article 1 28° (1) of the bill n° 6992 amending article 69 (1) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008. See Parliamentary document n°6992/00, p. 22.


Article 1 29° (2) of the bill n° 6992, amending article 73 of the amended Law of 29 August 2008. See Parliamentary document n°6992/00, p. 74.


Articles 2 and 3 in Chapter I of 2003/86/EC define who can be a sponsor to an application for family reunification in the EU.

Article 12 (3) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

Article 14 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008. This article is in line with the Judgment of the CJEU, Metock and Others v. Ireland– C-127/08 of 25 July 2008 and the Judgment of the First instance Administrative Court, 2nd Chamber n° 23254a of 17 December 2008.

Article 71 (b) in regards to article 45-1 of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

Article 69 (2) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

Article 71 (b) in regards to article 47 of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

Article 71 (b) in regards to article 64 of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

The level of the resources of the third-country national who is applying for family reunification is assessed with reference to the average monthly minimum wage of a non-qualified worker over a period of 12 months. The resources of the third-country national must be at least equivalent to this reference level. If the resources are below this level, the Minister may nonetheless issue a favorable decision, having taken into account the current situation of the third-country national (such as the stability of their job and income, access to home ownership or the use of free of charge accommodation); Article 69 (1) 1 of the amended Law of 29 August 2008 in accordance with Article 6 (1) of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.


In this regard, the Council of State in its legal opinion of 20 May 2008 (See Parliamentary document n° 5802/10 of 20 May 2008, p. 6) considered that it was against article 11 of the Constitution of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, which guarantees the constitutional right to a family, to require Luxembourgish nationals to fulfil the conditions established in article 6 of the Immigration Law, assimilating a Luxembourgish national to a mobile EU citizen in this context. This position has been ratified by the Administrative Courts (See First instance Administrative Court, 3rd Chamber, n° 34065 of 30 April 2015).
71 Article 42 in accordance with article 69 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
72 Article 51 (1) in accordance with article 69 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
73 Article 45 (1) in accordance with article 69 (1) and 71 b of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
74 Article 54 (1) in accordance with article 69 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
75 Article 64 in accordance with articles 69 (1) and 71 (1) b of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
76 Article 47 in accordance with articles 69 (1) and 71 b of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
77 Article 56 (1) of the Law of 18 December 2015 on international protection and temporary protection (Asylum Law) in accordance with articles 68 a) and 69 (2) of the Immigration Law.
78 Article 57 (1) et 59 of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
79 Article 60 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
80 Article 61 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
81 Article 62 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
82 Article 62bis (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
84 Article 69 (1) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.
85 Currently, BSPs are not covered by Directive 2003/86/EC.
86 Art. 4 in Chapter II of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that (Member) States shall authorise the entry and residence of certain family members, including the sponsor’s spouse and minor (including adopted) children of the sponsor and/ or his/ her spouse.
87 Article 70 (5) a) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
88 Article 70 (5) b) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
89 Article 71 of 17 March 1808. Article 143 was amended by the Law of 4 July 2014 introducing same sex marriages.
90 Article 70 (1) b) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
91 Luxembourg nationals.
92 All other nationalities.
95 Article 4.2. of the Law of 9 July 2004. For nationals of the European Community, the divorce should be evidenced by a "Certificate Referred to in article 39 concerning Judgments in Matrimonial Matters".
96 See articles 1126 ss of the New Civil Procedure Code in regards with articles 4 and 4-1 of the amended law of 9 July 2004.
97 I.e. other than those referred to in Art. 4 of Directive 2003/86/EC.
98 According to UNHCR, dependent persons should be understood as persons who depend for their existence substantially and directly on any other person, in particular because of economic reasons, but also taking emotional dependency into consideration. Dependency should be assumed when a person is under the age of 18, and when that person relies on others for financial support. Dependency should also be recognised if a person is disabled and not capable of supporting him/ herself. The dependency principle considers that, in most circumstances, the family unit is composed of more that the customary notion of a nuclear family (husband, wife and minor children). This principle recognises that familial relationships are sometimes broader than blood lineage, and that in many societies extended family members such as parents, brothers and sisters, adult children, grandparents, uncles, aunts, nieces and nephews, etc., are financially and emotionally tied to the principal breadwinner or head of the family unit. Further information is available at: http://www.unhcr.org/3b30baa04.pdf, as well as in the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on guidance for application of Directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification mentioned in Section 1 in the first part of this document.
99 Article 70 (5) a) and b) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008

100 Article 78 (1) c) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

101 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016, the Luxembourgish Red Cross, interview on 20 October 2016 and CLAE asbl., interview on 21 October 2016.

102 Article 78 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

103 Social parameters valid since 1 January 2016.

104 Social parameters valid since 1 January 2016.


106 Article 78 (1) c of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

107 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016

108 Article 144 paragraph 1 of the Civil Code.

109 Joint Answer of the Minister of Foreign and European Affairs and the Minister of Justice of 18 July 2016 to the parliamentary question n°2155 of 17 June 2016. There have already been applications for family reunification involving polygamous marriages that were rejected on the basis of article 70 (3) of the Immigration Law.

110 Article 391 of the Criminal Code

111 Answer of the Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of 18 July 2016 to the parliamentary question n°2155 of 17 June 2016

112 Article 391 of the Criminal Code

113 Joint Answer of the Minister of Foreign and European Affairs and the Minister of Justice to parliamentary question n° 2155 of 17 June 2016, 18 July 2016.

114 Article 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that Member States may require the person who has submitted the application to provide evidence that the sponsor has: accommodation suitable for the size of the family, as well as meeting health and safety standards; sickness insurance; and sufficient resources to provide for himself/ herself and his/ her family.

115 Article 69 (1) 2 of the amended law of 29 August 2008. Also Article 9 (1) of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.

116 Article 9 (1) of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.

117 Article 5 of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 25 February 1979 establishing the criteria of renting, health and hygiene which have to fulfil all rental accommodation


119 Article 69 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

120 Article 69 (1) 3 of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.


122 Article 69 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

123 Article 69 (1) 1 of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

124 Article 6 (1) of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.
125 Article 6 (1) paragraph 2 of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.

126 Article 6 (2) of the amended Grand-ducal regulation of 5 September 2008 establishing the criteria of resources and accommodation foreseen by the Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration.

127 Article 69 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

128 Art. 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that Member States may require TCNs to comply with integration measures, in accordance with national law.

129 Information provided by the Luxembourgish Reception and Integration Office (OLAI), Ministry of Family, Integration and the Greater Region, telephone interview, 8 November 2016.

130 Article 8 of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that Member States may require the sponsor to have stayed lawfully on the territory for a period not exceeding two years (or three years by derogation in specific circumstances) before having his/ her family members join him/ her.

131 Article 69 (1) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

132 Parliamentary document n° 6992/00 of 18 May 2016. Bill n° 6992 amending 1) the amended Law of 29 August 2008 on free movement of persons and immigration ; 2) amended law of 28 May 2009 on the Detention Centre ; 3) the law of 2 September 2001 regulating the access to the professions of craftsman, merchant and industrial.

133 Article 71 a of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.


136 Article 6 of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that Member States may reject an application for entry and residence of family members on grounds of public policy, public security or public health.

137 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016.

138 Article 9-12 in Chapter V of Directive 2003/86/EC set out more favourable conditions for family reunification of refugees.

139 Article 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC.

140 Article 7(1) of Directive 2003/86/EC.

141 Article 7(2) of Directive 2003/86/EC.

142 Article 10(3)(b) of Directive 2003/86/EC.

143 Article 70 (4) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

144 Article 70 (5) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

145 Article 70 (5) c) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

146 That later became the Law of 18 December 2015 on international protection and temporary protection.

147 See Parliamentary document n° 6779/00 of 19 February 2015, p. 47.

148 See Parliamentary document n° 6779/00 of 19 February 2015, p. 47.


150 See First instance Administrative Court, 3rd Chamber, n° 34065 of 30 April 2015.

151 In 2012, the cost of housing represented 15% of the average gross household income or 19% of the average net household income after income tax and social security contributions. See: Statec, Regards sur le coût de logement pour les ménages, n° 22, Novembre 2013, p. 2. The average monthly cost of rent in 2014 was established at 995 €. See Statec, "Prévision matérielle et coûts du logement 2003 – 2014", URL: http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=12958&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=3&FldrName=1&RFPath=29 As an indicator, the monthly rent price of a studio is 876 € and a two bedroom apartment is 1400 €. The price for a

152 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016, the Luxembourgish Red Cross, interview on 20 October 2016, Caritas Luxembourg, interview on 20 October 2016 and CLAE asbl., interview on 21 October 2016.

153 Information provided by Caritas Luxembourg on 29 November 2016.

154 Information provided by Caritas on 12 December 2016.

155 Article 69 (1) 1 of the Immigration Law.

156 Guaranteed minimum income (RMG) is of 1348,18 €/month per adult, whereas the minimum monthly salary required for a 12-months' period is of 1922,96/month per adult. See: Social parameters valid since 1 January 2016.

157 Information provided by the Luxembourgish Red Cross, interview on 20 October 2016, Caritas Luxembourg, interview on 20 October 2016

158 Information provided by CLAE asbl., interview on 21 October 2016 and Caritas Luxembourg, interview on 20 October 2016.

159 Article 4(5) of Directive 2003/86/EC stipulates that Member States may require the sponsor and his/ her spouse to be of a minimum age, and at maximum 21 years, before the spouse is able to join him/ her, in order to ensure better integration and to prevent forced marriages.

160 Information provided by the Luxembourgish Red Cross, interview on 20 October 2016, Caritas Luxembourg, interview on 20 October 2016 and CLAE asbl., interview on 21 October 2016.

161 Articles 144, 146 and 146-1 of the Civil Code.


165 Article 70 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008.

166 Article 69 (1) in accordance with article 70 (2) of the amended Law of 29 August 2008 and articles 144, 146-1 and 170-1 of the Civil Code.

167 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, 2 December 2016.

168 Answer of the Minister of Justice of 7 July 2016 to Parliamentary question n° 2145 of 13 June 2016.

169 Article 5 of Directive 2003/86/EC specifies that Member States determine whether, in order to exercise the right to family reunification, an application for entry and residence must be submitted to the competent authorities by the sponsor or his/ her (family) members.

170 Article 39 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

171 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, 2 December 2016.


173 Article 39 (1) in accordance with article 69 (1) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.


177 Article 73 (3) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

178 LU EMN NCP answer to NL EMN NCP Ad-Hoc Query on Checking identity and family relationships in case of family reunification with a beneficiary of international protection launched on 8 June 2016.

179 Article 73 (2) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

180 First instance Administrative Court, second chamber, n° 23176 of 27 February 2008 and First instance Administrative Court, n° 38236 of 26 July 2006 and Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016.

181 Information provided by the Directorate of Immigration, interview on 27 October 2016.

182 Article 70 (5) a) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

183 See judgment of the First instance Administrative Court, n° 36309 and n° 36310, 1st Chamber of 4 July 2016.

184 Article 70 (5) b) of the amended law of 29 August 2008.

185 Article 133 (1) and (2) and 134 of the amended law of 29 August 2008.
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Article 14 of Directive 2003/86/EC in your (Member) State stipulates that family members are entitled (the same way as the sponsor) to access education, employment and self-employed activity, as well as vocational guidance and training. Article 15 of Directive 2003/86/EC additionally specifies that family members are entitled to apply for autonomous right of residence after no more than five years, independent of that of the sponsor (also in case of dissolution of family ties).
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