

Over the last 25 years the European Council adopted three successive framework programmes: the Tampere programme (1999-2004), the Hague programme (2005-09) and the Stockholm programme (2010-14). While the Tampere and Hague programmes aimed at greater security, Stockholm focused more on protecting citizens' rights for a more open Europe for the benefit of all EU citizens as well as third country nationals.

Additionally, decision-making in these fields has become more effective thanks to the Lisbon Treaty, which came into force in December 2009, as well as the 2<sup>nd</sup> European Agenda on Integration.

For the post Stockholm program we propose three topics that member - states might consider relevant for revisiting:

1. Revive the discussion on the Common Basic Principles, which still remain valid and pertinent, with a view to explore whether any additions might be needed for fully addressing socio-economic challenges in EU member – states and for enhancing social cohesion in European societies.
2. Examine the role that countries of origin could play at the pre-departure level, in order to facilitate migrants integration in the host societies. Introducing this role in the mobility partnerships might be a way forward in this direction.
3. Linguistic issues should as well be dealt with. More specifically linguistic tests and certificates, which certain member – states require as a pre-condition for admission of migrants and their family members in the framework of family reunification are, in our understanding, problematic. Non-permission for entry of spouses (women in their majority), in case they do not meet language requirements, directly violates human rights and becomes an obstacle to migrants' integration. Bearing in mind that many women in third countries are functionally or simply illiterate, such policies seem to become a migration management tool rather than an integration one. In addition, since a number of legally residing low-skilled migrants coming from developing countries, are in a similar situation, coercive linguistic policies impede their full enjoyment of rights and could even jeopardise their residence in the receiving country. Alternative measures, corresponding to different linguistic skills which take into consideration the cultural and educational diversity in member – states might be envisaged.