

Memorandum to the Finnish Presidency

The Hague Programme and beyond

ECRE

EUROPEAN COUNCIL
ON REFUGEES AND EXILES
CONSEIL EUROPEEN
SUR LES REFUGIES
ET LES EXILES

AD6/8/2006/EXT/RW

Finland took over the Presidency of the European Union on 1 July and has set out its priorities for the area of Justice and Home Affairs. One important aim is to “launch a debate on how to develop the common asylum system now that the first round of legislation has been adopted¹”. This will begin with a review of progress of the Hague Programme at the informal Justice and Home Affairs Council in September. In the following memorandum, the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE)² highlights some of the issues that need addressing and makes a series of recommendations in the area of asylum and refugee policy. This memorandum complements ECRE’s recent publication *‘The Way Forward: An Agenda for Change. Europe’s role in the global refugee protection system’*³ which provides constructive recommendations on a range of refugee policy issues.

Finland has already built on the commendable work done during its last Presidency seven years ago to make the EU legislative process more accessible to the public. The transparency policy adopted at June’s European Council will make Council deliberations on legislation that are subject to co-decision not only open to the public, but also available simultaneously on line,⁴ representing a welcome step towards reducing the democratic deficit in the sensitive policy area of Justice and Home Affairs.

For ECRE, key issues for the Finnish Presidency include:

1. Balancing the fight against illegal immigration with access to protection
2. Responsibility-sharing and reform of the Dublin II Regulation
3. Ensuring transposition of EU asylum legislation into national law and implementation
4. Improving the quality of asylum decisions through practical cooperation
5. Safeguarding fundamental rights in return procedures
6. Including asylum seekers and refugees in mainstream society
7. Encouraging increased European resettlement activities
8. Putting human rights at the heart of EU-Russian relations.

¹ Letter by the Minister of Justice, Leena Luhtanen, and the Minister of Interior, Kari Rajamäki, to their colleagues, 21 June 2006, www.eu2006.fi

² ECRE represents 77 refugee assisting NGOs from 30 countries working towards humane and fair asylum and refugee policies and practice

³ *The Way Forward: An Agenda for Change. Europe’s Role in the Global Refugee Protection System*, ECRE, 2006.

www.ecre.org

⁴ *Presidency Conclusions, Brussels European Council 15/16 June 200*, www.europa.int

1. Balancing the fight against illegal immigration with access to protection

Finland's interior minister Kari Rajamäki has expressed his hope that discussions during the Presidency will be "in the spirit of Tampere".⁵ That spirit that has been noticeably absent in recent years, when the need to observe the fundamental principles of *non-refoulement* appears to have come second to the demands of the fight against illegal immigration. This has been particularly noticeable in the way Member States bordering the Mediterranean have approached the difficult problem presented by the arrival of substantial numbers of irregular migrants. The EU itself has established the FRONTEX agency, adopted a large number of border management measures, and allocated huge resources to this area in the next Financial Perspectives, while the Commission has recently put forward a proposal for 'rapid border intervention teams'. This energy has not been matched by a similar attention to the needs and rights of the proportion of irregular migrants crossing the Mediterranean who are refugees.

The Action Plan that came out of the Euro-African conference on migration and development in Rabat, Morocco in July made only cursory reference to protection issues: "All implementation must fully respect human dignity and the fundamental rights of migrants and of refugees."⁶ By contrast, the plan listed 15 specific measures to tackle illegal immigration, strengthen border controls and combat trafficking. Yet practical, protection-oriented ideas were readily available to participants: shortly before the Rabat conference UNHCR had proposed a 10-point plan for addressing mixed migratory movements.⁷

- *The Presidency should rekindle the spirit of Tampere by reaffirming the "absolute respect of the right to seek asylum" and the commitment made in Tampere to offer guarantees to those who seek protection in or access to the European Union, while taking into account the need to combat illegal immigration.*⁸
- *The Presidency should ensure that any evaluation of migration management measures and immigration controls, such as visa policy, carriers liability and joint sea patrols, assesses the impact on fundamental rights, specifically the right to asylum, Article 18 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.*

2. Responsibility-sharing and reform of the Dublin II Regulation

ECRE agrees that the EU must better share responsibility for immigration, asylum and border control policies.⁹ This must start with reform of the Dublin II Regulation, which pits Member States against each other, encouraging them to shift rather than share responsibility for asylum seekers. The Commission is expected to present a review of the Regulation to the Council during the Finnish Presidency.

In a recent resolution, the European Parliament called on the Commission to take the initiative as soon as possible to revise the Dublin II Regulation and to introduce a fair mechanism for sharing responsibilities among the Member States.¹⁰ At the end of June, ECRE wrote to the Vice President of the European Commission, Mr Franco Frattini, urging him to address the 'serious shortcomings' of the Dublin rules that fail to guarantee asylum seekers a fair hearing, put refugees at risk and cause unnecessary suffering to families, children and survivors of torture.

⁵ Finnish Minister of the Interior Kari Rajamäki at the Justice and Home Affairs Council: EU must take more collective responsibility for immigration, asylum and border control policies, 24 July, www.eu2006.fi

⁶ Action Plan of the Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development, Rabat, July 2006 <http://www.maec.gov.ma/migration/En/documentation.htm>

⁷ Addressing mixed migratory movements: A 10-Point Plan of Action, UNHCR, June 2006 www.unhcr.org

⁸ Tampere Milestones para 8, Conclusions of the Tampere European Council, 1999

⁹ Finnish Minister of the Interior Kari Rajamäki at the Justice and Home Affairs Council: EU must take more collective responsibility for immigration, asylum and border control policies, 24 July, www.eu2006.fi/

¹⁰ See European Parliament Resolution on the situation with refugee camps in Malta, 6 April 2006, P6_TA(2006)0136, paragraph 15.

Recent reports by ECRE¹¹ and UNHCR¹² on the operation of the Dublin II Regulation show that some states are denying access to a full asylum procedure to individuals transferred under the Dublin system, placing them at risk of being returned to their home countries to face persecution. By requiring that those fleeing persecution must claim asylum in the first EU country they reach, the Dublin II Regulation does not properly take account of the fact that a person's chance of being recognised as a refugee varies hugely from one EU country to another. As well as being unfair, the Dublin rules are inefficient, resource-intensive and an obstacle to genuine sharing of responsibility between European states.

- *The Presidency should take the opportunity of the forthcoming review by the Commission to begin a debate amongst Member States about ECRE's proposal that the Dublin II Regulation be replaced by a humane and workable system for sharing responsibility for asylum seekers across the EU.*
- *The Presidency should invite the JHA Council to take immediate steps to amend the Dublin II Regulation and related legislation, in order to:*
 - *Guarantee access to a full and fair procedure for all asylum seekers transferred under the Dublin II Regulation.*
 - *Better ensure the reunification of family members under Dublin II.*
 - *Exempt separated children from transfer under Dublin II except to allow them to join other family members provided this is in the best interests of the child.*
 - *Ensure that all Dublin II applicants receive adequate reception conditions and are only ever detained as a last resort.*

3. Ensuring transposition of EU asylum legislation into national law and implementation

The Commission has concluded that “the rate of implementation is not yet ideal”.¹³ ECRE regrets that Member States have dragged their feet when transposing EU asylum legislation into national law and that the Commission faces difficulties in monitoring whether instruments have been transposed and whether it has been done accurately.

In September, the Odysseus network will present the results of its study of transposition of the **Reception Conditions** Directive, carried out on behalf of the Commission. ECRE's own research in 2005¹⁴ found that many Member States were failing to provide the adequate standard of living for asylum seekers required by the Directive, some were failing to give access to their labour markets within 12 months of an asylum claim, and three continued to withdraw reception conditions from asylum seekers on grounds that were not permitted under the directive, depriving them of what was already a minimum standard of support. Other research has found that provision for vulnerable groups, particularly of mental health services for survivors of torture and trauma, is woefully inadequate.¹⁵

- *The Presidency should seek an undertaking from Member States to commit to finishing transposing and implementing rapidly and accurately the instruments of the first stage of the Common European Asylum System, and to ensure that the Commission is properly resourced to carry out its supervisory role, either directly or through other bodies.*

¹¹ *Summary Report on the Application of the Dublin II Regulation in Europe*, ECRE/ELENA, March 2006 is available at www.ecre.org

¹² *The Dublin II Regulation, a UNHCR Discussion Paper*, UNHCR, April 2006

¹³ *Communication to the Council and the Parliament: Report on the implementation of the Hague programme for 2005*, Brussels 28.06.06, COM (2006) 333 final

¹⁴ *The EC Directive on the Reception of Asylum Seekers: Are asylum seekers in Europe receiving material support and access to employment in accordance with European legislation?*, ECRE, Nov 2004

¹⁵ *Information and Cooperation Forum (ICF) Final Report*, February 2005, www.proasyl.de

- *The Presidency should encourage Member States to refrain from lowering their national standards to the minimum required by the various asylum instruments and reflect on how a further deterioration of standards can be avoided in the development of a common system.*

Common criteria for determining who is entitled to protection are a core element of a common asylum system. The deadline for transposition of the **Qualification Directive** falls during this presidency. If all Member States were to comply fully with this instrument, the variations in refugee recognition rates between Member States should be considerably reduced.

The Council should take this opportunity to reflect on a major flaw of the Qualification Directive, namely that it affords lesser rights to beneficiaries of subsidiary protection than to refugees, particularly with respect to benefits for family members, the duration of residence permits, the provision of travel documents, entitlement to social welfare benefits, and access to health care, the employment market, and integration facilities. The needs and circumstances of people with subsidiary protection are similar to Convention refugees. Once people are in the EU and have been found to be in need of international protection, it is perverse and inhumane to treat them differently according to their reason for fleeing their country of origin.

- *The Presidency should urge the Council to consider bringing the rights of persons benefiting from subsidiary protection in line with those of Convention refugees, in the context of debates about a common asylum system and single asylum procedure.*

It should also be noted that beneficiaries of subsidiary protection have no rights to family reunion in European law, a source of great hardship and distress to people who have been forcibly separated from relatives, friends and communities in their country of origin. The Hague Programme's invitation to the Commission to conduct in 2007 the "evaluation of first-phase legal instruments in 2007"¹⁶ should not be regarded as simply requiring an evaluation of individual instruments. A legal examination of all the instruments is required, that would show inconsistencies and gaps.

- *The Commission should be invited to carry out a study of the first stage instruments, ahead of next year's Green Paper, in order to identify inconsistencies and gaps, such as the absence of a right to family reunion for persons with subsidiary protection.*

4. Improving the quality of asylum decisions through practical cooperation

The Finnish Presidency intends to look forward to the next stage of the development of a Common European Asylum System, a *common* system, rather than different national procedures harmonised by a requirement to meet minimum standards. A core element must be consistent, high quality asylum decisions, wherever the asylum claim is made in the EU. The right to seek and enjoy asylum remains a lottery in the EU: wide variations in refugee recognition rates indicate dramatic differences in the quality of decisions.

- *In order to avoid a common asylum system based on the lowest common denominator, the Presidency should encourage the Council to make explicit that the objective of practical cooperation is high quality asylum decisions.*

One mechanism for ensuring consistency in asylum procedures and decisions is judgements by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) on interpretation of EC asylum legislation. Currently, however, asylum cases can only be referred by the highest national courts. The process of harmonisation would be accelerated if lower courts could refer to the ECJ, as in other areas of Community law.

¹⁶ *The Hague Programme: strengthening freedom, security and justice in the European Union*, JAI 559, 13 Dec 2004, para 1.2

- *ECRE supports the Commission's proposal that the power to refer asylum cases to the European Court of Justice should no longer be restricted to the highest national courts, thereby accelerating the process of harmonisation.*

Meanwhile, the Commission's **Communication on strengthened cooperation among Member States' asylum services**¹⁷ presents an opportunity to begin to move towards a more level playing field, by putting in place asylum systems that are both fair and efficient. Alternatively, as with negotiations on the Asylum Procedures Directive, the process risks facilitating the sharing of the worst national procedures.

The key to better quality decisions is transparency and monitoring. Independent monitoring mechanisms could identify gaps in existing decision-making procedures and the appropriate training and resources needed to fill these gaps.¹⁸ An EU-wide training programme for asylum decision-makers is essential to ensuring compliance with the minimum guarantees in the Asylum Procedures Directive and to develop a single procedure that fully respects states' obligations under international law.

- *A common asylum procedure should include independent monitoring mechanisms to identify gaps in existing decision-making procedures and the appropriate training and resources needed to fill these gaps. An EU-wide training programme should be established for asylum decision-makers.*

An essential tool for decision-makers is access to relevant, reliable, accurate and transparent Country of Origin Information (COI). UNHCR and independent experts should be involved in the first stage of establishing setting up a common COI portal and drawing up guidelines on the researching, collection and application of COI. The common portal that has been proposed and the future EU COI database must be publicly accessible and contain information from a wide range of sources, both governmental and non-governmental.

- *Any discussion of the development of common EU country of origin information should focus on the need for an independently managed system. If information is kept distinct from its application by decision-makers, it can remain impartial, reducing the need for debate about the general situation in countries of origin and enabling a more efficient focus on the individual's situation.*

The need to improve and share COI should not be confused with the development of a EU **common list of safe countries of origin**. The safe country of origin concept is inconsistent with the proper focus of international refugee law,¹⁹ which is not about what happens *generally*, but the protection needs of *individuals*.

- *Further discussion of the safe country list should be suspended, at least until the European Court of Justice gives it ruling on the challenge by the European Parliament to the lawfulness of the Procedures Directive, specifically the safe country of origin provisions.*

5. Safeguarding fundamental rights in return procedures

ECRE agrees that "Respect for human rights and the basic freedoms of the person to be returned is one of the most important elements to be kept in mind".²⁰ The proposed Returns Directive attempts to set some common standards guaranteeing dignity and safety during the return process to those third country nationals, including asylum seekers whose claims have been rejected, who have no right or no

¹⁷ *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on Strengthened Practical Cooperation. New Structures, New Approaches: Improving the Quality of Decision Making in the Common European Asylum System, COM (2006) 67 final*

¹⁸ *The Way Forward: Europe's role in the global refugee protection system. Towards Fair and Efficient Asylum Systems in Europe*, ECRE, September 2005

¹⁹ *ECRE Comments on the Amended proposal for a Council Directive on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status*, March 2005

²⁰ Kari Rajamäki, *Eurasylum Monthly Interviews*, Eurasylum, 2006 www.eurasylum.org

longer have a right to stay in Europe.²¹ Such safeguards are all the more vital given the flaws in national asylum systems and differences in quality of protection across the EU. In addition, as Mr Rajamäki has stated, the EU's "goal should be to achieve a durable solution for a person residing illegally in the Union".²²

ECRE found a number of positive elements in the Commission's proposal,²³ but many are undermined by other vaguely defined concepts, the implementation of which could render some safeguards meaningless in practice. Some Member States, responding to public pressure in the sensitive area of immigration, see the utility of this Directive in facilitating the process of return. ECRE's first concern, however, is that the principle of *non-refoulement* is not jeopardised or other fundamental rights undermined. The proposal allows a combination of repressive measures which could lead to disproportionately harsh return practices that amount to punishing people for exercising their fundamental right to seek asylum.

- *The Presidency is urged to expedite the legislative process on the Returns Directive while ensuring that the final text upholds fundamental rights.*
- *Specifically, the Presidency is requested to ensure that safeguards set out in the Directive are fully applicable throughout a Member State's territory, including border areas and 'transit zones' and that they include:*
 - *a guarantee of an effective judicial remedy with suspensive effect;*
 - *explicit reference to the 2005 Council of Europe Guidelines on Forced Return;*
 - *a requirement that Member States provide basic socio-economic support, including accommodation and subsistence, to asylum seekers whose applications have been rejected during the 'voluntary departure' period and until actual return is possible;*
 - *an obligation to grant a legal residence status for third country nationals who cannot be returned, and who have been in the EU for more than three years;*
 - *restriction of the use of detention to the last resort, when it has been shown to be necessary after a comprehensive assessment of the individual's circumstances, and all less coercive alternatives have been considered, with detention orders issued only by judicial authorities and subject to at least monthly judicial review;*
 - *procedural safeguards to ensure that re-entry bans do not impede access to asylum in the EU;*
 - *post-return monitoring of asylum seekers whose claims have been rejected, in order to evaluate the safety of the asylum and return process and to instil confidence in prospective returnees.*

6. Including asylum seekers and refugees in mainstream society

The worsening climate of intolerance and racism in Europe is damaging relations between host populations and refugees, while asylum seekers are increasingly excluded from society as a matter of policy. Many refugees are confronted with lengthy asylum procedures and have little opportunity to spend their time in meaningful ways, such as by following language courses or working. To delay support for integration until after an asylum seeker has been successful in their asylum claim makes the process of integration more difficult, leaving those eventually granted leave to settle in a European country demoralised by the time they are ready to fully participate in society. Worse, those who feel threatened or ostracised by their host society, instead of striving to belong, may seek to emphasise their difference by isolating themselves in their own communities, which may leave them vulnerable to

²¹ *Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third country nationals* (COM(2005) 391 final)

²² Kari Rajamäki, *Eurasylum Monthly Interviews*, Eurasylum, 2006 www.eurasylum.org

²³ *Comments from the European Council on Refugees and Exiles on the Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third country nationals* (COM (2005) 391 final)

radical influences. It is in Member States' interest, as well as asylum seekers' to provide integration support during the reception phase, as the European Parliament has recommended.²⁴

- *ECRE urges the Finnish Presidency to call upon governments, politicians and their parties to promote positive public attitudes towards migrants, asylum seekers and refugees.*
- *Member States should make provisions for integration measures for refugees during the reception phase. It is in their own interest to take advantage of Article 4 of the Reception Directive, which permits more favourable conditions than the minimum standards, and grant and support access to language and vocational training, higher education and employment as early as possible in the asylum process.*

ECRE is concerned that projects supporting the integration of refugees may be excluded from the proposed **Integration Fund**. While refugees have specific integration needs that should be addressed by targeted projects supported by the European Refugee Fund, they also require the kind of introduction programmes, language classes and other services that are provided for other third country nationals. If the Fund is not amended, NGOs will be forced to run parallel programmes delivering identical services to people with similar needs.

- *Before the Integration Fund is finally adopted, it should be amended to permit refugees to participate in projects it supports for third country nationals.*

The Commission has still not issued a long overdue proposal for an amendment to the **Long Term Residents Directive** to include persons in need of protection. As ECRE observed in its memorandum to the Austrian Presidency, it is perverse that refugees currently have fewer rights as long term residents under EC law than do other third country nationals. European countries should be aiming to provide refugees with rights similar to those enjoyed by nationals as soon as possible following recognition of status. Granting refugees a secure legal status and durable residence permit is essential for them to gain the stability and predictability required in order to proceed with their lives and contribute fully to the social, political and economic life of their host country.²⁵

The scope of the amendment must include beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, whose integration needs are identical to those of refugees, whatever their grounds for international protection. Long term resident status should guarantee access to the labour market and to education equal to nationals, enabling refugees to contribute to the host countries' economies and reducing welfare costs. Rights to freedom of movement must be included to allow refugees to relocate to a Member State where they have family or community links, or better language skills and will therefore be able to integrate most quickly.

- *ECRE calls on the Finnish Presidency to ensure that any negotiations on a forthcoming proposal on long term residence status for persons in need of protection result in a text that is consistent with refugees' rights under international law, and with the Union's objectives for integration. The status should not be dependent on the applicant passing integration tests.*

²⁴ European Parliament resolution on strategies and means for the integration of immigrants in the European Union (2006/2056(INI))

²⁵ *The Way Forward: Europe's role in the global refugee protection system - Towards the Integration of Refugees in Europe*, ECRE, 2005, www.ecre.org

7. Encouraging increased European resettlement activities

The past months have seen the EU putting a good deal of energy into the external dimension of Justice and Home Affairs policy, particularly with respect to migration from Africa. While considerable progress is being made in developing a more coherent approach to development and migration, disappointingly little effort is being by the EU to explore the potential use of resettlement in comprehensive solutions to refugee situations in regions of origins. Resettlement can be used strategically as a solution for some refugees, particularly in protracted refugee situations, while at the same time encouraging host countries in that region to provide for a larger number of refugees or improve the asylum conditions and opportunities for local integration.

Currently Europe accepts less than 5,000 resettled refugees a year. In comparison the US scheme provided 70,000 places in 2005. A European programme led by the EU could strengthen the international system of refugee protection by demonstrating to developing countries that Europe is serious about sharing responsibility fairly for refugee protection.

Some European countries have increased their annual resettlement quotas, but Member States have shown little interest in the establishment of an EU-wide resettlement scheme, as called for by ECRE²⁶ and proposed by the European Commission in 2004. Some Member States have indicated that they would consider accepting resettled refugees, but only in the context of an EU-wide scheme. One way to facilitate the establishment of national programmes would be to establish an EU scheme that allows countries with no resettlement experience to contribute on whatever scale they consider feasible. NGOs stand ready to provide information and offer their experience and expertise in resettlement alongside UNHCR and existing resettlement countries to move these processes forward.

- *With its long tradition of supporting the global refugee protection system by resettling refugees, Finland should promote the development of national resettlement programmes by other European countries and expansion of existing schemes, as well as a collective European resettlement system during its Presidency.*
- *Finland should also ensure the adoption during its Presidency of the Commission's proposed amendment to the European Refugee Fund, which would provide additional funds from 2008 to Member States contemplating initiating or expanding resettlement programmes.*

Meanwhile the EU's two pilot **regional protection programmes** (RPPs), which reach a critical stage during this Presidency, will present a valuable opportunity to test the strategic use of resettlement, despite their limited budgets. For the sake of balance, and in order to demonstrate a concrete commitment to responsibility-sharing on the part of the EU, both pilots should include activities that facilitate the resettlement of refugees from those regions to Europe.

- *Finland should ensure that the necessary progress is made in relation to RPPs to allow their implementation as soon as possible and that resettlement is included as a component of both pilot RPPs in the Western Newly Independent States and the Great Lakes region of Africa.*

8. Putting human rights and refugee protection at the heart of EU-Russian relations

Relations between the EU and the Russian Federation will feature prominently during Finland's Presidency.²⁷ An EU-Russia summit meeting will be held in Helsinki in November 2006, when Finland

²⁶ *The Way Forward. Europe's role in the global refugee protection system. Guarding Refugee Protection Standards in Regions of Origin*, December 2005, www.ecre.org

²⁷ *Preliminary Agenda for Finland's Presidency of the EU*. http://www.eu2006.fi/the_presidency/en_GB/presidency_agenda/

will seek to push forward with implementation of the roadmaps for “common spaces” as agreed by the EU and Russia.²⁸

ECRE is deeply concerned about the situation for asylum seekers and refugees in the Russian Federation. Access to asylum procedures is extremely restricted. As of 1st January 2006 there were only 456 recognised refugees recorded by the Federal Migration Service in Russia.²⁹ Asylum seekers have difficulties even handing in their applications for asylum, while those who did manage to register their application for refugee status in 2005 were given forms with interview dates for 2008 and even 2009. These forms do not legalise the stay of asylum seekers in the Russian Federation, leaving them open to being stopped and even detained by law enforcement agencies. Levels of racism and xenophobia are rising sharply, with attacks by racist groups on foreign citizens regularly reported. Finally, the situation for NGOs in the Russian Federation is increasingly difficult after Russian authorities approved a new, restrictive law, giving the authorities more control over NGO activities.

- *ECRE urges the Finnish Presidency to underline its commitment to democracy human rights and the rule of law by including respect for human rights, particularly those of asylum seekers and refugees, measures to tackle xenophobia and preservation of the independence of NGOs in all negotiations with the Russian Federation within the framework of the Common space of freedom, security and justice.*

The situation faced by a group of 13 people threatened with extradition to Uzbekistan continues to cause concern. Following an intervention by the European Court of Human Rights, Russia has suspended the extradition of the 12 Uzbeks and one Kyrgyz national, all of whom have been recognised by UNHCR as in need of international protection. Nevertheless, the EU must continue to exert pressure to ensure that the group are not sent to Uzbekistan, which accuses them of terrorism in connection with the 2005 uprising in Andijan.

- *ECRE requests the Finnish presidency to closely monitor the situation of the 13 people threatened with extradition to Uzbekistan in order to ensure that the Russian Federation upholds its obligations under the 1951 Convention and refrains from sending them to a place where they would be at risk of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment.*

ECRE, August 2006

For further information contact the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) at:

ECRE Brussels
Richard Williams, EU Representative
(from 29 August)
Rue Belliard, 205 - Box 14
B- 1040 Brussels
Tel: +32 (0) 2.514.59.39
Fax: +32 (0) 2.514.59.22
E-mail: eucre@ecre.be

ECRE London
Patricia Coelho, Policy Officer
103 Worship Street
London EC2A 2DF, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7377 7556
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7377 7586
E-mail: ecre@ecre.org

Web : <http://www.ecre.org>

²⁸ Preliminary Agenda for Finland's Presidency of the EU. http://www.eu2006.fi/the_presidency/en_GB/presidency_agenda/.

²⁹ The Migration Situation in the Russian Federation in 2005. <http://refugee.memo.ru/>.