



**Submission to Cécile Kashetu Kyenge,
Member of the European Parliament,
for the INI report 2015/2095**

**“The situation in the Mediterranean and the need
for a holistic approach to migration”**

Recommendations on

Point 5: “The strategy on cooperation with third countries, in particular on regional protection programs, resettlement, returns and to address the root causes of migration” AND point 6: “developing adequate channels of legal economic migration”

July 2015

Contact: Andrea Stocchiero, policy@focsiv.it.

In the framework of the European Parliament own-initiative (INI) on the “The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic approach to migration”¹, and following the Communication of the European Commission on “A European Agenda on Migration” proposed in May 2015, Concord Italia has elaborated analysis and recommendations focused on points 5 and 6 indicated by INI, and particularly:

1. On cooperation with third countries to address root causes of migration, based on a human development approach	2
2. On mobility	4
3. On the health sector: the brain drain question	5
4. On Assisted Voluntary Return	8
5. On cooperation with a family approach to unaccompanied foreign minors and children	9

Furthermore, other analysis and recommendations are presented in the report “For a new narrative on the future of the Mediterranean”, released by the Southern Europe Concord Platforms in 2014².

1. On cooperation with third countries to address root causes of migration, based on a human development approach³

The cooperation with third countries on migration policies must take into account the root causes (poverty, inequalities, lack of freedoms, conflicts, environmental degradation, ...), motivations, aspirations and interests of migrants, of their families, of communities and local governments.

The cooperation with third countries on migration policies should be based on a true partnership, respect of human rights and human development goals. The migration governance with dictatorships must be conditional to the respect of human rights. EU should supports local governments concretely committed on human development, with a “more for more” approach, and share the responsibility with coherent immigrant integration policies in European member countries.

The concept of a holistic approach means that the migration policy should be closely connected with interdependent dimensions as: development issues, conflicts and humanitarian interventions, peace building processes, trade and investment policies, foreign and security policies of EU and its member states. Such interdependences call for coherence and coordination among those dimensions, and relative institutions, in order to have a real impact. But, coherence with respect to what? Security, economic competitiveness per se or human development aims? Concord Italia sustains the **primacy of human development goals**. The balance among different interests and perceptions on migration, internally and externally to the EU, should be valued according to the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights. According to this position, **we recommend**:

- Migration policies make sense if they are aimed at the human dignity of every person. They should be mainstreamed in a human development paradigm that encompasses all the policy dimensions, externally and internally to the EU.
- Migration policies must be coherent with EU external actions (development and humanitarian aid, trade and investment policies, common security and defense policy) as well as with internal EU policies, such as employment, agriculture, welfare, health, education. Policy coherence for

¹ Concord Italy Meeting with Cécile Kashetu Kyenge, MEP, Bologna, May 22nd, 2015.

² Concord, For a new narrative on the future of the Mediterranean: a perspective from Southern Europe. Available at: <http://www.concorditalia.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/For-a-new-narrative-on-the-future-of-the-Mediterranean.pdf>

³ Focsiv and CeSPI

development should be at the heart of the interconnection between EU external and internal dimensions. This coherence should characterize and strengthen the EU position in the negotiation with third countries.

- The first priority is to create decent work and particularly youth employment in origin and transit countries, supporting vocational training, small producers, their organizations and clustering in local, national and regional markets. Labor intensive production in agriculture industry, essential services, are needed in the Mediterranean and Africa. They should be productive and sustainable at local and regional level. EU trade policy and trade aid should sustain the strengthening of national and regional markets among Mediterranean and African countries. Value chains of EU multinational corporations should not be incentivized if they are detrimental to local markets in those countries.
- Rural local communities, small farmers and fishermen, their access to local markets, lands, water and seeds, their resilience capacities, access to education and health local systems, should be supported through appropriated development cooperation and technological transfers. EU agriculture and trade policies should be compatible with rural development in Mediterranean and African countries.
- Humanitarian and protection aid should be closely linked to development cooperation (such as in the new Regional Development and Protection Programs) and integrated in local economic and social plans that encompass both displaced and local people through a universalistic approach, inhibiting the “war among the poor”, especially in the cases of protracted crisis. In these programs, resettlement and mobility for economic reasons should be facilitated at regional and international level.
- The full recognition of the associations of the diaspora as fundamental players in the processes of participatory democracy, communication and support to local communities is needed. The traditional agenda on migration and development has generally insisted on the potential of the diaspora as an agent of development cooperation in the developing countries, whereas less attention has been given to the fundamental role played by associations in consultative and participated processes. Migrants’ associations can foster development and integration processes, increasing bi-directional dialogue between local communities and institutions in the contexts of destination and origin. Providing platforms for constant dialogue over time, as suggested by the European Commission itself (SEC (2011) 1353 , p. 9) is a fundamental step in this direction

These human development policies focused on decent work and local development are not intended to reduce migration flows in the short term. Scientific literature demonstrates the migration hump effect of development. Mobility remains a relevant choice for family strategies. Mobility should be facilitated and enhanced for the betterment of family wellbeing. South-south migrations and south-north migrations should be protected and well integrated in local host societies. **In this sense a human development approach for combating root causes of migrations cannot be separated from the need to secure mobility and integration in host countries.**

2. On mobility⁴

Although it is not possible to completely and unconditionally open European borders, it is certainly necessary to give **greater opportunities for legal mobility**. EU approach in selecting high skills needed for the internal market may be in conflict with third countries interests. A more balanced approach should take into account the brain drain effects, the need to participate in financing the education sector of third countries and to help local institutions in progressively improve their recruitment capacities, to enlarge the entrance opportunities also to low skill migrants, because they are the most important factor for the human development of the families back home. To this end, **we recommend**:

- The cooperation with third countries on migration cannot be based only on the EU interest in controlling the flows and selecting high skills for the internal market. Migration of low skill migrants is needed too and it is important for the positive impact on origin countries.
- Re-build mobility partnerships on a hard core of common obligations based on the respect of human rights, with mechanisms of monitoring, control and resolution of conflicts, involving civil society organisations.
- Rebalance Partnerships' priorities: from an approach focused on security and border control to a growing importance of the axis on Migration and Development (M&D) and on regular mobility. Today, the easing of the visa regime concerns only temporary migration or certain categories of selected migrants (i.e. students, researchers) but not long-term visas. Mobility partnerships should give more space to real mobility perspectives towards EU countries.
- Abandon the perspective of conditionality which subordinates the application of the partnerships to the signing of readmission agreements by third countries. Only this way they will be willing to comply with its rules, controlling and self-restricting irregular migration in exchange for expanded and safer opportunities for temporary mobility.
- Encourage an approach that is truly shared, mutual and able to work at transnational level. It is necessary to provide innovations involving simultaneously origin and destination countries; their aim should be the promotion of *mutual* benefits and the management of *common* challenges; for instance: transnational networks of services; extension of programmes for transnational learning and employment mobility - as Erasmus Plus, Erasmus young entrepreneurs, Your first EURES - to the partner countries; institutional building in the origin *and* recipient countries for the development of common strategies with regard to the enhancement of migration in relationship with trade, foreign investment, transnational entrepreneurship, etc.
- Ensure consistency among actions, which today are an amount of different and separated projects rather than parts of a comprehensive and long-lasting strategy.
- Communitarize the Mobility Partnerships: all member states and not just some of them should participate to them.
- Widen the spaces for representation of different stakeholders at different levels, involving non-state actors and diaspora associations which, despite the EU rhetoric, are currently almost excluded from these processes

⁴ CeSPI. Some of the recommendations have been extracted from the policy paper “Migration and development in the policies of the European Union: trends toward a cosmopolitan approach” by Flavia Piperno, CeSPI Policy Paper with Concord Italia and the support of Action Aid, 2015.

- The introduction of job-search visas and multi-annual permits in order to increase the regularity and the predictability of migratory channels.
- The guarantee of a second migration chance through the possibility of ‘freezing’ the unused residence and work permits in case migrants decide to try to return to their countries.
- The cancellation of obligations that limit the periods of absence or oblige uninterrupted stay in the destination country to maintain/get the rights of residence. The EC *long-term residence permit* and the Blue Card allow for limited periods of absence (respectively 12 and 18 months) without losing the right of residence. These are restrictions that, in any case, reduce the opportunities for circulation and must be deleted from all types of permit and criteria to renew them.
- Longer work permits, as defined in the Council conclusions of July 2012 (8361/12).
- A stronger commitment to the portability of social rights, the recognition of educational qualifications and professional experience. These are difficult reforms to be undertaken, but absolutely essential to promote human development and the agency of individuals, making them able to shape their own destiny and plan their future according to their wishes and expectations in a global world.

3. On the health sector: the brain drain question⁵

In the framework of giving more opportunities for legal migration, a specific insight on the health sector is here proposed. The international migration of (highly) skilled health workers, in particular, will be analysed from a public health perspective, in line with the framework proposed also by WHO [Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel](#).

The Commission estimates “a potential shortfall of around 1 million healthcare workers in the EU by 2020, rising up to 2 million if long term care and ancillary professions are taken into account”⁶. The Commission affirms that “we are unlikely to be able to fully match the needs” in the health sector⁷, and that Europe needs to be equipped to attract skilled professionals.

All persons have the right to choose the place where they want to live and work. Migration in the health sector, however, presents specificities - if compared with other sectors such as IT or financial services - as it may impact on the right to health: out-migration of skilled professionals may pose a danger for the sustainability of health systems and for population’s access to health services in countries of origin. While designing policies for skilled migrants – therefore – we invite policy makers to take into consideration these specificities, and to look at migration of health professionals with the additional lenses of health equity.

⁵ Amref Italy and “Health Workers for All” partnership

⁶ EU Action Plan for the EU Health Workforce, 2012. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/workforce/docs/staff_working_doc_healthcare_workforce_en.pdf

⁷ A European Agenda on Migrations, 2015. Available at: 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

3.1 The revision of the Blue Card Directive

The global market of skilled (health) personnel, at the moment, is a competitive space where the more attractive (health) system “wins”.⁸ Europe must be able to be part of this competition, while preserving the values of equity, and in keeping with its obligations to Policy Coherence for Development⁹. The proposed **review of the Blue Card Directive** is therefore welcome as far as it will fully recognise the specificities of migration in certain sectors (like health), where the contrast to brain drain and a rights based approach need to find a clear space.

As of 2014, information about the occupations for which Blue Cards were granted was available only for 8% of cases¹⁰, which makes it impossible to assess its impact in terms of brain drain in the health sector. In terms of countries of origin, numbers of Blue Cards granted to highly qualified migrants from least developed countries appear low in absolute terms¹¹ and by European standards, but may be relevant for countries of origin where these professionals are extremely scarce. The risk of brain drain from these countries may increase after the Blue Card is reviewed and made a more attractive. Middle-income developing countries may be at even higher risk of brain drain.

Based on this information, **we recommend**:

- Provisions for ethical recruitment (Articles 3.3 and 8.4) should be maintained in any revised version of the Directive and – crucially – should be transposed in national legislations. By 2014 only Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Luxembourg and Malta had transposed these provision.¹²
- All Member States, while reporting on numbers of Blue Cards awarded, should disaggregate data by occupations, in order to allow an assessment of the impact of this measure on the health sector.
- In cases of countries which do not list any “shortage profession” for exclusion from the Blue Card Directive, but are nevertheless origin to considerable numbers of Blue Card holders in key professions, including health professions, a mechanism should be identified to initiate larger political dialogue based on principles identified by the WHO Code (see section 2 below).

The Blue Card as it is today is thought to attract highly skilled workers to the EU. Very little is said about the **conditions of return** of these workers in their countries of origin. Ensuring a possibility of return under satisfying conditions is an incentive for highly skilled workers to plan a continuation of their career – and a transfer of their skills - at home, after a period of work in the EU. A specific section on conditions of return should therefore be added to the Blue Card Directive, **based on principles of**:

- portability of acquired social security rights abroad (including old age, invalidity, accidents at work, occupational diseases and death-pensions; sickness, maternity and unemployment benefits);

⁸ It is shaped by a growing global demand for health personnel; the growing liberalization of rules for skilled migration⁸; austerity measures which reduce fiscal space for health and welfare, ‘pushing out’ health professionals from public health systems, with a trend to increase international migration; “soft law” regulation of the impact on countries of origin (see WHO Code of Practice).

⁹ Policy Coherence for Development is an obligation enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty. See http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/policy-coherence-development_en

¹⁰ Commission communication on the implementation of Directive 2009/50/EC (EU Blue Card), 2014. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0287&from=EN>

¹¹ Commission communication on the implementation of Directive 2009/50/EC (EU Blue Card), 2014.

¹² Commission communication on the implementation of Directive 2009/50/EC (EU Blue Card), 2014.

- reimbursement of the social security contributions which do not give rise to rights (where third country nationals have not met the qualifying conditions for acquiring social security rights, and in absence of specific agreements);
- assistance for the reintegration in the labour market of origin (may include training, financial aid, valorising acquired competences, access to micro-credit...).

3.2 Revision of the Mobility Partnerships and on Free Trade Agreements

While the Commission's Agenda prioritises the review of the Blue Card in order to effectively compete on the global market for highly qualified professionals, a holistic approach to migration should also give space to a [review and re-definition of the scope of Mobility Partnerships](#) (as stated before), to include a more prominent focus on legal migration and on brain drain.

Especially in the case of the health sector, in fact, structured political dialogue - based on a set of core obligations and on monitoring mechanisms - is needed to fully assess the impact of migrations on welfare systems. The need for forms of cooperation, assistance and redress for the loss of human capital in countries of origin may emerge from this dialogue, which cannot therefore be substituted by global market competition mechanisms for skilled workers.

This is even more true in consideration of the fact that many health professions may not fall under the definition of "highly skilled professionals": in this respect, we are in favor of a **job seeking permit** for non-EU nationals in order to open legal and safe avenues for migration to the EU; we believe however that, for specific shortage sectors like health, and for countries having particularly low density of health workers¹³, the introduction of this permit should be part of a larger political dialogue which looks at forms of **redress for the loss of human capital**¹⁴.

The Commission's Agenda describes the services sector as the one that "includes well trained, highly-skilled foreign professionals who need to travel to the EU for short periods in order to provide services to businesses or governments", as in Services Mode 4 (Presence of natural persons) of GATS, especially in relation to the temporary movement of labour¹⁵. **We do not support the idea of using Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) to agree reciprocities which enable an easier flow of professionals**: the services sector, and in particular the public services sector, is the one in which Europe focused its offensive trade interests in recent bilateral trade agreements negotiated or also installed with partners countries.

An example comes from Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements (DCFTAs), which the EU is negotiating with South Mediterranean Countries: according to Ecorys Sustainability Impact Assessment prepared for the Commission, more than 60% of the highly skilled workers in Morocco and in Tunisia are employed in public services, and more than 11% of the employees of the service sector will lose their jobs because of the DCFTAs.¹⁶ In Tunisia, for instance, exports of public and other services will be reduced by 22%, where imports will increase by 40%¹⁷.

The "Sustainable development" chapter included in the most recent FTAs contains voluntary mechanism of assessment and dialogue with civil society on those issues, but no compulsory measures are included to address and/or solve the worst side effect of the agreements'

¹³ As identified by the World Health Organization, <http://www.who.int/workforcealliance/countries/57crisiscountries.pdf>

¹⁴ Further analysis of brain drain of health workers and Mobility Partnerships is available [here](#) (p.16-17)

¹⁵ General Agreement on Trade in Services. More at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gatsqa_e.htm

¹⁶ Ecorys, SIA on Morocco and Tunisia DCFTAs <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/policy-making/analysis/sustainability-impact-assessments/assessments/#study-geo-17>

¹⁷ Ecorys, p. 184 http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/november/tradoc_151923.pdf

implementation, including brain drain, unfair competition with skilled labor force in EU countries, pressure on wages, human rights and labor rights protection both in the partners' countries and in the EU.

As affirmed also by Southern Europe Concord Platforms¹⁸, the EU must ensure effective policy coherence that supports longer-term structural changes and discourages or ultimately restrains the possibility that sensitive processes as migrations or policy sectors as public services rely on FTAs that in fact include reciprocity, nor clear rules on possible discriminations.

3.3 More coordination between migration policy and health policy

Partly as a result of the economic crisis, policies for legal economic migration are scarcely "communitarised". A piecemeal approach prevails in this area, with the adoption of directives targeting only specific categories of migrant workers, i.e. students and researchers (2004 and 2005), intra-corporate transfers (2014), seasonal workers (2014), highly skilled workers (2009). There is a need to conceive economic migration policies not in a segmented way, but in coordination with labour, education, training and development policies, and with non economic migration policies, through a holistic approach.

Overall, relying on international recruitment in fulfilling the demand on highly-skilled health workers to replenish ageing and diminishing workforce within the EU would be a disproportionate expectation. The key response to shortages of health personnel in Europe must come from the capacity to domestically train, recruit and retain those professionals, so also exploiting the employment and growth potential of the health sector.

In this perspective, the Commission's Action Plan for the EU Health Workforce rightly prioritises better health workforce planning and forecasting; anticipating future skills needs; and improving the recruitment and retention of health professionals within the EU. Ethical recruitment, based on principles of the WHO Code, is its fourth element.

The Commission's vision on health workforce – we believe - must be additionally matched by **robust investments on the health workforce at national level**, which in turn demand that austerity measures are relaxed and sufficient fiscal space is allowed for financing health systems.

Prevention of brain drain from third countries, therefore, starts first of all within EU's own public health and fiscal policies. Skilled migration policies must support this effort in the ways highlighted above, in keeping with EU's obligations in terms of Policy Coherence for Development.

4. On Assisted Voluntary Return¹⁹

Another specific insight concerns the Assisted Voluntary Return and its linkages with development cooperation:

The "Assisted Voluntary Return" (AVR) **in order to be effective and respectful of the person involved, has to be included in a development cooperation political and normative framework.** The aim of AVR should not be focused on the expulsion of irregular migrants but on the emancipation of the persons through reintegration programs that do not inhibit their mobility. The return of vulnerable persons and of migrants who want to come back for their human development

¹⁸ Concord, For a new narrative on the future of the Mediterranean: a perspective from Southern Europe. Available at: <http://www.concorditalia.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/For-a-new-narrative-on-the-future-of-the-Mediterranean.pdf>

¹⁹ CEFA/Focsiv, CIES, Oxfam Italia and IPSIA/Focsiv.

with families and communities in the countries of origin, should represent the main two targets of AVR. The reintegration has to be connected with development cooperation projects, so that the migrant's role, as potential actor of local development, is rightly corroborated, as well as his involvement in the economic, social and democratic life of the country of origin. The reintegration should be planned in coordination and synergy **with social programs** (such as measures for guaranteeing social security rights, socioeconomic safety net/social plans) both in EU and in countries of origin.

For this purpose **we recommend:**

- **a Voluntary Return grant plan at national and EU level.** It has to be consistent with the funding channels for the development cooperation and co-development initiatives in third countries. The aim is to offer complementary services regarding the reception, the reintegration process, the social and working inclusion of migrants. These services are addressed to the weakest migrants who need to be strengthened and supported in third countries. All these actions should be part of multi-annual programs and have to be consistent with national and international workers' rights. Moreover it would be interesting to promote reintegration strategies based on fair trade economic models, such as cooperatives, associations and social enterprises that link local development with access in the EU internal market, and that are able to trigger virtuous growth paths of employment.
- **a revision of the Voluntary Return Directive (2008/115/CE).** It should not be considered as a security instrument focused on the expulsion of irregular migrants, but as a norm aimed at supporting the human development and needs of migrants. It should be part of a coherent collaboration with third countries in a humanitarian and development framework. The implementation of the Directive should guarantee similar methodologies and minimum quality standards at community-level, concerning both the departure offer and, eventually, the re-entry within the EU borders. It will be productive to organize meetings and participative mechanisms between the European governments, the Commission, NGOs and other social actors working within this field. These initiatives are likely to ease an exchange of best practices that will lead to a common approach concerning migration and all its different stages: arrival, reception, integration and support in the departure process.
- the fair debate between EU and third countries institutions on the corroboration of the **best practices concerning the assisted voluntary return.** The debate should consider and promote partnerships as well as development cooperation and therefore the implementation of innovative strategies, in particular mobility models involving voluntary return and respectful of migrant's rights.

5. On cooperation with a family approach to unaccompanied foreign minors and children²⁰

Finally, last recommendations are addressed at creating a cooperation with a family approach to unaccompanied foreign minors and children. They are a relevant and priority vulnerable target group for the cooperation with third countries and for the integration in host countries. Their number is increasing due to the conflicts and insecurities that are spanning around the EU. They deserve a strong protection and welfare system that should be assured at transnational level and in an integrated way.

²⁰ AIBI and CeSPI

We recommend:

- To respect at every level art. 24 paragraph 2 of The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union providing as mandatory that “*in all actions relating to children, whether taken by public authorities or private institutions, the child's best interests must be a primary consideration*”, which first of all means to put decisions concerning children on the top of the institutional agenda. The said legal principle also impose to consider child interest as preeminent on other interests, in particular on the interest to protect EU boundaries.
- To achieve an integrated child friendly welfare system through a strong cooperation between EU and countries of origin and transit welfare institutions, focused on the role of families and of their no profit associations
- To support coherent strategies and partnerships in order to house or to assist the return of unaccompanied minors through a focused, traceable, transparent family to family approach. The “FAMILY TO FAMILY” approach is out of the logic of pure aid intervention, it aims at developing specific activities and personalized projects, within a clear and defined public-private partnership, establishing a system of good practices and testing new instruments. The actors of a mixed partnership between public and private sectors are families, local, national and international institutions, public social services, qualified no-profit associations acting in Europe and in third countries, other potential stakeholders. In countries of origin, associations must work in collaboration with local institutions and international organizations, to support families, both preventing children departures and making traceable their mobility path. In Europe we need to develop a network of qualified family associations and families which, in collaboration with the municipalities and competent institutions, must be prepared for the temporary care of unaccompanied minors in order to guarantee them, under conditions of full equality, the application of child protection measures as far as it is recognized to any other minor on the basis of their presence into the territory. Children and youngest people should stay within the structures of first asylum for a limited time. In addition, minors under six years must be preferably fostered in families or family-based communities than in bigger and impersonal structures. In any case, where applicable and relevant to their interests, all unaccompanied children should be preferably cared temporarily within families.
- To promote the family hosting and the protection of the family relations, especially for mothers alone and unaccompanied minors- The growing number of refugee women, both pregnant or with babies, and unaccompanied minors who disembark in the European coasts, imposes the need to guarantee them protection since the first reception. The first aim when such migrants are in EU territory is to verify their juridical status and the eventual existence of a family to join (asylum seekers, refugee, unaccompanied minors etc), and during their stay fundamental human rights must be guaranteed to them. To do that we must implement targeted projects in order to receive them in family environment, where possible, or in dedicated communities, equipped for the needs of fragile nucleus. To realize this process, families must be first prepared to open their home. Then, trained families may approach temporary foster care structures in order to realize, accompanied by professionals, several activities within the foster structures (study, fun and recreational activities...). Once the relations between the family and the child is created and becomes significant, solutions of temporary family care could be applied since the foster family could play a significant role as a bridge towards the reunification of the unaccompanied foreign child and his/her family in Europe, if possible, or support his/her integration in the European territory, depending on the interest involved²¹.

²¹ See more at: <http://www.aibi.it/sostegnoadistanza/basta-morti-in-mare-come-funziona-progetto-affido-internazionale-family-to-family-bi/#sthash.nJcL4LRD.dpuf>

- To assume the international foster care as the main process for the resettlement, asylum and social inclusion of unaccompanied minors. International foster care could be the solution in order to prevent irregular immigration and the arrival of unaccompanied children. Once recognized the unstoppable need of many children and young people to leave their countries looking for a future for them and their families at home, we have to aim at creating an international integrated welfare system where public and private actors cooperate in order to put families and personal human relations first. In this context, mobility programmes for young people, for training or working purposes, should be opened as a legal alternative to irregular immigration. Besides that, the family environment must be endorsed and supported in children and young people's life. In the framework of specific programmes, the creation of synergies and cooperation among the different families involved (the family of origin, the temporary foster family and the family the minor wishes to join in Europe) could strengthen social cohesion and solidarity and, at the same time, guarantee children of every age the right to be protected. Behind the idea of temporary international foster and family care programmes there is also the main objective to realize sustainable integration and social inclusion and an easier access to welfare and repatriation services.

Considering that almost all EU countries have ratified the *1996 Hague Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children*, and that under article 3 it applies on “the placement of the child in a foster family or in institutional care” and “guardianship, curatorship and analogous institutions”, Europe should soon develop common rules and practices. This is particularly useful in order to be ready to answer in a common and shared way, once the competent central foreign authorities, under the Convention, will ask EU countries' central authorities for requirements needed before issuing a decision on a protection measure for a child who aim at moving to an EU country. A system of integrated family care and training programmes, at the same time, must reach the respect of fundamental children rights.

- Finally, such cooperation supposes the setting up of transnational networks of care services that would promote the social and economic inclusion of migrants in both directions of the migration process and through coordinated strategies. We believe that transnational collaboration between services and the exchange of best practices would be especially necessary in the following areas: 1) Information, training and integration into the labour market of the countries of origin and destination (the promotion of the EU *centres for human resources* goes in this direction and in our opinion is an expression of this ‘bi-focal’ perspective); 2) Preparation and mediation for children' inclusion in the education system (the issue of children' integration in the school system is raising concern not only in the countries of arrival but also in many countries of origin because of the strong return flows due to the economic crisis); 3) Psycho-social support ‘here’ and ‘there’: especially in relation to the processes of transnationalization of families.