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1. Summary of Session 3

On 11-13 February 2022, 175 randomly selected European citizens from different ages, backgrounds, and coming from all across the European Union, met for the third time to discuss the topics of “EU in the World / Migration”, continuing the deliberations that took place during Sessions 1 and 2. For this final session, participants in Panel 4 were hosted at the Maastricht Exhibition and Conference Center (MECC), in Maastricht by Studio Europa Maastricht in cooperation with Maastricht University and European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), with the possibility to participate online. Using the orientations, they developed during Session 2 as the basis of their work, citizens produced and endorsed 40 final recommendations, which will be presented and discussed in the Conference Plenary. Of the 175, 17 participants attended and intervened remotely.

Discussions and collective work were carried out in three formats:

- **In subgroups.** Each of the 15 subgroups was composed of around ten to thirteen citizens. Four to five languages were spoken in each subgroup, each citizen being able to speak in their own language or in a language in which they felt comfortable. Each subgroup had a dedicated professional facilitator from the deliberation group or from other external service providers. To support the work of the facilitators, the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA) provided one assistant per subgroup.
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• In plenary, with all participants. Plenary sessions were led by two main moderators from the deliberation group, with interpretation in the 24 official EU languages, at the MECC in Maastricht.

With the support of experts and fact-checkers, their own knowledge, and experiences, and through deliberations, citizens started by examining all the orientations produced by the Panel during Session 2 in an “open forum” setting. In addition to the expertise provided, they were also supported by subgroup facilitators. Each citizen was given fifty stickers (ten green for stream 1, ten red for stream 2, ten blue for stream 3, ten yellow for stream 4, ten orange for stream 5) and proceeded to prioritise up to ten orientations, per stream. Once this prioritisation at the Panel level was completed, citizens were allocated to join the same subgroups they worked in during Session 2 and collectively acknowledged which of their group’s orientations had been prioritised by the rest of the Panel.

For the development of recommendations, each subgroup was given an indicative range for the number of recommendations of one to three, with a maximum of five. The top 3 orientations ranked by the Panel within the substream were added in 1st, 2nd and 3rd position. The subgroup then used black stickers (five per person) to prioritize the remaining orientations and add them in 4th and 5th position.

Subgroup work was then dedicated to developing orientations into recommendations. To do so, citizens used a recommendation template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Signs Limit in EN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Justification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements/questions which the group had to address (not a strict obligation but a strong recommendation) while formulating the justifications of the recommendations were:

1. Why is this recommendation important and relevant to the topics of the Panel?
2. Why is it important to take action at EU level?
3. What are the undesirable effects/trade-offs of this recommendation and why do we nevertheless think it is important to do it?

During the work in subgroups, four inter-subgroup feedback sessions of about 30 minutes each were held in order to help participants understand the work done in the other subgroups and to enrich their recommendations. For each feedback session, one participant from each subgroup moved to a different room. This participant presented the draft recommendations prepared by his/her subgroup so far and took note of the comments of his/her peers. The assistant introduced the feedback into an online spreadsheet for the subgroup that authored the draft recommendations to be able to consult it, besides the oral report by their representative.

The recommendations from each subgroup were then voted by the Panel on Sunday, 13 February. Before the vote, all participants received a document with all draft recommendations generated the day before so that they could read them in their own language (automatically translated from English). The voting took place via an online form. The voting process was divided in five slots corresponding to the five streams of the Panel. The recommendations were presented stream by stream in 30-minute slots and began with one citizen from each subgroup sharing feedback on the work produced over the weekend. The main facilitation read out each of the recommendations of the stream in English to
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allow the citizens to hear the interpretation simultaneously. The recommendations were voted one by one by all participants. All interpreters obtained in advance the written draft recommendations in English in order to ensure the most qualitative possible interpretation at the time of the vote.

With the results of the final votes, recommendations were classified as follows:

- Recommendations having reached the threshold of 70% or more of the votes cast were adopted by the Panel.
- Recommendations failing to pass the threshold were considered as not validated by the Panel and are included in Annex III of this report.

The video recordings of the Panel Plenary sessions can be found here:

- Panel Plenary session on February 11th, 2022
- Panel Plenary session on February 13th, 2022

2. Context of Session 3 in the European Citizens’ Panel process

The European Citizens’ Panels are a key feature of the Conference on the Future of Europe. Four European Citizens’ Panels are organised to allow citizens to jointly reflect on the future they want for the European Union.

- 4 Panels of some 200 European citizens each chosen through random selection, from the 27 Member States;
- Reflecting the EU’s diversity: geographic origin (nationality and urban/rural), gender, age, socioeconomic background and level of education;
- At least one female and one male citizen per Member State is part of each Panel;
- A third of each Panel is composed of young people (age 16-25). A special link between this youth group and the European Youth Event has been created.

Each Panel meets three times between September 2021 and February 2022. Session 1 took place in Strasbourg, at the European Parliament. Session 2 was held online, using Interactio: an online tool allowing multilingual meetings with simultaneous interpretation in 24 languages. Session 3 is held in four different Member States: Panel 1 in Dublin at the Institute of International and European Affairs and at Dublin Castle, Panel 2 in Florence at the European University Institute, Panel 3 in Natolin at the College of Europe and at the Palace of Culture and Science in Warsaw, and Panel 4 in Maastricht hosted at the Maastricht Exhibition and Conference Center (MECC) by Studio Europa Maastricht in cooperation with Maastricht University and the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA).

Whereas session 1 was an introductory session aimed at vision-building, agenda-setting, and prioritising the topics citizens want to concentrate on, and session 2 was aimed at delving into these topics and producing orientations, session 3 was dedicated to producing input to the Conference Plenary by formulating a set of recommendations for the Union’s institutions to follow-up on.
3. Main output of the session: Recommendations adopted by the Panel (to be taken forward to the Plenary)

Stream 1 Self-reliance and Stability

Substream 1.1 Autonomy of the EU

1. We recommend that strategic products from European fabrication (such as agricultural products, semiconductors, medical products, innovative digital and environmental technologies) should be better promoted and financially supported to keep them available and affordable to European consumers and reduce dependencies from outside Europe to the largest possible extent. This support could include structural and regional policies, support to keep industries and supply chains within the EU, tax breaks, subsidies, an active SME policy as well as education programs to keep related qualifications and jobs in Europe. However, active industrial policy should be selective and focused on innovative products or those that are relevant to secure basic needs and services.

We recommend this because Europe has entered too many dependencies from outside Europe in key areas that have potential for diplomatic conflicts and could result in shortcomings of basic or strategically relevant products or services. As production costs in the EU are often higher than in other parts of the world, more active promotion and support of these products will enable and incentivise Europeans to buy competitive European products. It will also strengthen European competitiveness and keep future-oriented industries and jobs in Europe. Stronger regionalisation of production will also reduce transport costs and environmental damages.

2. We recommend that the EU reduce dependencies from oil and gas imports. This should be done by actively supporting public transport and energy efficiency projects, a Europe wide high-speed rail and freight network, the expansion of clean and renewable energy provision (in particular in solar and wind) and alternative technologies (such as hydrogen or waste-to-energy). The EU should also promote the cultural change from the individual car towards public transport, e-car sharing and biking.

We recommend this because it creates a win-win situation both for the autonomy of Europe from external dependencies as well as ambitious climate and CO2 reduction targets. It will also allow for Europe to become a strong player in future-oriented technologies, strengthen its economy and create jobs.

3. We recommend a law is passed at EU level in order to ensure that all EU production and supply processes and the goods which are imported, comply with qualitative, ethical, sustainable and all applicable human rights European standards, offering certification for products abiding by this law.

We recommend this as it helps both consumers and traders to be able to easily access information about the products they are buying/trading. This is achieved through checking the certification system; certification also helps to reduce the gap between cheap and expensive products available on the market. The cheap products will not meet the required standard and therefore cannot pass as being of good quality. Qualification for this certification would serve to protect the environment, saving resources and promoting responsible consumption.

4. We recommend the implementation of a European-wide programme to support small local producers from strategic sectors across all Member States. These producers would be professionally trained, financially supported through subsidies, and encouraged to produce (where raw materials are available in the EU) more goods fulfilling requirements at the expense of imports.
We recommend this because by supporting EU based producers in strategic sectors, the EU can reach economic autonomy across these sectors. This could only serve to strengthen the entire production process thus promoting innovation. This would lead to more sustainable production of raw materials in the EU, reducing transport costs and serving to protect the environment.

5. We recommend to improve the implementation of human rights at a European level through:
   Raising awareness in countries that do not comply, at the required extent, with ECHR (European Convention of Human Rights) or the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms; a strict control, coordinated by the EU and the Justice Scoreboard, of the extent to which human rights are respected among Member States and a strong enforcement of compliance through different types of sanctions.

We recommend this because human rights have already been agreed upon by the Member States when ratifying the European Convention of Human Rights, now being necessary to increase the acceptance in each individual state in order to make sure human rights are actively known and implemented in these Member States.

6. We recommend a revision and an intense communication campaign at a cross European level to be initiated in order for EURES (European Employment Services), the EU Immigration Portal and the EU Skills Profile Tool for Third Country Nationals to be better known by European citizens and more frequently accessed by EU companies in order to advertise and publicise their vacancies.

We recommend to not create a new online platform advertising job opportunities for European youth. There are more than enough similar initiatives which already exist at a European level. We believe enhancing what already exists is the key to promoting the existing workforce and employment opportunities at a European level.

Substream 1.2 Borders

7. We recommend that a system for labour migration into the EU that is based on the real needs of the European labour markets is created. There should be a unified recognition system of professional and academic diplomas from outside and within the EU. There should be professional qualification offers as well as cultural and linguistic integration offers for qualified migrants. Asylum seekers with relevant qualifications should be given access to the labour market. There should be an integrated agency for which the European Cooperation Network of Employment Services could be the basis.

We recommend this because Europe needs qualified labour in certain areas that cannot be fully covered internally. Currently, there are not enough viable ways to legally apply for a work permit in the EU. A European wide recognition system for professional and academic diplomas will facilitate covering these needs and enable more simplified labour migration within and from outside the EU. Employment gaps could be filled more effectively and uncontrolled migration better managed. Opening the system of labour migration to asylum seekers could help accelerate their integration into European economies and societies.

8. We recommend that the European Union expands its legislation to assign more power and independence to Frontex. This enables them to intervene in all Member States so that they can ensure the protection of all external borders of the EU. However, the EU should organise process audits on the organisation of Frontex, as full transparency is needed in the functioning of Frontex to avoid all kinds of abuses.
We recommend this because we find it unacceptable that Frontex can be denied access to the borders, particularly in situations where human rights are violated. We want to ensure that Frontex implements European legislation. Frontex itself must be controlled and checked to prevent inappropriate behaviour within the organisation.

9. We recommend that the European Union organises, specifically for economic migrants, the possibility of screening citizens (on proven skills, background, etc.) in the country of departure; this is to determine who is eligible to come and work in the EU, depending on the economic needs/vacancies of the host country. These screening criteria must be public and consultable by everyone. This can be realised by creating an (online) European Agency for Immigration.

We recommend this because in this way people do not have to cross the border illegally. There would be a controlled flow of people who enter the EU, which results in a decrease in the pressure at the borders. At the same time, this facilitates the fulfilment of job vacancies in the host countries.

10. We recommend that the European Union ensures that the welcoming policy and facilities at each border are the same, respecting human rights and guaranteeing the safety and health of all migrants (for example pregnant women and children).

We recommend this because we highly value the fair and equal treatment of migrants at all borders. We want to prevent migrants from staying too long at the borders and Member States becoming overwhelmed with the inflow of migrants. Member States must all be well-equipped to welcome them.

Stream 2: The EU as an International Partner

Substream 2.1 Trade and Relations in an Ethical Perspective

11. We recommend that the EU enforces restrictions on the import of products from countries that allow child labour. This should be done through a blacklist of companies that is periodically updated according to current conditions. We furthermore recommend to ensure gradual access to schooling for children leaving the workforce and to promote consumer awareness on child labour through information made by official EU channels, e.g. campaigns and storytelling.

We recommend this because we recognize the link between the lack of access to schooling and the presence of child labour. Through this recommendation we want to raise awareness of the consumers, to reduce the demand for products made by child labour, so that the practice can eventually be abolished.

12. We recommend that the EU establishes partnerships with developing countries, supporting their infrastructure, and sharing competences in exchange for mutually favourable trade deals to aid them in the transition towards green energy sources.

We recommend this in order to facilitate the transition to renewable energy sources in developing countries through trade partnerships and diplomatic agreements. This would establish good long-term relationships between the EU and developing countries, and it would contribute to the fight against climate change.
13. We recommend that the EU introduces a mandatory eco-score to be displayed on the front of all products that can be bought by the general consumer. The eco-score would be calculated according to emissions from production and transportation, as well as harmful content, based on a list of hazardous products. The eco-score should be managed and monitored by an EU authority.

We recommend this in order to make the EU consumer more aware of the environmental footprint of the products they buy. The eco-score would be an EU-wide scaling method, to easily show how eco-friendly a product is. The eco-score should include a QR code on the back of a product, providing further information on its environmental footprint.

Substream 2.2 International Climate Action

14. We recommend that the European Union adopts a strategy in order to be more autonomous in its energy production. A European body integrating the existing European energy institutions should coordinate the development of renewable energies depending on the needs, capacity and resources of Member States while respecting their sovereignty. The institutions would promote knowledge sharing between them to implement this strategy.

We recommend it because the current dependency makes us vulnerable in situations of political tensions with countries we import from. We see it with the current electricity crisis. However, this coordination should respect every country’s sovereignty.

15. We recommend higher environmental standards for the export of waste inside and outside of the EU and more stringent controls and sanctions to stop illegal exports. The EU should incentivise the Member States more to recycle their own waste and use it for energy production.

We recommend it in order to stop environmental damage when some countries get rid of their waste at the expense of others, especially when this is done outside of any environmental standards.

16. We recommend that the EU encourages the ongoing environmental transition in a stronger way by setting a goal of eliminating polluting packaging. This would involve promoting less packaging or more environmentally friendly packaging. To ensure that smaller companies can adapt, help and adjustments should be provided.

We recommend it because we need to reduce the use of natural resources, especially raw materials from outside the EU. We also need to reduce the harm done by Europeans to our planet and its climate. Increased support to small companies is critical to ensure they can adapt without increasing their prices.

17. We recommend that countries of the European Union, together, look into the question of nuclear energy more seriously. There should be increased collaboration around the assessment of the use of nuclear power and its role in the transition that Europe needs to achieve towards green energy.

We recommend it because the nuclear question cannot be solved by one country. There are currently over a hundred reactors in half of the Member States, and more are under construction. Since we share a common electricity grid, the low-carbon electricity they produce benefits all Europeans and increases our continent’s energy autonomy. In addition, exposed nuclear waste or an accident would affect several countries. No matter what choice is made on whether to use nuclear energy or not, Europeans should discuss it together and build more converging strategies while respecting national sovereignties.
Substream 2.3 Promotion of European Values

18. The EU should be closer to the citizens. We recommend that the EU creates and strengthens links with citizens and local institutions, such as local governments, schools, and municipalities. This should be done in order to improve transparency, reach the citizens and communicate better with them about concrete EU initiatives and general EU information.

We recommend this because current EU information is not accessible enough to all groups in society and does not reach ordinary citizens. It is often boring, difficult to understand and not user-friendly. This must change to ensure that citizens have a clear vision of the EU’s role and actions. To spark interest, EU information needs to be easier to find, motivating, exciting and in everyday language. Our suggestions are: School visits by EU politicians, radio, podcasts, direct post, press, bus campaigns, social media, local citizen assemblies and creating a special task force to improve EU communication. These measures will allow the citizens to get EU information that is not filtered through national media.

19. We recommend stronger citizen participation in EU politics. We propose direct citizens’ involvement events, similar to the Conference on the Future of Europe. They should be organised on a national, local, and European level. The EU should provide a coherent strategy and central directions for these events.

We recommend this because such participatory democracy events will provide correct information about the EU, as well as improve the quality of EU policies. The events should be organised in order to promote core values of the EU - democracy and citizen participation. These events would provide an opportunity for the politicians to show the citizens that they find it important that citizens are aware of current events and should be involved in shaping them. Centralised guidelines will give the national and local Conferences a coherent and uniform shape.

Stream 3: A Strong EU in a Peaceful World

Substream 3.1 Security and Defence

20. We recommend that a future ‘Joint Armed Forces of the European Union’ shall predominantly be used for self-defence purposes. Aggressive military action of any kind is precluded. Within Europe, this would entail a capacity to provide support in times of crises such as in the case of natural catastrophes. Outside European borders this would provide the capacity to be deployed in territories in exceptional circumstances and exclusively under a respective legal mandate from the United Nations Security Council and thus in compliance with international law.

Were this recommendation implemented it would allow the European Union to be perceived as a credible, responsible, strong, and peaceful partner on the international stage. Its enhanced capacity to respond to critical situations both internally and externally is thus expected to protect its fundamental values.

Substream 3.2 Decision-making and EU Foreign Policy

21. We recommend that all issues decided by way of unanimity are changed to be decided by way of a qualified majority. The only exceptions should be the admission of new membership to the EU and
changes to the fundamental principles of the EU as stated in Art. 2 of the Lisbon Treaty and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

This will consolidate the position of the EU in the world by presenting a united front towards third countries and agilise its response in general and in particular in crisis situations.

22. We recommend that the European Union strengthen its ability to sanction Member States, governments, entities, groups, or organisations as well as individuals that do not comply with its fundamental principles, agreements, and laws. It is imperative to make sure that the sanctions that already exist are quickly implemented and enforced. Sanctions against third countries should be proportional to the action that triggered it and be effective and applied in due time.

In order for the EU to be credible and reliable, it has to apply sanctions to those who infringe upon its principles. These sanctions should be readily and actively enforced and verified.

Substream 3.3 Neighbouring Countries and Enlargement

23. We recommend that the European Union allocate a specific budget to develop educational programmes on the functioning of the EU and its values. Then it will be proposed to the Member States that wish that they can integrate them into their school curricula (primary, secondary schools, and universities). In addition, a specific course on the EU and its functioning could be offered to students wishing to study in another European country through the Erasmus programme. Students choosing this course would be given priority in the allocation of said Erasmus programmes.

We recommend this to strengthen the sense of belonging to the EU. This will enable citizens to better identify with the EU and transmit its values. Moreover, it will also improve transparency regarding the functioning of the EU, the benefits of being part of it, and the fight against anti-European movements. This should act as a deterrent to Member States leaving the EU.

24. We recommend that the EU makes greater use of its political and economic weight in its relations with other countries to prevent certain Member States from undergoing bilateral economic, political, and social pressures.

We recommend this for three reasons. Firstly, this will reinforce the feeling of unity within the EU. Secondly, a unilateral response will provide a clear, strong, and faster answer in order to avoid any attempt by other countries to intimidate and engender repressive politics against EU members. Thirdly, this will reinforce the security of the Union and make sure that no Member States feel left out or ignored. Bilateral responses divide the EU, and this is a weakness used by third countries against us.

25. We recommend that the European Union improve its media strategy. On the one hand, the EU should strengthen its visibility on social media and actively promote its content. On the other hand, the EU should continue to organise conferences such as Conference on the Future of Europe on an annual in person basis. In addition, we also recommend that the EU further encourage innovation through promoting an accessible European social media platform.

We recommend the above as it could not only reach younger people, but also generate more interest and involvement among European citizens through a more engaging and effective tool of communication. These events like the Conference on the Future of Europe should allow citizens to be more involved in the decision-making process and make certain that their voice is heard.
26. We recommend that Member States agree on a strong vision and a common strategy in order to harmonise and consolidate the identity and the unity of the EU before allowing the accession to other countries.

We recommend this because we believe it is essential to both strengthen the EU and consolidate the relationship between Member States before considering the integration of other countries. The more states integrate into the EU, the more complicated the decision-making process will become within the EU; hence the importance of reviewing these decision-making processes that are voted through the process of unanimity.

Stream 4: Migration from a Human Point of View

Substream 4.1 Remedy causes of migration

27. We recommend that the European Union should participate actively in the economic development of countries outside the European Union and from where there is a high outflux of migrants. The EU, with the help of the relevant bodies (for example local NGOs, local politicians, fieldworkers, experts, etc.), should look for ways to peacefully intervene efficiently and actively in countries with important migration outflux that have previously agreed with the exact terms of cooperation with local authorities. These interventions should have tangible results with measurable effects. At the same time, these tangible results and effects should be clearly outlined in order for EU citizens to understand the development aid policy undertaken by the Union. In this sense, EU development aid actions should become more visible.

We recommend this because, even though the EU is working on international development, it needs to keep doing so and invest in transparency and visibility in the policy and actions that it undertakes.

Substream 4.2 Human Consideration

28. We recommend having a common European labour framework, thus harmonising working conditions throughout the Union (ex. minimum salary, working times, etc.). The EU should try to create basic common standards on labour to prevent migration from citizens that leave their countries of origin seeking better working conditions. As part of these standards, the EU should reinforce the role of trade unions at the transnational level. By doing so, the EU would be considering internal economic migration (EU citizens' migration) as a critical issue.

We recommend this because we have identified that a lot of people within the EU migrate due to economic reasons, since there is a disparity between the working conditions of European Member States. This leads to a brain-drain effect in countries which should be avoided in order for Member States to keep talent and workforce. Even though we support free movement of citizens, we think that EU citizens' migration between EU Member States, when happening involuntarily, is due to economic reasons. That's why it is important to establish a common labour framework.

29. We recommend the implementation of a joint and collective migration policy in the EU based on the principle of solidarity. We want to focus on the problem in regards to the refugees. A common procedure in all the Member States of the Union should be based on the best practice and customs that seemed to be successful in all the countries of the Union. This procedure should be pro-active and actively being executed both by the national authorities and the administration of the EU.
The problem in regards to the refugees concerns all the countries in the EU. Currently, the practices in the states are too diversified which has negative consequences for both refugees and the citizens of the Union. Therefore, a coherent and consistent approach is required.

30. **We recommend that the EU increases its efforts to inform and educate citizens of the Member States about the topics related to migration.** This aim should be achieved by educating children, as early as possible, from the beginning of primary school on the subjects such as migration and integration. If we combine this early education with the activities of NGOs and youth organisations as well as wide-reaching media campaigns, we could fully reach our goal. Additionally, a wide range of communication channels should be used, from leaflets to television and social media.

It is important to show the people that migration also has many positive aspects such as additional work force. We want to emphasize the importance of raising awareness on both processes, so that people understand the reasons and consequences of migration to abolish the stigma which comes from the fact of being perceived as a migrant.

**Substream 4.3 Integration**

31. **We recommend that the Directive 2013/33/EU on minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers in Member States be replaced by a compulsory EU regulation, which will be uniformly applicable in all Member States.** A priority should be that reception facilities and accommodation be improved. We recommend the creation of a specific monitoring body from the EU for the implementation of the regulation.

As the existent directive is not implemented in a uniform way in all Member States. Conditions such as the Moria refugee camps have to be avoided. Therefore, the recommended regulation should be implemented and have compulsory sanctions. As for the monitoring body, it should be strong and reliable.

32. **We recommend that the EU ensures that every asylum seeker and refugee, during the process of the residence procedure, attends language and integration courses.** The courses should be mandatory, free of charge and include personal assistance for the initial integration. They should start within two weeks after the submission of the residency application. Additionally, incentives and sanctions mechanisms should be established.

Learning the language as well as understanding the culture, history and ethics of the country of arrival is a key step to integration. The lengthy wait for the initial integration process has a negative impact on the migrants’ social assimilation. Sanction mechanisms can help identify a migrants’ willingness to integrate.

**Stream 5: Responsibility and Solidarity across the EU**

**Substream 5.1 Distributing Migration**

33. **We recommend replacing the Dublin System with a legally binding treaty to ensure just, balanced and proportionate distribution of asylum seekers in the EU on the basis of solidarity and justice.** Currently, refugees are required to put forward their asylum requests in the EU Member State they first arrive in. This system transition should be as swift as possible. The EU Commission’s proposal for a New EU Pact on Migration and Asylum from 2020 is a good start and should be put into legal form, since it includes quotas on distribution of refugees among EU Member States.
We recommend this because the current Dublin System does not respect the principles of solidarity and justice. It puts a heavy burden on the countries at the border of the EU, where most asylum seekers first enter EU territory. All Member States have to take responsibility to manage refugee flows into the EU. The EU is a community of shared values and should act accordingly.

34. We recommend the EU provide support to the EU Member States in order to process asylum requests both at a faster pace and according to joint standards. In addition, humanitarian accommodation should be provided for refugees. To take burden off the arrival countries, we recommend that refugees be relocated within the EU quickly and efficiently after their first arrival into the EU so that their asylum request can be processed elsewhere within the EU. For this, financial support from the EU as well as organisational support through the EU Asylum Agency is needed. People whose asylum requests were denied must be sent back to their countries of origin in an efficient manner — as long as their country of origin is considered safe.

We recommend this because asylum procedures currently take too much time, and they may differ from one Member State to another. By speeding up asylum processes refugees spend less time waiting for their final asylum decision in temporary accommodation facilities. Asylum seekers who are admitted can be integrated more quickly into their final country of destination.

35. We recommend strong EU financial, logistical and operational support for the management of the first reception which would lead to a possible integration or repatriation of irregular migrants. Beneficiaries of such support shall be the EU border states who carry the burden of the migration influx.

We recommend strong support because some EU border states bear the greatest burden from the migrant influx due to their geographical location.

36. We recommend that the mandate of the EU Agency for Asylum shall be strengthened to coordinate and manage the distribution of asylum seekers within the EU Member States to achieve a fair distribution. A fair distribution requires to take into account the needs of the asylum seekers as well as logistical and economical capacities of EU Member States and their needs in terms of labour market.

We recommend this because a centralised coordination and management of the distribution of asylum seekers which is regarded as fair, by Member States as well as their citizens, prevents chaotic situations and social tensions, thus contributing to greater solidarity between EU Member States.

Substream 5.2 Common Approach to Asylum

37. We recommend either creating an overarching EU institution or strengthening the EU Asylum Agency to process and decide upon asylum requests for the whole European Union based on uniform standards. It should also be in charge of a just distribution of refugees. This institution should also define which countries of origin are safe and which are not and should be responsible for sending back rejected asylum seekers.

We recommend this because the current asylum policy is characterised by unclear responsibilities and different standards between EU Member States. This leads to inconsistent handling of asylum procedures across the EU. Furthermore, the EU Asylum Agency currently only possesses "soft" power. It can only advise Member States on asylum issues.
38. We recommend the establishment, without delay, of dedicated asylum centres for unaccompanied minors across all EU Member States. This should be done in order to accommodate and provide care to the minors according to their particular needs, at the earliest opportunity.

We recommend this because:
1) Many minors are likely to be traumatised (coming from areas of conflict).
2) Different children will have differing needs (according to age, health, etc.).
3) Were this recommendation implemented, it would ensure that vulnerable and traumatised minors would receive all necessary care at the earliest possible opportunity.
4) As minors are future European citizens and as such, if treated appropriately, should contribute positively to the future of Europe.

39. We recommend the establishment of a common, transparent system for dealing with the expeditious processing of asylum seekers. This process should provide for a minimum standard and should be applied across all Member States equally.

We recommend this because:
1) Were this recommendation implemented, it would lead to a faster and more transparent way of dealing with asylum claims.
2) A failure to expedite the asylum process leads to illegality and criminality.
3) Minimum standards as referred to in our recommendation should encompass respect for human rights, health, and the educational needs of asylum seekers.
4) Implementing this recommendation would lead to access to employment and self-sufficiency, allowing a positive contribution to EU society. Regularising employment status prevents abuses of asylum seekers in the working environment. This could only benefit a more successful integration of all affected.
5) Extended stays in asylum centres have negative consequences in terms of the mental health and well-being of the occupants.

40. We strongly recommend a complete overhaul of all agreements and legislation governing asylum and immigration in Europe. We further recommend that an ‘all of Europe’ approach be adopted.

We recommend this because:
1) All current agreements are unworkable, impractical, and no longer fit for purpose since 2015 and up to the present day.
2) The EU should be the first “agency” that manages all other agencies and NGOs directly dealing with asylum issues.
3) The Member States affected are the ones that are left largely alone to deal with this issue. The ‘à la carte’ attitude of some Member States reflects poorly on the unity of the EU.
4) New targeted legislation would allow for a better future for all asylum seekers and lead to a more unified Europe.
5) Gaps in the current legislation are giving rise to conflicts and disharmony across Europe and are causing increased intolerance amongst European citizens towards migrants.
6) Stronger, relevant legislation would lead to a reduction in crime and abuses of the current asylum system.
Annex I: How were recommendations produced?

A. An Overview of Session 3

- Day 1: Reconnect, prioritize, and get started
  - Welcome and objectives for the weekend
  - Open Forum: Read and prioritize orientations
  - Make orientations into recommendations

- Day 2: Make orientations into final recommendations
  - Feedback to other groups: Finalise recommendations

- Day 3: Vote on final recommendations
B. Recommendation production scheme

**STEP 1 - ORIENTATIONS**

**STEP 2 - CLUSTERING**

**STEP 3 - PRIORITIZING 5 CLUSTERS**

**STEP 4 - RECOMMENDATIONS**
C. Detailed process for the production of recommendations

Friday 11/02/2022

Plenary 1

Objective: Reconnecting as a Panel and getting ready for Session 3

Welcome; Floor to citizens; Platform update; Agenda of the weekend; Introduction to methodology of the session

Open forum 1

Objective: Prioritising orientations

Reading the orientations and informal discussion in two lobby rooms (no interpretation provided); prioritising orientations with stickers; Each citizen was given fifty stickers (ten green for stream 1, ten red for stream 2, ten blue for stream 3, ten yellow for stream 4, ten orange for stream 5) and proceeded to prioritise up to ten orientations, per stream.

Stream 1  Self-Reliance and Stability
Substream 1.1 Autonomy of the EU

Stream 2  The EU as an International Partner
Substream 2.2 International Climate

Stream 3  A Strong EU in a Peaceful World
Substream 3.1 Security and Defense

Stream 4  Migration from a Human Perspective
Substream 4.1 Integration

Stream 5  Responsibility and Solidarity across the EU
Substream 5.1

Subgroup work 1

Objective: Start transforming orientations into recommendations
Saturday, 12/02/2022

Subgroup work 2

Objective 1: Transform orientations into recommendations

The same methodology as in subgroup work 1 was followed.

Objective 2: Giving/receiving feedback to other subgroups from the same stream.

Objective 3: Giving/receiving feedback from other subgroups from different streams.

The same methodology as before was continued.

Objective 4: Finalising recommendations

In this last phase, an attempt was made to integrate feedback from the other subgroups and from fact checking. The subgroups finalised their recommendations.

Sunday, 13/02/2022

Open forum 2

Objective: Work on key messages for the Conference Plenary

The group of 20 Panel representatives to the Conference Plenary worked also between sessions to produce the key messages. To do this, they conducted interviews with other participants to try to capture these messages and to be able to communicate the Panel’s findings in a simple way. Key messages should reflect the recommendations and their justifications.

Plenary 2

Objective: Voting recommendations

Instructions given to participants:

1. Press a button in the tablet
2. Scan a QR code to access the link of the form with the Stream’s recommendations
3. Check your Personal Identification Number (PIN) that is behind the tablet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Panel 4 session 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>European Citizens’ Panel 4: “EU in the World / Migration”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Introduce the PIN in the form</td>
<td>5. Vote thumb up or thumb down for each of the recommendations in each Stream and submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The recommendations with 70% or more thumbs up from the votes cast are adopted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II: Experts and Fact-checkers inputs to support the fact-checking process

The experts and fact-checkers input was coordinated by the so-called “Knowledge and Information Centre – KICK”, consisting of members of the Common Secretariat and the deliberation group. Whenever participants, facilitators, observers or attending experts detected a need for factual clarification, this was communicated to the KICK, which redirected the question to the appropriate expert and/or fact-checker.

A number of experts onsite and online followed the subgroups’ deliberations in order to be able to trigger fact-checking. Besides, experts from the three Institutions were on call in order to reply to fact-checking questions in their respective fields of expertise, in particular as regards already existing regulatory and other policy instruments.

Experts and fact-checkers were requested to respond within a very short delay by returning as clear a text as possible which could be transmitted by the facilitator to the participants upon approval by the KICK. The experts below were available, not all received questions and some could provide input under various streams.

**List of experts onsite and online:**

**Experts for Stream 1: Self-reliance and stability**
- **Sophie Vanhoonacker**, Chair in Administrative Governance and Jean Monnet professor at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS), Maastricht University.
- **Martijn Pluim**, Director Migration Dialogues & Cooperation at ICMPD.

**Experts for Stream 2: The EU as an international partner**
- **Heidi Maurer**, Researcher at the department for e-governance and administration at the Danube University Krems.
- **Anna Herranz-Surrallés**, Associate Professor of International Relations Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University.
- **Nadya Dedikova**, Diplomatic writer, EU Green Deal Diplomacy.
- **Bernard Hoekman**, Professor and Director of the research area “Global Economics” at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute in Florence.
- **Andrea Ott**, Professor of EU External Relations Law at the Law Faculty of Maastricht University.
- **Wolfgang Koeth**, Senior Lecturer at European Institute of Public Administration.

**Experts for Stream 3: A strong EU in a peaceful world**
- **Steven Blockmans**, Director of Research at Centre for European Policy Studies, Professor of EU External Relations Law and Governance at the University of Amsterdam and editor-in-chief of the European Foreign Affairs Review.
- **Michael Zinkanell**, AIES Deputy Director.
- **Leonard Schuette**, Doctoral researcher in the NestIOr project 'Who gets to live forever? Toward an Institutional Theory on the Decline and Death of International Organisations', Maastricht University.
- **Béáta Huszka**, Assistant Professor at Eötvös Loránd University.
- **John O’Brennan**, Jean Monnet Chair in European integration and Director of the Maynooth Centre for European and Eurasian Studies.
Experts for Stream 4: Migration from a Human Point of View

- **Rainer Münz**, Visiting Professor at the Central European University.
- **Talitha Mortimer Dubow**, Researcher within the Migration Group at UNU-MERIT/ Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, Maastricht University.
- **Martijn Pluim**, Director Migration Dialogues & Cooperation at ICMPD.
- **Lalaine Siruno**, PhD, School of Business and Economics, Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, Maastricht University.
- **Jérôme Vignon**, Adviser at the Jacques Delors Institute.

Experts for Stream 5: Responsibility and Solidarity Across the EU

- **Violeta Moreno-Lax**, Professor of Law at Queen Mary University of London.
- **Philippe De Bruycker**, Professor and Jean Monnet chair for European immigration and asylum law at the Institute for European Studies of the Université Libre de Bruxelles.
Annex III: Other recommendations that were considered by the panel and not adopted

Stream 1 Self-reliance and Stability

Substream 1.1 Autonomy of the EU

We recommend, where the developing countries request it, intervention programmes for economic development based on partnerships adapted to each state’s needs and/or commercial agreements, after an initial study of their economic potential and thereafter granting economical support and ensuring professional training.

We recommend this because this leads to the development of industrial independence, creating workplaces which improve the overall migration situation/status; this can also serve to aid better commercial agreements in developing countries.

Stream 2: The EU as an International Partner

Substream 2.1 Trade and Relations in an Ethical Perspective

We recommend that the EU includes regulations that oblige companies to control their supply chain by periodically providing a full (auditing) report and set conditions that reward and restrict import in accordance with ethical criteria. Depending on the size, the company should provide an internal and/or external audit report.

We recommend this in order to extend the ethical perspective when trading with the EU through monitoring of company activity in the supply chain across countries, incentizing companies to behave in accordance to ethical criteria such as the use of dangerous products, labour rights and conditions, possible use of child labour, and environmental protection. This recommendation would not apply to online products bought directly by the consumer.

Stream 3: A Strong EU in a Peaceful World

Substream 3.1 Security and Defence

We recommend that the present European security architecture is re-conceptualized as a more efficient, effective, and capable supranational structure. This will ultimately result in the creation of the ‘Joint Armed Forces of the European Union’. This development shall entail the gradual integration and subsequent conversion of national armed forces. This unification of military capacities and capabilities across the European Union is also supposed to foster an enduring European integration. The creation of the Joint Armed Forces of the European Union would also require a new cooperation agreement with NATO as well as non-European NATO Member States.

Following this recommendation, we expect military structures within the European Union to be more cost-efficient and capable of responding and acting where necessary. As a consequence of this integrated approach, the European Union should be better placed to act decisively in a coordinated manner in critical situations.
Stream 4: Migration from a Human Point of View

Substream 4.1 Remedy Causes of Migration

We recommend that the EU creates a protocol for action regarding the upcoming refugee crisis that will arise from the climate crisis. As part of this protocol, the EU must expand the definition of refugees and asylum seekers to be comprehensive and include the people affected by climate change. Since a lot of migrants will not have the chance to go back to their countries of origin due to its uninhabitability, another part of the protocol should make sure that institutions find new usages for areas affected by climate change in order to support the migrants that have left these territories. For example, flooded zones could be used to create wind energy farms.

We recommend this because we are all responsible for the climate crisis. Hence, we have a responsibility towards those who are most affected. Even though we have neither predictions nor concrete data about future climate refugees, climate change is something that will for certain affect millions of people's lives.

Substream 4.2 Human Considerations

We recommend the immediate enhancement and funding of legal, humanitarian roads and means of transport for refugees from crisis areas in an organised manner. The special system of Safety European Roads (SER) should be established and regulated by the special body created specifically for this purpose. This agency constituted by means of the legislative procedure would be empowered with its own special competencies enshrined in its rule of procedure.

Human trafficking and smuggling are serious issues that need to be dealt with. Our recommendation would certainly lead to the reduction of these concerns.

Substream 4.3 Integration

We recommend the introduction of a European directive which should ensure that each living area in every Member State cannot have more than 30% of inhabitants from third countries. This goal should be achieved by 2030 and European Member States must get support for the implementation of this.

We recommend this because a more even geographical distribution will lead to a better acceptance of migrants from the local population and therefore an improved integration. The percentage was inspired by a new political agreement in Denmark.
Annex IV: Clustered Orientations

Stream 1: Self-reliance and stability

1.1. Autonomy of the EU

1. **1.1.1 orientation**: Potentially all European member states should participate in the euro, but the accession criteria must be fulfilled.

2. **1.1.2 orientation**: Profits on speculation in crypto currencies should be taxed; Crypto currencies should not be recognized as official means of payment.

3. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

   1.1.2.1 orientation: There should be incentives for production in Europe and European workers should be supported.
   1.1.11.1 orientation: We propose that EU states and, implicitly, investors coming from them, have more favourable contracting conditions than non-Union investors trying to invest in the Union.

4. **1.1.2.2 orientation**: Food from local sources should be promoted and financially supported.

5. **1.1.3.1 orientation**: Compliance with the WTO standards should be certified and sanctioned by independent bodies.

6. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

   1.1.4.1 orientation: Companies should be required to take back all their products.
   1.1.4.2 orientation: Companies should be required to offer warranty for their products for 10 years and the availability of spare parts for 20 years.
   1.1.10.2 orientation: According to Group 1 feedback, we believe that 10 years of warranty / 20 years of availability of spare parts could help.

7. **Grouping of 4 orientations**

   1.1.4.3 orientation: Products should get a QR code on their production and supply chain.
   1.1.10.1 orientation: We propose that, first of all, to create a system of high standards for EU products to become a standard for all imported goods.
   1.1.14.1 orientation: The EU should have a company’s accountability program to encourage them to respect legislation on the supply chain and discourage them to outsource services in countries that exploit workers or do not work sustainably.
   2.1.2.1 orientation: Certification schemes that can inform consumers on the environment and working conditions (for example the ethical production methods / eco score).

8. **1.1.5.1 orientation**: Sustainability and ethical criteria should always be considered in international trade agreements.

9. **1.1.5.2 orientation**: There should be more sanctions and tariffs on imports from countries that are violating the standards.
10. **1.1.6.1 orientation**: There should be more technology and R&D partnerships with countries that are not already one of the big partners (e.g., Taiwan, Africa, Latin America).

11. **1.1.6.2 orientation**: We should maintain and support more international schools outside Europe; European ethical values should be taught in class.

12. **1.1.7.2 orientation**: By expanding public transport, dependence on the car should be reduced.

13. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

   **1.1.8.1 orientation**: We propose some sort of subsidies to be offered to producers working in areas that are the most prone to this trend.

   **1.1.8.3 orientation**: We propose high taxation of materials coming out of the European Union for use in other countries.

   **1.1.8.4 orientation**: Following the Feedback received from Group 1, we believe that a possible solution would be the taxation of CO2 emissions of transport companies.

14. **1.1.8.2 orientation**: We propose that the materials / products / goods that are exported from the EU and then re-imported into the EU to be charged with very high taxes for discouraging the manufacture of goods using Union materials outside the EU.

15. **1.1.9.1 orientation**: We propose that the production activities carried out by certain companies return to the countries of origin so that, implicitly, much of the production to return to the EU (this might be encouraged through an incentive system for these returning companies).

16. **1.1.9.2 orientation**: According to Group 1 feedback, we believe it is a good solution to reduce exports of critical raw materials, limiting this action only to them, not all material categories in general.

17. **1.1.12.1 orientation**: We propose a unitary action at EU level in terms of negotiations for imports or exports.

18. **1.1.13.1 orientation**: Linked to this topic, we believe that in order to demonstrate unity, European legislation in key areas that have begun to be increasingly present in the Member States in recent years (abortion, LGBTQ rights, etc.) should be superior to national legislation.

19. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

   **1.1.15.1 orientation**: We believe that these countries should be helped through European intervention programs to develop their production capabilities.

   **2.1.3.1 orientation**: Develop stronger relationships with the evolving economies, as well as other countries.

20. **1.1.16.1 orientation**: We believe that an accessible to all platform with EU-wide employment opportunities should be created.
1.2 Borders

21. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.1</td>
<td>Frontex should assume greater responsibility for the protection of external borders, the responsibility should not be primarily with the nation states. Frontex employees could be trained together with border guards in the member countries. Frontex could also closely cooperate with Europol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.11.1</td>
<td>The EU must expand its legislation and assign more power and independence to Frontex. However, the EU should certainly also impose more controls and require full transparency in the functioning of Frontex in order to avoid abuses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. **1.2.7.1 orientation**: There should be a system for labour migration, which is based on the real needs in Europe; the system in Canada should be a model. There should also be professional qualification offers as well as cultural and linguistic integration offers for migrants in Europe.

23. **1.2.7.2 orientation**: The private sector should get more incentives to keep production in the EU and thus also offer jobs for migrants.

24. **1.2.9.2. orientation**: Specifically for economic refugees the EU should organise in the country of departure the possibility of screening citizens (on skills, background, etc.) to determine who is eligible to come and work in the EU. These screening criteria must be public and consultable by everyone. This can be realised by creating an (online) European Agency for Immigration.

25. **1.2.10.1 orientation**: The EU must ensure that the policy at each border is the same, respecting human rights and guaranteeing the safety and health of all refugees (e.g., pregnant women and children). Possibly in collaboration with Frontex. If the country does not live up to this, the EU should punish the country or even temporarily take over a part of the country so that refugees can safely travel through the country (a kind of “white transit zone” to travel not to stay).

26. **1.2.12.1 orientation**: The EU should make NGOs superfluous by preventing them from acting on their own. The EU itself has the duty to save lives and must act in a humanitarian way. The NGOs must operate commissioned by the EU and not on their own.

Stream 2: The EU as an international partner

2.1 Trade and Relations in an Ethical Perspective

27. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1</td>
<td>Cooperation with the private sector and suppliers in the countries concerned, so that the problem is solved at the source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.2</td>
<td>Ensure children’s social conditions, including schooling, for example through free schooling, in countries with child labour exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

- **2.1.2.2 orientation:** Monitor trade exchanges between countries and ensure that the ethical values are respected.
- **2.2.5.3 orientation:** Strengthen collaboration with exporting countries to ensure that they meet environmental, ethical standards, and that their products comply with European safety standards (CE label, create a new more flexible and better respected).

29. **2.1.3.2 orientation:** Base trade agreements with China on international agreements and treaties.

30. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

- **2.1.4.1 orientation:** For example via quota on products when there is scarcity.
- **2.1.4.2 orientation:** For example, secure essential electronics and products in health / vaccines.
- **2.1.4.3 orientation:** Ensure own production in the EU of essential products in times of scarcity.

31. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

- **2.1.5.1 orientation:** Provide controls, taxes, and penalties against corruption.
- **2.1.5.2 orientation:** When trading with countries where there is corruption, it is central that all parties have a thorough understanding of the framework of the agreement.
- **2.1.5.3 orientation:** Trade agreements must be respected when trading with countries with corruption so that the money is distributed under the agreement.

32. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

- **2.1.6.2 orientation:** Ensure environmental agreements are respected by developing countries, and that both the agreements and developing countries are supported by the EU.
- **2.2.3.4 orientation:** Facilitate the transfer and exchange of green technologies to developing countries (within the framework of trade or diplomatic agreements).

33. **2.1.6.3 orientation:** Consciously aware consumers in the EU.

2.2 International Climate Action

34. **2.2.2.1 orientation:** More stringent measures and controls to limit these exports, increased collaboration between national supervisory forces to combat environmental abuses.

35. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

- **1.1.7.3 orientation:** Member States should better recycle its waste and use waste for energy generation. This could be incentivised and supported by the EU.
- **2.2.2.2 orientation:** Encourage better waste reuse, including creating energy (biogas).
- **2.2.2.3 orientation:** More recycling.
36. **2.2.4 orientation**: Reduce packaging and help small businesses create greener packaging (appliances).

37. **2.2.3.1 orientation**: Create a single space for European companies to enable them to promote eco-responsible products and services and exchange knowledge.

38. **2.2.3.2 orientation**: Create a European academic consortium specifically linked to green innovations.

39. **2.2.3.3 orientation**: Develop the European Innovation Council.

40. **Grouping of 4 orientations**

   **2.1.6.1 orientation**: Higher taxation on the countries that do not comply with the environmental standards.
   **2.2.4.1 orientation**: Tax proportionately to the conditions (environmental and labour law) of production.
   **2.2.4.2 orientation**: Create stricter rules to penalise companies that use these practices.
   **2.2.6.2 orientation**: Strengthen taxation mechanisms and premiums to push to less emitting consumption.

41. **2.2.5.1 orientation**: Increase the share of mineral ores and raw materials extracted in the EU.

42. **2.2.5.2 orientation**: Encourage the development of more environmentally friendly extraction methods.

43. **2.2.6.1 orientation**: Launch a moratorium on energy consumption of digital services and the regulation of particularly voracious and non-critical uses such as crypto-currencies and NFT.

44. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

   **1.1.7.1 orientation**: Energy production within Europe should be expanded and we need to make better use of our internal resources.
   **2.2.7.1 orientation**: Develop further renewable electricity (solar, wind, hydropower, biogas produced from waste) within the EU.
   **2.2.7.3 orientation**: Create a European leader in the field of green electricity generation (green electricity Airbus).

45. **2.2.7.2 orientation**: Launch a European debate on nuclear energy.

46. **2.2.7.4 orientation**: Allow a better transfer of energy within the European Union (gas pipeline and others).

2.3. Promotion of European Values

47. **2.3.1.1 orientation**: Review values and norms to ensure co-ownership of the idea in all member states.
48. **2.3.2.1 orientation**: Implement this kind of processes (The Conference on Europe's Future, in which we participate) more often at EU level.

49. **Grouping of 4 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
<td>Create and strengthen intermediaries between the EU and local institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2</td>
<td>Communicate more directly with European citizens by means of a dedicated channel (for example through reports, various media) to inform the EU climate policy and concrete projects and initiatives carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.3</td>
<td>Publish more statistics on emissions from different EU sectors and make them more visible (for example via the aforementioned channel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.2</td>
<td>We recommend that the EU communicate directly with European citizens by means of a dedicated channel or communication department. Information about concrete projects and initiatives carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. **2.3.4.1 orientation**: The EU should provide joint security at EU borders in accordance with EU principles and values. That is, to respect human rights regardless of what happens along the external borders.

51. **2.3.4.2 orientation**: The EU should promote cooperation between the national armies of different EU countries and European Union personnel.

52. **2.3.4.3 orientation**: We recommend the EU should secure borders while safeguarding regulated migration.

**Stream 3: A strong EU in a peaceful world**

3.1. Security and Defence

53. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>We recommend that a European Army be formed as a supplement to existing NATO strategies and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2.1</td>
<td>We recommend to restructure the current (European) security architecture and transfer existing financial resources towards more efficient military formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.1</td>
<td>We recommend developing and constructing future European armed forces in coordination with NATO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. **3.1.4.1 orientation**: We recommend that European armed forces can only be used for defence purposes and that aggressive military behaviour is precluded.
3.2. Decision-Making and EU Foreign Policy

55. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.2.1.1 orientation:</th>
<th>We recommend that the European Union stop using unanimity for so many decisions, and that it only uses it for some, few, essential and non-urgent matters.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1 orientation:</td>
<td>We propose that the decision mode within the EU is amended for all decisions to be taken by a qualified majority vote. Once this change is made, the EU will be able to study new countries' applications for integration and submit them to the qualified majority vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. **3.2.1.2 orientation:** We further recommend, to implement Orientation 1, that the EU strengthen its democratic structures, such as the role of the European Parliament in these processes.

57. **Grouping of 5 orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.3.1 orientation:</th>
<th>We as citizens recommend that the EU create a &quot;catalogue of fines and restrictions on membership privileges&quot; to deal with violations of values or other common agreements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.2 orientation:</td>
<td>We as citizens recommend that the EU implement sanctions against member states violating human rights. Member states should be united on the sanction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.1 orientation:</td>
<td>We recommend that the European Union strengthen its ability to sanction member states or third states, as well as making sure that these sanctions are enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3.2 orientation:</td>
<td>(Financial) sanctions should be placed against EU member states which do not comply with existing rules and solidarity mechanisms on migration policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1.1 orientation:</td>
<td>We recommend concrete and hard penalties / sanctions against EU member countries when member countries violate human rights or the rule of law throughout asylum procedures. For example, EU funds could not be paid to Member States.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Neighbouring Countries and Enlargement

58. **3.3.1.2 orientation:** We propose that the Member States clearly define together a common vision of the future of Europe in terms of EU expansion to other neighbouring countries.

59. **3.3.2.1 orientation:** We propose to establish a European civic education in the Member States so that citizens have more knowledge of the EU and its functioning, and that they adopt European values. This European civic education should be proposed by the EU institutions, and then accepted in the different Member States.

60. **3.3.2.2 orientation:** We propose to develop the presence of the EU on social networks, especially to reach a younger audience, and to avoid misinformation in the media.

61. **3.3.3.1 orientation:** We propose that the EU makes greater use of its commercial weight in the diplomatic relations with neighbouring countries to prevent certain Member States from undergoing bilateral pressures from them.
Stream 4: Migration from a Human Point of View

4.1. Integration

62. **4.1.1.1 orientation:** We recommend the EU to financially support the countries of origin to enhance their economic and political development, but always analysing each case individually and taking into account the specifics of each country. Experts should identify countries in which these actions could be carried out and guide the actions that will be developed on the ground. There should also be cooperation with NGOs working on the ground to help channel the aid, since they know the situation and the citizens well.

63. **4.1.1.2 orientation:** We recommend establishing a link between support for migration in countries of origin and EU enlargement policies with border countries.

64. **4.1.1.3 orientation:** We recommend also dealing with migration between the countries of the EU itself as a critical issue.

65. **4.1.2.1 orientation:** We recommend the EU to have a model that facilitates the education and training of migrants to favour their return to their countries of origin, always guaranteeing that their lives are not in danger in that country. It is important to educate them to increase the resources of these countries and to protect refugees by supporting them in the process of learning new skills.

66. **4.1.2.2 orientation:** We recommend the European Union to work on common level exams for all countries inside and outside the EU, thus favouring both migrants and the states themselves.

67. **4.1.2.3 orientation:** We recommend working on a common labour framework to ensure stability within the European Union.

68. **4.1.2.4 orientation:** We recommend the European Union to invest in a model similar to “EURES” but focused on third countries.

69. **4.1.3.1 orientation:** We recommend working on a specific action protocol to fight climate change that addresses the issue from the perspective of climate migration.

70. **4.1.3.2 orientation:** We recommend the European Union to reflect on what a migration crisis is and what is not and to define, previously, criteria that allow differentiating one from the other and acting accordingly.

4.2. Human Considerations

71. **4.2.1.1 orientation:** We recommend the implementation of a common migration policy in the European Union.

72. **Grouping of 6 orientations**

| **4.1.4.1 orientation:** | We recommend working to promote de-stigmatization. |
| **4.2.1.2 orientation:** | We recommend the implementation of activities in the Member States focused on education and increasing social awareness in the field of migration. |
### 4.3.3.2 Orientation: Success stories of well-integrated migrants need to be spread, ideally not through campaigns but through events where migrants tell about their stories.

### 4.3.3.3 Orientation: Thought should be given to how to explicitly reach people with negative attitudes towards migrants.

### 5.1.6.3 Orientation: We recommend that the EU increase their efforts to inform and educate the EU citizens about migration, and clearly distinguish in their educational campaigns between the different categories of migration (regular and irregular, legal and illegal, refugees, asylum seekers, migrants).

### 5.2.7.2 Orientation: The chosen EU authority should provide accurate information to the member states to educate citizens as to the culture and ethos of the country of origin of those migrants seeking asylum. The media should be used to do this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>73. Grouping of 5 orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.5.1 Orientation:</strong> There should be better and more intensive communication with migrants in the countries of origin and transition countries where human traffickers are active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.8.1 Orientation:</strong> There should be better education and communication with potential migrants in the countries of origin. A wide range of communication channels should be used, from leaflets to television and social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.9.1 Orientation:</strong> We recommend that the EU should inform citizens who are looking for a better life (i.e., no war refugees) in the country of origin about the reality of the new country (expectation management). The EU should also invest in infrastructure in the country of departure and in the quality of life of the people who want to flee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2.2.1 Orientation:</strong> We recommend the creation of a common and coordinated information policy in the EU, addressed to the countries of origin of people who may become victims of smugglers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1.6.4 Orientation:</strong> We recommend that the EU strengthens their efforts to steer and control refugee streams. For example, the EU should try to advise refugees during escape on realistic chances of being accepted, relevant laws, rules, and procedures to enter the EU and alternative options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 74. **4.2.2.3 Orientation:** We recommend the creation of legal, humanitarian roads and means of transport for refugees from crisis areas in an organised manner. At the same time, it is necessary to create criteria allowing for verification that their arrival to the European Union is justified. List of priority actions. |

| 75. **4.2.2.5 Orientation:** We recommend that greater emphasis be placed on actively combating human smuggling. Strengthening international security and intelligence in this area of activities. More funding for institutions such as Europol and other agencies. Need for dedicated institutions dealing with people smuggling across borders. |

| 76. **4.2.3.1 Orientation:** We recommend taking action at the global level, not only at the EU level. Cooperation with countries around the world. A network of well-functioning centres where people have good conditions, in which they stay for a short period of time and in which they receive concrete help in order to integrate quickly and start a new life. |
4.3. Remedy Causes of Migration

77. **Grouping of 2 orientations**

- **4.3.1.1 orientation**: Close individual support for migrants during integration must be ensured in all countries.
- **4.3.1.2 orientation**: Migrants must be offered language courses quickly.

78. **4.3.1.3 orientation**: There should be no more "ghettos"; migrants should live distributed. Schools in particular should be better mixed. The experience with the failed integration of the Roma should be evaluated; lessons should be learned.

79. **4.3.1.4 orientation**: Refugees should be supported to settle where they have a suitable job opportunity. For this purpose, a platform should be created with which the skilled worker profiles of the refugees and the regional demand for skilled workers can be recorded and matched.

80. **4.3.2.2 orientation**: The following uniform requirements for legal migration should apply in the EU: Language skills of the target language or English at level B 1 or B 2 on entry or compulsory language courses after entry + professional qualifications that are demonstrably needed in the EU (qualifications must be verified) + a personal statement on the objective and intended duration of migration.

81. **4.3.3.1 orientation**: Opportunities for personal encounters should be created.

82. **Grouping of 4 orientations**

- **4.3.4.1 orientation**: The living and accommodation conditions of migrants must be drastically improved.
- **4.3.4.2 orientation**: Migrants should have the opportunity to complain about poor living and accommodation conditions.
- **5.2.7.1 orientation**: We recommend that an EU wide programme should exist as soon as asylum seekers arrive that informs asylum seekers of where employment and housing opportunities actually exist.
- **5.2.9.1 orientation**: We believe that programmes should be implemented to assist asylum seekers including being subsidised to help them assimilate or integrate. With a focus on basic housing and education.

Stream 5: Responsibility and Solidarity Across the EU

5.1. Distributing Migration

83. **Grouping of 4 orientations**

- **1.2.4.1 orientation**: The procedures for processing migration requests should be accelerated.
- **4.2.2.4 orientation**: We recommend accelerating asylum procedures. Ensuring safe return to the country of origin if there is a real need to send the person back. Providing security in
the place where the sent person is to return. Making sure that the person wants to be sent back, is it safe for them, what conditions are they returning to? Need to make sure that there is any chance of integration, so as not to send people who do not want to return to their country of origin.

4.3.2.1 **orientation:** The procedures for asylum applications should be accelerated. However, the quality of the examination procedures must remain guaranteed. Therefore, more staff should be made available to the authorities. The EU should learn from the efficient screening procedures of the USA.

5.1.1.1 **orientation:** The countries where the refugees arrive (arrival countries) should receive more support in order to be able to process asylum applications quickly and efficiently. Arrival countries should also be supported in order to be able to provide appropriate infrastructure to accommodate asylum seekers. An EU institution should take over this task and its coordination, e.g., a (to be founded) EU Ministry of Migration.

84. **Grouping of 8 orientations**

1.2.6.1 **orientation:** The Dublin System should be reformed, and migrants should be distributed more equally among European Member States, depending on the capacity and economic performance of the receiving countries.

4.2.2.2 **orientation:** We recommend a revision of the Dublin Convention. Action more at the European level, not at the level of the member states.

5.1.1.2 **orientation:** Asylum applications should be placed directly at EU level, not at the level of the member countries.

5.1.2.1 **orientation:** An allocation formula should be found to distribute refugees (both those who received asylum and those who not) among EU member states - taking into account the individual conditions and (financial) capacities of the EU member states.

5.1.3.1 **orientation:** Quotas should be introduced and implemented, which define the number of refugees per EU member country - based on the (financial) capacities of the member countries.

5.2.2.1 **orientation:** We recommend creating uniform rules and criteria for asylum procedures in the EU.

5.2.5.2 **orientation:** We believe that the Dublin agreement is no longer practical or of use regarding integration. Planned and admission integration must be part of any new pact or agreement. It is no longer fit for purpose and antiquated and based on asylum seekers being left to manage their own affairs. The Dublin agreement should not be amended, it should be completely replaced.

5.2.8.1 **orientation:** We recommend that a sound legal framework should exist to allow fair and equitable distribution of asylum seekers and applications. There should be a more robust system with the Eu providing instructions to the member states.

85. **5.1.6.1 orientation:** We recommend that the European agencies better coordinate to achieve a fair distribution of asylum seekers and refugees (= irregular migration) within the EU Member States.

86. **5.1.6.2 orientation:** We recommend that the EU operates on crisis procedures in a proactive and prospective manner and reacts not only to refugee streams arriving at EU member countries’ borders.

87. **5.1.7.1 orientation:** We recommend that more money and operational support be made available to countries particularly affected by irregular migration. The amount of the contributions of the individual member states should be measured by objective criteria (e.g.,
GDP, number of inhabitants, etc) and the EU should examine possibilities of raising money on the financial markets (capital markets) in order to finance the burden sharing (and thus also promote e.g., integration projects, care for refugees, etc).

88. **5.1.7.2 orientation:** The opinion of EU citizens should be taken more into account and more efforts must be made to generate agreement and acceptance among EU citizens on such an important topic such as migration.

89. **5.1.8.1 orientation:** We recommend that the migration policy of Member States for regular immigration becomes more liberal and permeable.

### 5.2. Common Approach to Asylum

90. **5.2.3.1 orientation:** Refugees who most likely will have the right to asylum in the EU, should be granted simplified access to asylum procedures, e.g., directly in their home countries.

91. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

- **5.2.2.2 orientation:** We recommend the establishment of a high-level EU institution to take care of asylum issues and to make sure that these are carried out consistently and legally reliable. This institution should define which countries of origin can be deemed "secure" and which are deemed "insecure".
- **5.2.3.2 orientation:** We recommend setting up a higher-level institution located at EU level or alternatively to strengthen the European Asylum Support Office. A high-level institution like that should be able to review asylum applications uniformly throughout the EU.
- **5.2.11.1 orientation:** We recommend the creation of a centralised organisation to manage all asylum immigration matters. An umbrella organisation that is sufficiently resourced should be set up. There should be a central organisation monitoring, co-ordinating and governing all.

92. **5.2.5.1 orientation:** We believe that asylum seekers should be comprehensively integrated in a more uniform and organised way.

93. **5.2.6.1 orientation:** We recommend a new pact/legal framework that reflects the times we now live in is established. The issues on integration should be addressed upstream as it should be dealt with early.

94. **5.2.10.1 orientation:** We recommend that each EU member state apply the assessment/qualification process equally using all shared resources.

95. **Grouping of 3 orientations**

- **5.2.12.1 orientation:** Dedicated centre or centres should be established to accommodate the needs of vulnerable unaccompanied minors and or orphans immediately upon arrival in the EU.
- **5.2.12.2 orientation:** We recommend that specific educational and health programmes should be provided to minors as soon as is practicable.
- **5.2.12.3 orientation:** We recommend that fostering services are established to assist in the care of unaccompanied minors. This should happen in an expeditious fashion. Supports should be made available to willing foster families.