Funded by the European Union

EMN European Migration Network

Incentives and motives for voluntary departure

EMN INFORM

July 2022

1. KEY POINTS TO NOTE

- This inform strives to examine the impact of incentives and motives on a third-country national's decision to depart voluntarily. Incentives refer to the measures offered by national authorities to encourage a third-country national to return voluntarily to a country. Motives, on the other hand, refer to the personal and contextual reasons on which a third-country national will make their decision to voluntarily depart or not.
- Pre-departure and post-arrival incentives for voluntary departure are provided in the vast majority of responding Member States plus Norway. These incentives include both in-kind and in-cash incentives. The amount of in-cash incentives varies widely, typically based on the profile, needs and nationality of the beneficiary.
- Responding Member States and Norway found that voluntary return incentives that can be tailored to the needs of the beneficiary were reported to have the most impact on encouraging the voluntary departure of third-country nationals who have been issued with a return decision.
- Most Member States and Norway have opened the opportunity to benefit from Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) programmes. In most instances, these programmes are available to nationals from all over the world, although nationals of EEA countries and/or nationals from visa-free countries may be excluded in some Member States. Several Member States do, however, also tailor specific programmes to specific regions or countries of return.
- Though limited information is collected on the impact of available incentives on the decision to depart voluntarily, boosting information about AVRR and offering counselling sessions to develop a plan for the return and reintegration were indicated to have a bigger influence on the decision to take up opportunities for voluntary departure than in-cash support.
- Incentives offered within AVRR programmes are not necessarily the main deciding (external) factor as other factors, such as economic opportunities, security, social circle, quality of life, threat of forced return, have the greatest impact overall on a third-country national's decision whether or not to depart voluntarily. These factors can, in some cases, outweigh the incentives offered, leading to forced return or a continued stay, as several Member States reported. However, return and reintegration assistance can help the third-country national to make the final step once their decision to depart voluntarily is taken.
- A variety of tools to disseminate information on incentives were used across the EU. Tools that allowed for wide dissemination (posters/leaflet/brochures) and for a targeted approach (return counselling) were the most popular and deemed to have a positive impact on the third-country national's decision. Information provision in strategic locations (reception, accommodation and/or community centres, for instance) was also a tool widely used as it allowed information to reach targeted populations. Tools that allowed for trust to be built (information multipliers) were also widely used.
- Very little information is collected by Member States and Norway on the motives for voluntarily departure and more specifically on reasons for accepting, or refusing, available assistance for voluntary departure. As such, incentives are currently not usually developed to target specific motivations.

2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

This inform focuses on the issue of voluntary departures from the EU Member States and Norway, in compliance with a return decision, or in anticipation of a return decision being issued. It focuses on the incentives and the motives for departing voluntarily, including factors contributing to the decision-making process, and on their interconnection.[1]

EU Member States and Norway use various incentives to promote the voluntary departure of third-country nationals who have been issued a return decision. These include opportunities to benefit from assistance to voluntarily return and reintegrate in the country of return, typically provided in the framework of specifically designed assistance programmes (AVRR programmes). The incentives offered can be of a financial nature but may also include other measures. However, some literature showed that these incentives do not always seem to be known by the target groups and they appear to play a rather minor role in the complex combination of factors that influence the decision to depart voluntarily and/or make use of available assistance to return.[2]

As a deliverable of the EU Commission's Pact on Migration and Asylum,[3] which aims to develop effective and humane procedures for the return of individuals not entitled to stay in the EU, an EU Strategy for Voluntary Return and Reintegration was adopted.[4] It seeks to support Member States in their efforts in encouraging voluntary departure, which is viewed as a more humane and dignified path than forced return.[5] While promoting voluntary return has been a key strategic objective of the EU since it was enshrined in the Return Directive,[6] and despite Member States' efforts to introduce new policies to encourage voluntary departure,[7] statistical data shows that the potential of return – both voluntary and forced – has not yet been exhausted. In 2020 only about 25 per cent of all people without the right to stay in the EU actually returned.[8] In previous years, only about 36 per cent returned in 2018 and 34 per cent in 2019.

In light of this, the new EU Strategy for Voluntary Return and Reintegration lists practical measures to improve the framework for voluntary return from Europe.[9] Ensuring quality of support is a fundamental aspect of this strategy and provides for a wide range of pre-return measures, including counselling, medical or psychological assistance, as well as financial, legal, and logistical support for travel.[10] However, studies have shown that financial incentives have limited effect on return and that they alone do not significantly influence the migrant's decision to return.[11]

This inform first explores which incentives exist in the EU Member States and Norway and to what extent they affect the decision to depart voluntarily.

Second, it examines the impact of information dissemination on the decision to take up voluntary departure. Notably, the inform explores whether there is a link between the provision of information on available incentives and on the consequences of non-compliance with a return decision on the one hand, and the decision to depart voluntarily and/or benefit from assistance to return on the other.

Finally, this inform attempts to analyse whether available incentives have impacted the motives behind a decision to depart voluntarily and/or benefit from AVRR programmes. To do so, it surveys whether Member States and Norway record the target groups' motivation to depart voluntarily – or to refuse voluntary departure – and the extent to which these motives are considered when designing incentives schemes for voluntary departure.

1 This inform was developed on the basis of the responses provided by 24 Member States (AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK) and NO to the AHQ: Incentives and motives for voluntary departure, AHQ 2022.11, launched on 8 March 2022.

2 Koser K., Kuschminder K., "Comparative Research on the Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Migrants", 2015, https://www.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl486/files/migrated_files/What-We-Do/docs/AVRR-Research-final.pdf last accessed on 23 November 2021.

3 EU Commission, New Pact on Migration and Asylum, available here:https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:85ff8b4f-ff13-11ea-b44f-01aa75ed71a1.0002.02/DOC_3&format=PDF?, last accessed on 9 May 2022.

4 Communication on the EU strategy on voluntary return and reintegration, COM (2021) 120 final, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0120&from=EN, last accessed on 23 November 2021. The European Commission' Strategy addresses voluntary return in its broader sense, including both situations where the third country national has been issued a return decision, and when the decision is not issued yet (e.g. because the irregular stay has not been detected).

5 European Council on Refugees and Exiles, Voluntary Departure and Return: between a rock and a hard place, 2018, https://www.ecre.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Policy-Note-13.pdf, last accessed on 23 November 2021, p. 2.

6 Communication on a New Pact on Migration and Asylum, COM (2020) 609 final, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:85ff8b4f-ff13-11ea-b44f-01aa75ed71a1.0002.02/DOC_3&format=PDF, last accessed on 23 November 2021.

7 EMN inform, Overview: Incentives to return to a third-country and support provided to migrants for their reintegration, 2014, https://www.emncz.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/122.pdf, last accessed on 23 November 2021, p. 2.

8 It should be noted that the EUROSTAT data provide comparable data only to a limited extent, for example because the return decision was issued in the previous year, but the departure did not take place until the following year. See Mananashvili S., 'EU's Return Policy: Mission Accomplished in 2016? Reading between the lines of the latest EUROSTAT return statistics', 2020, https://www.icmpd.org/file/download/48144/file/Policy%2520Brief_%2520EU%2520Return%2520Rates_%2520COVID_19_%2520and%2520the%2520Future%2520of%2520Return%2520Policies%2520and%2520Partnerships.pdf, last accessed on 7 January 2022; EUROSTAT. Third country nationals ordered to leave', https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/migr_eiord, last accessed on 29 November 2021; EUROSTAT, 'Third country nationals returned following an order to leave', https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/migr_eirtn, last accessed on 29 November 2021.

9 European Commission, Migration management: New EU strategy on voluntary return and reintegration, 27 April 2021, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0120&from=EN?, last accessed on 9 May 2022.

10 Communication on the EU strategy on voluntary return and reintegration, COM (2021) 120 final, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52021DC0120&from=EN, last accessed on 23 November 2021.

11 Schmitt M., Bitterwolf M., Baraulina T., 'Geförderte Rückkehr aus Deutschland: Motive und Reintegration', 2019, https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Forschung/Forschungsberichte/fb34-evaluation-starthilfeplus.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4, p. 41, last accessed on 23 November 2021.

3. AVAILABLE INCENTIVES FOR VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

3.1. AVAILABLE INCENTIVES

This section reviews the incentives used in EU Member States and Norway to encourage third country nationals who have been issued a return decision (or in anticipation of a return decision being issued), to depart voluntarily, instead of (attempting to) abscond or wait for forced removal.[12]

PRE-DEPARTURE INCENTIVES

Pre-departure incentives are provided in all responding Member States, with the exception of Italy. Several Member States described how the incentives available in their countries apply regardless of geographical regions or third-country nationals' profiles.[13] Some Member States provide incentives (or have at least one AVRR programme) tailored to the profile,[14] country of origin[15] and/or the needs of the individual.[16]

In several Member States these pre-departure incentives are granted following a **case-by-case examination** by the authorities,[17] especially for in-kind incentives.

The widely available **in-kind incentives** include information and counselling as it allows authorities, or Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) or International Organisations (including the International Organization for Migration (IOM)), to detect and respond to specific needs. Other most common in-kind incentives are logistical support to organise the return journey, and providing for the basic needs of the individual prior to return, including covering accommodation, healthcare, food support, etc.

Concerning **in-cash assistance**, the amounts differ from Member State to Member State, although cash grants above € 250 are more prevalent. The amounts vary according to the nationality and the country of return. For instance, France and Belgium grant a higher amount of cash if third-country nationals are subject to more visa measures.

The different types of pre-departure services are laid out in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1: Available in -kind and in-cash pre-departure incentives to voluntary departure[18]

Type of in-kind incentive	Member States
Information and counselling	AT, BE, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, IE, LT, LV, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO, PL
Logistical support to organise the return journey	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO, PL
Services to address basic needs (medical care, psychological support, pre-departure housing, etc.)[19]	AT,[20] BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES,[21] FI, FR,[22] HR, IE, LT, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO
Return escort to provide support as needed (e.g. vulnerable persons)	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL,[23] ES, FI, FR,[24] HU, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, SE, NO, PL
Travel costs[25]	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO, PL
Administrative support to complete applications for travel documents	AT, BE, BG, CY, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR HR, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO, PL
Assistance to comply with COVID-19 health requirements	BE, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, IE, LT, MT, NL, SK, NO, PL

12 In Ireland, a return decision is broadly equivalent to a deportation order issued under section 3, Immigration Act 1999, as amended. In the Irish system, a person can only avail of voluntary return assistance before a deportation order is issued. Ireland does not participate in the Return Directive 2008/115/EC. It is therefore difficult to compare voluntary return in Ireland with other EU Member States.

13 CY, EE, EL (Certain specific conditions in countries of origin may lead IOM to temporary suspend assisted voluntary return and reintegration activities), ES, FI, IE, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO.

14 BE, DE, IE, MT, NL.

15 BE, CY, DE, EE, , IE, MT, NL.

16 BE, DE, EE IE, MT, NL, SE.

17 AT, BE, CY, CZ, DE, NL, SE, SI.

18 In SK, apart from information and counselling all other types of assistance are provided only within the AVRR programme, implemented by IOM. IOM does not 'motivate' migrants to return nor second provision of 'incentives', but rather advocates for informed decision reached upon unbiased return counselling as well as provision of sustainable reintegration assistance tailored to individual circumstances.

19 This incentive is in addition to the services provided in line with Article 14b of the Return Directive.

20 In AT, medical care during the transfer is provided.

21 In ES, this will be on an exceptional basis.

22 In FR, this is specific for returnees to Georgia who have medical conditions.

23 In EL, this is only possible for specific medical cases.

24 In FR, this covers returnees to Georgia who have medical conditions. Accommodation is also provided for assisted voluntary return applicants in dedicated assisted return schemes.

25 This can concern internal travel costs, as flight costs for all Member States can be paid for by Frontex via the Frontex Application for Return (FAR).

Type of in-kind incentive	Member States
Reimbursement of special additional costs during travel	AT,[26] BE, BG, ES, FI, LT, NL,[27] SE, NO
Support to attend a training programme, either in the host country or in the country of return	AT, DE, EL, ES, FI,[28] MT, NL

In-cash assistance	Member States
Cash grant (under EUR 250 per person)	DE,[29] EE,[30] ES,[31] FI,[32] LV, SK,[33] NO[34]
Cash grant (above EUR 250 per person)	AT,[35] BE,[36] CY,[37] DE,[38] EL,[39] FR,[40] LU, LT,[41] MT, NL[42]

Several Member States provided pre-departure support to third-country nationals to attend a training programme either in the host country or in their country of return.[43] If the training is taking place in the country of return, then the pre-departure incentive provided consists of administrative or enrolment support.

POST-ARRIVAL INCENTIVES

All responding Member States plus Norway provide **post-arrival incentives** to influence a third-country national's decision to depart voluntarily, with the exception of Italy and Latvia. The latter provides partial incentives post-arrival by assessing the circumstances on a case-by-case basis within the framework of AVRR programmes. The most common incentives among reporting States are those which are tailored to the specific profile and needs of the third-country national,[44] as 14 Member States plus Norway explained.[45]

Indeed, there is a prevalence of **in-kind incentives** which can be **tailored** to the particular needs of the third-country national, such as basic necessities, vocational training and support to start a business.[46] Whereas most Member States and Norway offer in-kind post-arrival incentives,[47] that are typically available within the framework of AVRR programmes, only a few Member States reported on the amount these in-kind incentives represented, and/or the duration over which the in-kind incentives are ensured.[48]

Box 1 below shows how France has adapted its reintegration programmes to offer the in-kind support best suited to the needs and profile of third-country nationals.

26 In AT, this kind of support is offered within the "Sustainable reintegration in Iraq" program.

27 In NL, this may vary according to the country of return and the status of the individual upon departure.

28 In FI, as part of the "Sustainable reintegration in Iraq" (ERRIN) project, pre-departure business training was offered to Iraqi nationals from Baghdad.

29 In DE, the cash grant provided can be as low as € 50 depending on the third-country national's individual case (ago, country of origin, criminal history, etc.).

30 In EE, the IOM VARRE project may provide cash depending on the needs, on average € 50 (up to € 75) per person but may be more if there are children.

31 In ES, € 50/person/ per day up to € 400 per household.

32 In FI, € 200 is given to adults, while € 100 is given to children.

33 In SK, € 100 is provided on the day of departure for those returning within the AVRR programme.

34 In NO, cash support offered on departure consists of $ 80 per adult and $ 110 per child

35 In AT, this assistance ranges from € 250 to € 900 per person depending on the legal status in Austria and country of return.

36 In BE, for countries with a visa obligation, the cash grant is € 350 per adult / € 175 per child; for countries without a visa obligation, the cash grant is € 50 per adult / € 25 per child.

37 In CY, the IOM implemented AVRR programme provides € 300 to returnees, while the Civil Registry and Migration Department provides between € 500 to € 1 500 depending on the country of return.

38 In DE, the REAG/GARP programme provide cash support that ranges from € 50 to € 4 500, depending on the status and country of return. If a country of return is not covered by the programme, there are possibilities of refinancing.

39 In EL, the IOM implemented AVRR program provides between € 500 to € 2 000 depending on the country of return and the place the individuals were residing while in Greece.

40 In FR, countries with a visa obligation: € 650 per person (adults and minors) / countries without a visa obligation: € 300 per person (adults and minors). An exceptional increase of up to € 1 200 may be granted to adult nationals of countries subject to a visa, on special request, as a priority for withdrawing and refusing asylum from third-country nationals present in dedicated accommodation. Additionally, € 150 may be given to returnees who take the steps to obtain travel documents themselves. The increased amount is also available for example to homeless people (in camps or squatter places).

41 In LT, since August 2021, between € 300 to € 1 000 is provided to third-country nationals depending on when they applied for voluntary return.

42 In NL, the financial support provided depends on their nationality and whether they are an adult or (unaccompanied) minor and could amount to € 500, depending on the case.

43 AT, DE EL, ES, FI, MT, NL.

44 SE.

45 BE, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FI (an increased amount of assistance may be granted if this is justifiable due to the applicant's age, injury, illness, family circumstances, or some other personal reason), FR, IE, LT, LU, NL, PL, SK, and NO.

46 AT, BE, DE, EE, FI, IE, NL, SE, SK.

47 AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, and NO.

48 Only eight Member States provided this information: CY (IOM on average € 1 350 in kind assistance, CRMD up to € 2 000 in cash and in-kind support for up to 12 months, through FRONTEX JRS project), EL (in-kind assistance amounts to € 1 500), FI (in category A countries in-kind assistance amounts to EUR 5000 and in category B, C and D countries to EUR 3000), FR (see box page 7 dedicated to the French scheme which provides for 3 levels of support), IE (the value of in kind reintegration assistance for single individuals is up to € 1 200 and for families up to € 2 000, with a small amount provided in cash), LT (€ 1000 is provided to support reintegration), LU (in-kind and in-cash assistance is available for up to 6 months), NL (reintegration support can amount to EUR 1800 per adult and 2800 per (unaccompanied) minor, of which maximum € 300 can be provided in cash and the rest in kind), SK (reintegration assistance grant can amount to € 1 300 standard case and € 2 000 vulnerable case. Duration of the assistance is 12 months after the departure or until the end of the project, whichever comes sooner).

Box 1 French reintegration programmes adapted to the needs and profile of beneficiaries

France has implemented reintegration programmes which offer three levels of support to nationals from 28 different countries.[49] The three level of support are organised as follows:

Level 1: social reintegration support covers the family's initial set-up costs (within the first six months of return) relating to the housing, health or schooling of minor children, up to a maximum of € 400 per adult and € 300 per minor child.

Level 2: employment reintegration assistance is offered through job search assistance provided by a specialised local service provider and financial assistance to cover part of the salary (maximum 60 %) over a maximum period of one year and up to a maximum of € 4 000, or through the financing of training improving the employability of the candidate and up to a maximum of € 2 000.

Level 3: support for reintegration through business creation which includes carrying out a feasibility study of the project, covering part of the start-up costs of the enterprise in addition to the personal input mobilised by the beneficiary and monitoring the activity for one year. The maximum amount of assistance depends on the countries (priority countries € 6 300, countries without agreement € 5 200, and visa-free countries € 3 000).

Regarding **in-cash assistance**, amounts were also usually adjusted to the needs, profile and country of return of the third-country national.[50] However, there is a stronger emphasis on the **country of return** as compared to post-arrival in-kind incentives. On average, the amounts of in-cash assistance tend to remain under € 1 000. However, Member States with the highest number of caseloads tend to give a much higher sum. In Norway, as a means to encourage return within the period for voluntary departure, the amount of in-cash assistance decreases if the person applies only after the expiration of the date for voluntary departure.

Generally, in- kind and in-cash incentives are combined for greater impact- 10 Member States plus Norway combine both types of incentives.[51] See an example in Box 2 below.

Box 2 Post-arrival in-kind and in -cash assistance in Ireland

The Irish reintegration assistance is provided in-kind, with a small portion (up to 300 euros) issued in cash. The in-kind assistance allows the person to start a business or enter further education or training when they are back in their home country but can also be tailored to other needs depending on the needs and vulnerabilities of the returnee. The value of this reintegration assistance for single individuals is up to € 1 200 and for families up to € 2 000.

The different types of post-arrival incentives provided are elaborated in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2: Available in-kind and in-cash post arrival incentives to return[52]

Type of in-kind incentive	Member States plus Norway (if applicable)
Support to start a business (e.g. implementation of income generating activities or obtaining professional equipment)	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI,[53] FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO[54]
Vocational training or educational courses (e.g. school fees)	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO[55]
Support to find a work placement	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, FI, FR, HU, IE,[56] LT, LU, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK
Basic needs (medical services, accommodation, food, etc.)	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EL, FI, FR, IE,[57] LT, LU, MT, NL, PL,[58] SE, SK, NO[59]
Logistical support upon arrival	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, FI, HR, HU, IE,[60] LU, MT, NL, SE, SK

49 Armenia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo Brazzaville, Congo DRC, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Guinea Conakry, Haiti, Mali, Morocco, Mauritius, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan and Russia.

50 CY, DE (in the Starthilfe Plus programme), FI (adjusted based on country of return and the need), NL, SE.

51 AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, ES, FI, LU, NL, PL, SE and NO.

52 All types of assistance are provided only within the AVRR programme, implemented by IOM. IOM does not 'motivate' migrants to return nor second provision of 'incentives', but rather advocates for informed decisions reached upon with the support of unbiased return counselling, as well as the provision of sustainable reintegration assistance tailored to individual circumstances.

53 In FI, the amount will vary according to the country of return.

54 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.

55 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.

56 In IE, this is only available as of 2022 as a pilot measure run by IOM Ireland for returnees to Georgia.

57 IOM Ireland can provide a reintegration grant to cover basic needs as long as strict criteria are met.

58 In PL, this incentive only applies to vulnerable cases.

59 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.

60 Depending on the country of return, IOM may have representatives there that can assist with onward travel and making arrangements for accommodation once the returnees arrives.

Type of in-kind incentive	Member States plus Norway (if applicable)
Medical care	AT, BE,[61] CY, DE, FI, FR, IE,[62] LU, MT, NL,[63] PL,[64] SE, SK, NO[65]
Post-arrival counselling	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE ES, FI, HR, HU, IE, MT, NL,[66] SE, SK, NO[67]
Assistance to comply with COVID-19 health requirements	BE, CY, FI, IE, LT, MT, NL, SE, SK, NO[68]
In-cash assistance	**Member States (plus Norway)**
Cash grant under € 1 000	AT,[69] BE, CY, DE, FI,[70] LU,[71] NL,[72] PL,[73] NO[74]
Cash grant over € 1 000	BG,[75] CY,[76] ES,[77] FI,[78] LU,[79] SE,[80] NO

COUNTRIES/REGIONS OF RETURN IN WHICH THESE INCENTIVES ARE AVAILABLE

On average, most AVRR programmes are not set-up for specific **countries or regions of return**: the decision to grant support is generally taken based on an individual needs assessment and review of the situation in the country of return.[81] However, target populations or countries/regions of origin may be excluded from specific incentives. In particular, nationals from EU Member States, EEA countries, and/or visa-free countries tend not to be accepted in AVRR programmes.[82] Austria further excluded nationals from Western Balkan[83] countries and third-country nationals who committed crimes or pose a risk to public order or national security.[84]

Nevertheless, in several Member States there are also **specific programmes tailored to countries or regions of return**:[85]

- In Cyprus, the AVRR programme implemented by IOM is open to nationals from all countries, while the program run by the Civil Registry and Migration Department concerns only countries whose nationals are present in Cyprus in high numbers, including sub-Saharan African countries, Middle Eastern countries, several Asian countries (including Iraq, Pakistan and Bangladesh), several Eastern European countries, Western Balkan countries and North African countries.
- In 2021, Finland led an ERRIN project "Sustainable reintegration in Iraq", which targeted Iraqis, and Latvia is also preparing a project specifically aimed at Iraqis.
- The Netherlands piloted two tailored AVRR projects for Moroccan nationals in detention. A significant number of illegally residing Moroccan nationals are subject to detention measures of various kinds. Moroccan nationals are excluded from reintegration support, according to Dutch policy. Contrary to the policy, these exceptional AVRR projects were set up to assess the willingness of Moroccan detainees for voluntary return with reintegration support and test whether these pilot projects are an effective measure to break the cycle of illegal (over)stay. The majority of the targeted

61 In BE, the amount provided will vary from case to case depending on needs and detected vulnerabilities and will last 1 year.
62 In IE, assistance can be provided for once off medical care.
63 In NL, this includes psychosocial support.
64 In PL, this incentive only applies to vulnerable cases.
65 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.
66 In NL, this assistance if available for up to 12 months.
67 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.
68 In NO, this is only available in specific countries of origin.
69 In AT, cash assistance of up to € 500 is granted.
70 In FI, the amount of cash assistance depends on the country of return: for adults, it is € 200, 500, 800 or 1 500 depending on the country of return (for children: € 100, 300, 500, 750.). Additional cash assistance can be given in cases of specific vulnerabilities.
71 In LU, depending on the type of cash assistance, the amount will vary between € 500 to € 5 000.
72 In NL, a maximum of € 300 can be provided in cash for reintegration support under the REAN (Return and Emigration of Aliens) programme. For incidental expenses during travel or after arrival, up to € 200 can be provided for adults and unaccompanied minors depending on the nationality, or € 40 for accompanied minors.
73 In PL, beneficiaries of the voluntary return programme are entitled to receive a cash allowance of PLN 300 or 800.
74 In NO, the amount can vary between € 500 or € 1 500.
75 In BG, the financial assistance ranges from € 1 000 to € 2 000, depending on the status of the individual.
76 In CY, the case grant can be up to € 2 000.
77 In ES, financial assistance is provided post-arrival to help set up a business project. The assistance ranges from € 1 000 to € 6 000.
78 In FI, the amount of cash assistance depends on the country of return: for adults, it is € 200, € 500, € 800 or € 1 500 depending on the country of return (for children: € 100, € 300, € 500, € 750). Additional cash assistance can be given in cases of specific vulnerabilities.
79 In LU, depending on the type of cash assistance, the amount will vary between € 500 to € 5 000.
80 In SE, cash assistance can amount to SEK 30 000 for third-country nationals aged 18 and over and SEK 15 000 for children. Families can receive a maximum of SEK 75 000 in cash assistance.
81 AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE (the amount of services offered may vary according to the country of return, other factors also influence the amount of services for example age, belonging to a vulnerable group or criminal history), EE, EL, FI (the amount of assistance provided will vary according to the country or return), FR (the amount will vary according to whether the country is subject to a visa or not), HR, HU, IE, LT, LU, NL, PL, SK, NO.
82 AT (refers exclusively to the payment of financial start-up assistance; support within the framework of organisational assistance and the assumption of travel costs is granted if the necessary conditions are met. Furthermore, returnees who are excluded from financial start-up assistance are given a small amount of money if they are destitute, in order to cover their first urgent needs after returning to their country of origin), BE, EE, FI, MT, NL (nationals from EU/EEA countries and nationals from the 35 richest countries in the world as determined by gross national product per capita are excluded from all AVRR Programmes, as are third-country nationals who have departed the EU in the last five years with the support of IOM, the Repatriation and Departure Service (*De Dienst Terugkeer en Vertrek* - DT&V) or Frontex), SK.
83 This was also the case in LU.
84 In AT, this exclusion depended on the nature and severity of the offence committed. FI (the Police may exclude applicants based on crimes committed); this also applies to DE. If a longer prison sentence has been served or a person is deemed a threat to national security, a third-country nationals might be excluded from receiving AVRR support.
85 CY, FI, LV, MT, NL, SE, NO.

third-country nationals was issued a return decision, though this was not a prerequisite to be able to participate. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, actual pilot results were limited. In total, 99 third-country nationals were counselled, of which 10 actually voluntarily returned to Morocco with reintegration support.

- In Sweden, different assistance was available according to the country of return: in-cash assistance was available for nationals from Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Iraq (Kurdistan, central and southern), Yemen, Libya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Somalia, Palestine, Sudan, South Sudan and Ethiopia; while in-kind assistance was available for nationals from Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Iraq, Morocco, Nigeria and Pakistan.

Box 3 below provides an example of a reintegration project tailored to a specific region of return.

Box 3: German reintegration projects tailored for returnees to Albania and Kosovo

Germany provides country and region of return specific reintegration support e.g. in Kosovo and Albania. The reintegration projects URA Kosovo and URA Albania funded by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) and German federal states (Länder) offer a wide variety of support measures (either in-cash or in-kind) tailored to the individual needs of each returnee. Within a given budget available support measures can be combined freely in order to provide each individual the most effective support possible.

The political situation in the country of return may also lead to an adaption of programmes: in Lithuania, an increase in the amount of assistance was driven by the migration crisis at the border with Belarus in 2021 and did not target any specific group based on the country of origin.

3.2. EFFECTIVENESS OF AVAILABLE INCENTIVES

INCENTIVES WITH THE MOST IMPACT

Several Member States and Norway provided information on which incentives had the most impact on a third-country national's decision to voluntarily depart.[86] However, no Member State carried out comparative studies to reach these results, but rather relied on their practical experience. There were two exceptions to this. First in Sweden, where the Swedish Migration Agency was tasked with analysing and reporting on factors that contribute to voluntary returns in 2020;[87] comparative studies are however not carried out regularly. Additionally, Germany conducted an evaluation of the *Starthilfe* Federal Programme.[88]

A number of Member States reported that **incentives which can be tailored to the needs and profile of the third-country national** have the most impact. Indeed, this is especially the case for counselling and information provision, as explained by several Member States.[89] For them, providing information about AVRR and the possibility to attend, if interested, counselling sessions, had the greatest impact, as it helped the individuals make an informed decision regarding their return. The evaluation conduced in Germany, concluded that the return counselling was important when making return decisions and that in-kind and in-cash support provided upon return was important to support beneficiaries finding a stability in the initial period after return.

Contrary to studies that suggest the opposite, Member States mentioned in-cash assistance as an effective incentive.[90] Several Member States noted that an increase in the **amount allocated to in-cash assistance** also led to an increase in voluntary departures.[91] For instance, in Cyprus, the increased cash assistance available since September 2021 contributed to a higher number of voluntary departures. In France, the number of assisted voluntary return applicants increased sharply under the exceptional scheme which combined groundwork with patrolling and increased assistance by € 1 200 in addition to the € 650 originally allocated.[92]

Other successful incentives were identified by several Member States and Norway,[93] for example:

- In two Member States, **in-kind assistance** seemed to have a stronger impact than in-cash assistance. In Belgium, accessing in-kind reintegration assistance had a significant impact in choosing to voluntarily comply with a return decision. Finland stated that there was an increase of third-country nationals choosing in-kind assistance rather than cash between 2020 and 2021. The impact of in-kind assistance may vary according to the nationality of the individual.
- In Norway, an **increase in-cash support** led to an increase of voluntary departures of Russian nationals, while an increase of in-kind support led to an increase of voluntary departures of Ethiopians.
- Lithuania found that increases in voluntary departures could also be attributed to the **developing cooperation** with Iraq's national authorities, where consular visits helped to convince Iraqi nationals to depart in voluntary compliance with a return decision and supported them in accessing travel documents.

Conversely, several Member States found that **incentives had less impact than other external factors on the decision to depart voluntarily, although**

86 AT, BE, CY, CZ, EE, ES, FI, FR, LT, LU, NL, PL, SI, and NO.

87 In the Appropriation Directives for 2020.

88 Further information about the evaluation can be found here: https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Forschung/Forschungsberichte/fb34-evaluation-starthilfeplus.html?nn=282388, last accessed on 1 July 2022.

89 AT (obligatory return counselling at the legally determined point in time), BE, CZ, DE, EE, FR, MT, NL.

90 Schmitt M., Bitterwolf M., Baraulina T., 'Geförderte Rückkehr aus Deutschland: Motive und Reintegration', 2019, https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Forschung/Forschungsberichte/fb34-evaluation-starthilfeplus.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4, p. 41, last accessed on 23 November 2021.

91 CY, DE, FR, LT MT.

92 The scheme was implemented in tandem with the dismantlement of camps in France, for migrants willing to go to the UK.

93 For example, BE, CY, FI, LT, LU, PL, NO.

these would facilitate making the decision.[94] In Luxembourg, IOM staff who provide return counselling found that factors with the most impact on the decision to depart voluntarily included the risk of being forcibly removed and the Schengen entry ban, which would prohibit the third-country national from re-entering the territory for up to five years. Germany came to a similar conclusion. Similarly, Sweden found that evidence suggested that the perspective of being forcefully removed or the risk of being issued an entry ban were the main drivers behind the decision to comply with the obligation to leave within the period for voluntary departure, in particular for individuals returning to countries with geographical proximity to the Schengen area. In the Netherlands, evidence shows that AVRR has limited impact on the decision to voluntarily depart compared to other aspects, such as perceived safety in the country of return or thoroughness of the asylum procedure. However, return and reintegration assistance can help the third-country national to make the final step once their decision to depart voluntarily is taken.[95] The return decision is more likely to be impacted by safety, changes in the host country and the country of return, as well as status of the asylum application.

More generally, Poland found through post-arrival monitoring visits conducted jointly by Polish authorities and IOM that return assistance provided third-country nationals with a sense of security, appreciation and an improved social status, which would discourage migration to the European Union and allow them to be free of the burden of the social stigma of forced return.

Six Member States stated they had no data to know which incentives had the most impact.[96]

Box 4 below presents the key findings of an internal study conducted in France.[97]

Box 4: French study showed the success of reintegration assistance

The Evalua study received by OFII in 2020 shows that the national reintegration scheme is a functioning scheme. The evaluation examined reintegration programmes in 14 countries with interviews of 373 beneficiaries out of a total of 1 357 beneficiaries over the period 2014-2017. Various sectors were represented: 88% focused on business aid, 16% focused on social aid and 6% focused on employment aid. The results show that:

- 82% of beneficiaries of this reintegration scheme are still in their country of return between two and five years after their project has been funded. Only 3 % returned to France.
- 51% of the projects examined are still active (which is higher than the 5-year survival rate of micro-enterprises (24%) and other sole proprietorships (50%) in France).
- An average of 1.2 jobs were created per assisted person (including that of the returnee). On average, 12% created 4.4 jobs (including the beneficiary's job), which are involved in the development of the country of return.

CHALLENGES NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INCENTIVES TO RETURN

Challenges which lessened the impact of incentives to depart voluntarily were identified by 12 Member States plus Norway.[98]

Five Member States and Norway explained that **incentives were usually not attractive enough to outweigh the benefits of remaining.**[99] In Austria, this was especially the case if the incentive available was not perceived as providing income-generating options. In Lithuania, even the increased lump-sum payments were found to be less than what the third-country national initially spent for their travel to the country.

Accessing AVRR was cited as a challenge in three Member States plus Norway,[100] as there was a lack of trust or credibility that the reintegration assistance could be provided in the return country. This was expressed either through a distrust in the return country's authorities themselves,[101] and/or because of the administrative and procedural burden third-country nationals must endure to access assistance.[102] Similarly, Sweden[103] and Norway explained that delays in accessing assistance were cited as challenges.

The situation in the country of return was also reported as a challenge to the effectiveness of incentives in six Member States plus Norway.[104] Indeed, and as stated above, incentives are not necessarily the main deciding factor in a decision to depart voluntarily. These incentives can be outweighed by other factors, such as (the absence of) economic opportunities, support from a social circle upon return, and the burden of the return stigma, to name a few, and can lead to a continued stay in the EU Member States and Norway.

Another challenge raised by four Member States plus Norway was **ensuring that the assistance responded**

94 EE, LU, NL, SE. In Estonia, one of the measures to motivate individuals to return voluntarily within the period for voluntary departure is that a person may apply to revoke the prohibition on entry (entry ban) if they prove that they have left the territory of a Member State within the term for voluntary departure.

95 IOM, Reaching out to the unknown, 2008, https://iom-nederland.nl/images/Reports/IOM_Rapport_Reaching_out_tot_the_unknowndefinitef.pdf, last accessed on 1 April 2022; Leerkes, A.S, Galloway, M, & Kromhout, M., "Kiezen tussen twee kwaden", Ministerie van Veiligheid en Justitie, 2010, http://hdl.handle.net/1765/23243, last accessed on 9 May 2022.

96 EE, EL, FI, IE, LV, SK.

97 Unfortunately, the study could not be published.

98 AT, BE, EE, FI, FR, IE, LT, LU, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK and NO.

99 AT, CY, DE, FI, LT, SI and NO.

100 BE, FR, SE and NO.

101 FR.

102 SE, and NO.

103 In Sweden, these examples are based on interviews with returnees to Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the following report: Constanza Vera Larrucea, Henrik Malm Lindberg & André Asplund, "Those who were sent back: Return and reintegration of rejected asylum seekers to Afghanistan and Iraq", *Delmi Report 2021:10*, Those who were sent back - Delmi, last accessed on 16 May 2022.

104 BE, DE, IE, LU, NL, SE, NO.

effectively to individual needs.[105] Lithuania and Norway both found that in-kind assistance was not always sufficient to ensure a successful reintegration, while in Sweden, returnees stated that they would have welcomed more psycho-social support.[106]

The impact of the **COVID-19 pandemic** was raised in Belgium, France and Poland- Belgium and France stated that health regulations meant that implementing reintegration assistance was difficult, especially as return operations had been stalled. In Poland, the entry into force of the Special Act which provided legal solutions for third-country nationals also precluded them from accessing voluntary return programmes, as they were allowed to conditionally stay on the territory. As a result, some third-country country nationals who wished to return could not do so.

Austria and Poland also noted challenges with the **institutional set-up for delivering return assistance.** Austria stated that relying on referral mechanisms was in some instances a challenge, as it did not always guarantee the participation of the returnee (e.g. in trainings) in the return country, and that implementation periods of some programmes were too short to produce additional information on the project and to distribute these to all return counsellors, therefore also not being able to set up a referral mechanism on a national level (as in the case of SRI project). Poland noted that the dependence on IOM as the main implementing partner for AVRR programmes, limited at the possibility to apply return assistance as incentive for all countries of return. Finally, the Slovak Republic found that in some instances, third-country nationals found it easier to return by their own means rather than rely on assistance provided. This was especially the case for third-country nationals from a region/country near the Slovak Republic.

4. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON INCENTIVES AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS

4.1. MEANS USED TO INFORM POSSIBLE BENEFICIARIES ABOUT AVAILABLE INCENTIVES

Various tools for **information dissemination** are implemented across the EU Member States and Norway,[107] as outlined in Table 3 below. These tools and methods aim to reach all individuals who may be interested in voluntary departure programmes.

One of the most implemented tools is **return counselling**, as it allows for counsellors to provide exhaustive, accurate, and tailored information to third-country nationals. Notably, IOM Ireland additionally offers a counselling service through an independent professionally qualified psychotherapist. The aim of this service is to give beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of the voluntary return programme an opportunity to speak with someone who can potentially assist with any anxiety or fears the beneficiary may have through therapy. This can assist the beneficiary with decision making around return as well as to prepare for departure.

Tools which allow for a **wider audience** to be reached (such as posters/leaflets and brochures), and tools which give potential returnees the opportunity to **seek information themselves** (online presence, such as websites and social media) are also largely used across Member States.

Though less widely implemented, a few Member States have chosen to develop specific projects with local authorities or NGOs,[108] to maximise outreach. One such project is highlighted in Box 5 below.

Box 5: Belgian Individual Case Management Support (ICAM) desks

Belgium has set up ICAM desks in seven major cities since December 2021. These desks aim to inform irregularly staying migrants about their situation, investigate possible new residence procedures, and help and encourage them to return voluntarily. If a new residence procedure is not useful and if the irregularly staying migrant refuses to return voluntarily, the consequences of illegal stay are explained including the possibility of forced return. Due to the war in Ukraine and the deployment of coaches in the registration centre, the activities of the ICAM desks have been mainly put on hold in 2022.

In several EU Member States and Norway, information about AVRR programmes is accessible either **as soon as third-country nationals lodge an application for asylum**[109] and/or as soon as the **return procedure begins**.[110] Member States who make information available as soon as the application for asylum is lodged explained that this was to ensure that third-country nationals had access to clear and correct information as early as possible. Similarly, Austria has taken several communication measures to ensure that people who are obliged to leave the country are already informed about the incentives for voluntary departure at an early stage or even before the return decision has been issued.

Table 3 below provides an overview of the different information practices used in EU Member States and Norway.

105 BG, EE, LT, SE and NO.

106 These examples are based on interviews with returnees to Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the following report: Constanza Vera Larrucea, Henrik Malm Lindberg & André Asplund, "Those who were sent back: Return and reintegration of rejected asylum seekers to Afghanistan and Iraq", *Delmi Report 2021:10*, Those who were sent back - Delmi, last accessed on 16 May 2022.

107 AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK and NO.

108 BE, CZ, DE IE, MT, NO.

109 BE, CY, FR, DE IE, LU, LV, MT, SE, SK, NO.

110 CY, DE, EE, FI, FR, HR, IE, NL, PL, SE, SK.

TABLE 3: Information dissemination tools per Member State

Information dissemination tools	Member States
Posters/leaflets/brochures	AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, EL, ES, DE, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO
Return counselling (in person or online)	AT,[111] BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, FI, FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK, NO
Information provision in strategic locations (e.g. reception/accommodation centres, hospitals, transportation centres, police stations, schools, etc.)	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO
Online presence (social media, website, information platform, etc.)	AT, BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, LT, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO
Information multipliers (e.g. translators, community leaders, NGOs, consular representations, diaspora, etc.)	BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, FR, IE, LT, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK, NO
Information included in the return decision	BE, CZ, DE, FI, FR, IE, LU, MT, NL, PL, SK, NO
Social media campaigns	AT,[112] CZ, DE, EL, FI, IE
Mailing campaigns[113]	AT[114]
Helpline	AT, BE, DE, FI, IE, LT, MT, NL, PL, SE, SK
Outreach projects with different partners, including local NGOs and local authorities	BE, CZ, DE, IE, FR,[115] MT, NO

FEATURES FOR EFFECTIVE INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

According to several EU Member States,[116] **in-person return counselling** was a top feature of information campaigns as it allows the authorities or relevant organisations to build trust with the third-country national and ensure they receive accurate and complete information on voluntary return options. Linked to this, several EU Member States plus Norway explained that tailoring the information provided, as well as personalising the tool used to reach target audiences (e.g. addressing a personal letter or email in the appropriate language), had a positive impact on ensuring third-country nationals were attentive to information about voluntary departure.[117]

Five EU Member States[118] plus Norway stated that having an **online presence** (e.g. website, social media, etc.) was effective as it allowed third-country nationals to access information themselves and to reach out to authorities in case of interest.

When the goal is to reach a more **targeted** (and illusive) group, several methods were found to be more effective, such as providing information in **strategic locations** (accommodation and reception centres, etc.) and relying on **information multipliers** (community leaders, NGOs, etc.) which will build trust for third-country nationals.

Targeting strategic locations where third-country nationals were likely to be, was found to be an effective method used in some Member States to ensure accurate information dissemination.[119] This included reception, accommodation and detention centres, migrant camps for instance.

Relying **on strategic information multipliers**, such as community leaders, local NGOs, or even the diaspora, was another method used in some Member States, and reported to be beneficial as third-country nationals already trusted them.[120]

As illustrated in Table 3, other methods were also used, such as leaflets and posters, but also including information within the return decision directly, providing information in a timely manner and setting up helplines.

111 Return counselling is mandatory once a return decision against an asylum seeker or lawfully resident third-country national becomes final or enforceable/practicable (exceptions hereof e.g. in case of an illegally resident third-country national or accelerated procedures). A formal letter is sent to the potential returnee in their own language informing them of this obligation. The possibility of receiving voluntary return counselling at any stage of the procedure has been retained.

112 In November 2021, AT launched a social media campaign on Facebook and Instagram to reach specific language groups. It was also aimed at accommodation facilities in Austria where third-country nationals were irregularly staying.

113 In CZ, the return decision is sent by mail and includes information about voluntary return.

114 A direct mailing campaign was set up in 2021 to reach selected third-country nationals, who had a valid order to leave but continued to stay illegally in Austria. The letters called on them to attend return counselling again and included information material on return incentives

115 The OFII have organised maraudes in the Hauts-de-France department.

116 AT, BE, BG, CY, DE, EE, FI, IE, LU, MT, NL, SE.

117 CY, DE, EE, LU, PL, and NO.

118 BG, DE, FR, SE, SK, and NO.

119 BG, DE, FR, IE, LT, PL.

120 FR, IE, NL, SE, and NO.

5. MOTIVES FOR VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE

This section provides additional reflection on motives for voluntary departure, and whether they are taken into account (or not) when designing the incentives.

5.1. Motivations for choosing voluntary DEPARTURE

Collecting data on the motives to choose or to refuse (assistance for) voluntary departure is **not yet a systematic practice** across EU Member States and Norway. As such, it is very difficult to identify trends in motivations. Nevertheless, this information is collected in some instances (though not systematically), such as during the counselling sessions,[121] or through implementing partners like IOM.[122]

In cases where motives to choose to depart voluntarily, with or without benefitting from available voluntary return assistance, were collected, these were often pertaining to **factors outside** of **the incentive provided** by the host country, including mainly:

- Failure to find work and disappointment in the life in the host country,[123]
- Irregular status and fear of being forcibly returned,[124]
- Family reasons, including health issues, in the country of return,[125]
- Change of situation in the country of return.[126]

5.2. Motivations to refuse voluntary return

In some instances, records were kept on why a third-country national would choose to refuse to depart voluntarily.[127] The most cited reason was **hope** – third-country nationals may hope that their asylum application will be reconsidered or that they may obtain a legal residence permit with enough time.[128] The **conditions in the return country** were also cited as a reason to refuse to depart voluntarily as perhaps there are no economic opportunities, no social circles to rely on, or that the stigma associated with return would be too heavy to bear.[129] Indeed, in Ireland, a study conducted by IOM outlined several reasons why voluntary departure was not always seen as a viable option.[130] Among the reasons outlined were that persons often felt disconnected from their country of return, that they feared rejection upon arrival, and that they did not want to give up hope on their asylum application. Additionally, they did not always have sufficient resources to return.

Insufficient return and reintegration support offered by Member States via reintegration assistance packages was not cited by any responding Member States or Norway.

5.3. Instances where voluntary return packages were adapted to the motives collected

There were only a few instances where motivations were recorded and specifically taken into consideration to adjust return incentives. In Greece, IOM adapted its packages to offer more flexibility and more tailored options to those interested in voluntary return, taking into account their profile, needs and skills, preferences, etc. In Ireland, IOM has attempted to tailor AVRR packages after monitoring trends in return, including motives to return and countries of return. As a result, IOM Ireland key times to deliver information. Cyprus and Luxembourg explained that the motivations cited did not impact the design of incentives schemes at all.

121 CY, HR, LU.

122 DE, EL, ES, IE, NL. In DE, the joint BAMF and IOM research Project "Evaluation of the return programme Starthilfe Plus" collected this information: BAMF, IOM, "Evaluation of the return programme Starthilfe Plus", 2019, https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/EN/Forschung/Forschungsberichte/fb34-evaluation-starthilfeplus.html?nn=403976, last accessed on 9 May 2022.

123 CY, DE, EL, IE, LU, SE and NO. NO relied on the evidence in this report: JP Brekke, "Why Go Back? Assisted Return from Norway", Institute for Social Research, Report 2015:08, 2015, https://www.udi.no/globalassets/global/forskning-fou_i/retur/why-go-back-assisted-return-from-norway.pdf, last accessed on 25 May 2022.

124 EL, HR, IE, LU.

125 CY, DE, EL, IE, LU.

126 IE and NO. NO relied on the evidence in this report: JP Brekke, "Why Go Back? Assisted Return from Norway", Institute for Social Research, Report 2015:08, 2015, https://www.udi.no/globalassets/global/forskning-fou_i/retur/why-go-back-assisted-return-from-norway.pdf, last accessed on 25 May 2022.

127 AT, CY, CZ, DE, EL, LU, and NO.

128 CY, EL, HR, IE, NL (through an amnesty provision), and NO.

129 DE, EL, IE, LU, NO.

130 IOM Ireland, "Experiences and view of migrants living in Ireland- focus on voluntary return and reintegration", 2020,. The research used mixed methods, a combination of an online survey which explored the views of 102 respondents as well as in-depth qualitative interviews with 15 persons who were, at the time of interview, current or former applicants of International Protection.

Disclaimer

Published

July 2022

Suggested citation:

European Migration Network (2022). Incentives and motives for voluntary return – EMN inform. Brussels: European Migration Network.

Read more:

EMN website: http://ec.europa.eu/emn

EMN LinkedIn page: https://www.linkedin.com/company/european-migration-network

EMN Twitter account: https://www.linkedin.com/company/european-migration-network

Keeping in touch with the EMN

EMN website www.ec.europa.eu/emn
EMN LinkedIn page https://www.linkedin.com/company/european-migration-network/
EMN Twitter https://twitter.com/EMNMigration

EMN National Contact Points

Austria www.emn.at/en/
Belgium www.emnbelgium.be
Bulgaria www.emn-bg.com
Croatia https://emn.gov.hr/
Cyprus www.moi.gov.cy/moi/crmd/emnncpc.nsf/home/home?opendocument
Czechia www.emncz.eu
Denmark www.justitsministeriet.dk/
Estonia www.emn.ee/
Finland www.emn.fi/in_english
France www.immigration.interieur.gouv.fr/Europe-et-International/Le-reseau-europeen-des-migrations-REM3/Le-reseau-europeen-des-migrations-REM2
Germany https://www.bamf.de/EN/Themen/EMN/emn-node.html
Greece http://emn.immigration.gov.gr/en/
Hungary www.emnhungary.hu/en
Ireland www.emn.ie/
Italy www.emnitalyncp.it/
Latvia www.emn.lv/en/home/
Lithuania www.emn.lt/en/
Luxembourg https://emnluxembourg.uni.lu/
Malta https://emn.gov.mt/
The Netherlands https://www.emnnetherlands.nl/
Poland https://www.gov.pl/web/europejska-siec-migracyjna
Portugal https://rem.sef.pt/
Romania https://www.mai.gov.ro/
Spain https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/emn-Spain/
Slovak Republic https://emn.sk/en/
Slovenia https://emm.si/en/
Sweden http://www.emnsweden.se/
Norway https://www.udi.no/en/statistics-and-analysis/european-migration-network---norway
Georgia https://migration.commission.ge/index.php?article_id=1&clang=1
Republic of Moldova http://bma.gov.md/en