



EMN Austria National Conference 2015

Irregular Migration and Return in the EU and Austria

21 September 2015, Albert Schweitzer Haus, Vienna, Austria

Conference Report



The European Migration Network (EMN) is co-ordinated by the European Commission with National Contact Points (EMN NCPs) established in each EU Member State plus Norway. The National Contact Point Austria in the EMN is financially supported by the European Commission and the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY..... 3

MINUTES..... 4

 Welcome and Opening 4

 Introductory Presentation: Irregular Migration Routes to the EU 4

 Keynote Speech: EU Policy On Irregular Migration and Return..... 5

 Short Presentations: National Policies and Measures on Irregular Migration
 and Return 7

 Short Presentations: EMN Study “Dissemination Of Information On Voluntary
 Return: How To Reach Irregular Migrants Not In Contact With The
 Authorities” 8

 Closing Remarks: Conclusions and Outlook..... 10

ANNEXES 11

 Annex 1: Short Biographies..... 11

 Annex 2: Agenda..... 14

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This report is a summary of the conference “Irregular Migration and Return in the EU and Austria”, which took place on 21 September 2015 in the Albert Schweitzer Haus in Vienna. The event was organized by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Country Office for Austria as the National Contact Point Austria in the European Migration Network (EMN).

The conference brought together researchers, government officials, representatives of the European Commission, and a number of individuals



from the wider society in order to discuss the topic of irregular migration and return from different perspectives. There were presentations about the latest research findings on migration routes to the European Union and factors influencing individual migrant destination choices. Furthermore, the options available to, and role of, the European Union relating to the successful management of current challenges in the field of migration and asylum were examined and experiences from some European countries were shared.

Moreover, the latest EMN study about the dissemination of information on voluntary return among persons who are not in contact with the authorities was presented. This study provides an overview of the different situations, actors and measures that exist in member states. It also includes up-to-date, comparable statistics.

MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING

Julia Rutz, Head of Research and Migration Law Department at the IOM Country Office for Austria, welcomed speakers and participants to the conference. She gave a short presentation of the European Migration Network (EMN) and its function within the EU. In particular, Julia Rutz referred to the studies that the IOM Country Office for Austria publishes on a regular basis in its role as National Contact Point Austria in the EMN. The audience were encouraged to obtain copies of the reports in either digital or hardcopy form and to make use of the information provided. Julia Rutz then moderated the programme of the conference.



The second part of the welcoming speech was given by **Thomas Mühlhans**, Head of Asylum and Return Funding Unit in the Federal Ministry of the Interior. He was especially pleased by the high number of experts from the field of return among the audience and emphasized the importance of mutual learning and exchange. With respect to the findings of the latest EMN study on dissemination of information on voluntary return, he mentioned that migrants prefer to contact civil society organizations for voluntary return rather than being forced to return. With regard to standards in the return process, he still sees room for improvement. Concluding, he highlighted the remarkable situation on the European level, which he witnesses as member of the EMN Return Experts Group: while it is difficult to reach a common asylum policy due to differing stances among member states, for example, in the field of return states try hard to work much more synergetically. According to Thomas Mühlhans a coherent European cooperation concerning this matter seems realistic.

INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATION: IRREGULAR MIGRATION ROUTES TO THE EU

Katie Kuschminder from the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance opened the topic of her presentation by posing the question of how migrants become irregular migrants. She outlined the two options 1) entering a country illegally or 2) overstaying the permitted duration of stay after an initially authorized entry. Subsequently, she presented two of her studies from the field of "Irregular Migration".

The study *Irregular Migration Routes to Europe and Factors Influencing Migrants' Destination Choice*, which analyses already existing research results, showed – for example – that persons coming from regions geographically similar such as Pakistan and Afghanistan came to Turkey via very different routes. The reasons for these varying migration routes are to be found – in decreasing order of importance – in safety and conflict along the routes, weather conditions, border surveillance and push-back policies, and in changes in countries' political status or visa regimes.



With regard to migrants' destination countries, the study identified that economic factors have greatest influence. Migrants principally go as far as their money can take them. The second greatest influence lies in the role of the smugglers migrants engage. Each smuggler has a network of contacts

and offers only particular destinations, so the final destination largely depends on the smuggler a migrant comes into contact with. Moreover, the journey does not always necessarily end at the agreed destination. Access to information and social networks are another important factor. Furthermore, experiences and conditions in transit countries play a role. If they are rather good, some migrants decide not to continue their journey and transit countries become permanent residences, while bad conditions effect a higher pressure to migrate onwards. Finally, there was some indication that information about good reception conditions for asylum-seekers may also influence the choice of destination countries, but in this and some other fields a lack of research results was recognized. This led to the second study *Understanding decision making factors of irregular migrants in transit*, for which interviews in Athens and Istanbul were conducted.

Although the analysis of the study's results was not finished yet, Katie Kuschminder wanted to share some of the first findings and outlined the most prevalent reasons for migrants not to stay in Athens/Istanbul but to migrate onwards: (1) Better living condition in the destination country, (2) safe country, (3) good chances to become a citizen/regular migrant in the destination country, (4) good treatment for asylum-seekers in the destination country, (5) good social security and health system in the destination country.

The PowerPoint presentation from Katie Kuschminder is available [here](#).

Discussion

During the following discussion, the reason for Germany's high attractiveness was raised by the audience. According to Katie Kuschminder this was hard to say. She pointed out that even though the interviews were conducted before the actual opening of borders by Germany took place in the summer of 2015, Germany ranked first by far with regard to other destination countries. Furthermore it was asked why migrants tend to settle down in transit countries rather than to return to their countries of origin, what personal background the interview partners had and if information campaigns had had any impact on return decisions. However, Katie Kuschminder stressed that in order to get answers to these questions, they will have to wait for the further analysis of the study results.



KEYNOTE SPEECH: EU POLICY ON IRREGULAR MIGRATION AND RETURN



At the beginning of his presentation, **Fabian Lutz** from the European Commission expressed his appreciation for the EMN. He praised its contribution to the highly beneficial mutual learning, which had also been mentioned by Thomas Mühlhans before. He also noted that, at EU level, return is no longer a controversial topic, but rather a field of broad agreement. As the European Union only has had competence for migration issues for a comparatively short time, in his opinion the expectations in this area should not be raised too high. The reform that

allows decision by majority vote and no longer only by unanimous vote definitely brought a better ability to act, however. Fabian Lutz also underlined that that, within infringement proceeding, a member state that refuses to fulfil an obligation can, ultimately, not be forced to take any action.

Fabian Lutz outlined the specific EU competence that is based on Art. 79 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. According to this, a common EU immigration policy should inter alia aim at combating illegal migration. For this purpose, for instance measures with regard to removal and repatriation of persons residing without authorization may be taken and readmission agreements with third countries may be concluded. Then he gave a short overview of the comprehensive relevant EU legislation, where, according to Fabian Lutz, especially the Return Directive plays a crucial role. The aim of this directive is primarily the establishment of clarity: either a person gets a proper residence permit or a return decision is issued and effectively implemented, whereby in this case voluntary return has to have priority over forced return. To ensure a consistent application of the Return Directive, the European Commission has now issued a Return-Handbook, which describes how the directive should be implemented from the Commission's point of view.

In terms of recent developments three communications by the European Commission, which are recommendations and not legally binding, were mentioned by Fabian Lutz. Initially, the European Agenda on Migration set down four medium to long term priorities for measures to be taken by the EU: (1) reducing the incentives for irregular migration, (2) securing the external borders, (3) strengthening the common asylum policy and (4) developing a new policy on legal migration. In connection with the first point about irregular migration, on one hand the causes for irregular migration and displacement in third countries should be tackled by development cooperation, humanitarian aid and migration officers in EU delegations. On the other hand, the business concept of smugglers shall be made unattractive by implementing the EU Action Plan against migrant smuggling. Here, stricter penalties, better information policies and prevention through information about risks in the countries of origin are to play important roles. As the main problem currently lies in the fact that the right of protection only exists on EU territory, but legally/regularly reaching this territory is not possible, consequently more secure ways into the EU have to be established. Finally, the EU Action Plan on Return aims to enhance the effectiveness of the EU system regarding return of irregular migrants, whereby the crucial role of the better use and lining of existing databases and enhancing cooperation with transit countries and countries of origin was emphasized.

Concluding, Fabian Lutz pointed out that in the nearer future no essential changes of the legislative framework are needed, but a more efficient implementation of already existing provisions should be aimed at.

Discussion

In the following short discussion with the audience, in the first place questions were raised about the problem of how third countries could be induced and motivated to cooperate in the field of return with the EU. Fabian Lutz answered that trade agreements have an important role in this context and concluding readmission agreements and complying with them has to be made attractive to these countries. Furthermore he proposes eradicating a clause that provides for accepting not only the third countries' own nationals, but other persons who entered through this country as well because this clause is hard to accept for many countries and therefore impedes agreements.



SHORT PRESENTATIONS: NATIONAL POLICIES AND MEASURES ON IRREGULAR MIGRATION AND RETURN



Michail S. Kosmidis from the Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform in Greece started his presentation by showing the specific characteristics of the situation in Greece. During recent years, the country has been confronted with a constantly growing migration flow, which has its cause (at least partly) in the current situation in Syria. Poor living conditions in refugee camps in neighbouring countries in the Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey result in a high migratory pressure for the people living there, which finally leads to a particularly high level of irregular migration to Greece. These developments can be seen clearly with data about apprehended irregular migrants. According to Michail S. Kosmidis it is remarkable, for example, that the numbers of apprehended Syrians and Afghans from January to August 2015 increased tenfold compared to the same time period in the previous year. In contrast, the number of returned third-country nationals decreased in comparison to the previous year.

Michail S. Kosmidis generally emphasized challenges concerning the readmission process. These are based on a lack of travel documents, incorrect implementation of readmission agreements, missing cooperation of various consular authorities or even the absence of consular authorities in Greece such as in the case of Afghanistan. Other important factors influencing the current state of migration in Greece are, according to Michail S. Kosmidis, the particular geographic position of Greece with its numerous islands and the short distance to Turkey and a lack of resources – in financial and infrastructural terms as well as concerning staff shortages.

After giving a short overview of the organization of the asylum and reception system in Greece, which is based on the Greek Action Plan for Asylum and Migration Management 2010, Michail S. Kosmidis presented measures and policies that shall contribute to a better management of the actual challenges. The Greek Strategic Plan for Asylum (2015) described the current situation and defines concrete targets for 2015. These are implemented in the context of a Portfolio for Migration Policy. One main focus lies on an improvement of the reception conditions and the processing of the existing backlog in applications for asylum. In the field of return, implementation of new projects within the EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) is currently planned.

Besides the establishment of an effective migration management in Greece, Michail S. Kosmidis identified the EU's reasonable participation with regard to joint responsibility for a successful management of the migratory flows from the Middle East, as well as regarding an effective implementation of return decisions and readmission agreements, as a future challenge.

The PowerPoint presentation from Michail S. Kosmidis is available [here](#).

René van Schijndel from the Ministry for Security and Justice in the Netherlands mentioned asylum as another form of migration, but assigned it to irregular migration, as entry takes place without authorization. He started by giving a brief presentation of relevant figures on asylum-related migration, which includes first asylum applications, subsequent applications and family reunifications for asylum-seekers. Between 2013 and 2014, migration in this field increased by about 80 per cent and between January and July 2015 nearly two thirds of the whole 2014 number had already been reached. However, the Dutch situation concerning migration recently underwent a fundamental change due to a dramatic



increase in asylum-seekers. In 2014 an average of 60 asylum applications were registered per day, during the last four weeks approximately 700 applications per day were made. A difference between the situation in Greece and to the situation in the Netherlands is the fact that the second largest group of asylum-seekers – after Syrian nationals, who form the largest group – comes from Eritrea, not Afghanistan. As the vast majority of Syrian applicants receive positive asylum decisions, the issue of return is not predominant at the moment.

However, one main political focus in the Netherlands is on the fight against organized crime in the context of human smuggling and human trafficking, which is why a multidisciplinary Expertise Centre for Human Trafficking and People Smuggling has been founded. An effective return regime is considered to be a pillar of these efforts. René van Schijndel emphasized the importance of ensuring that people who are no (longer) legally residing in the Netherlands actually leave the country. Nonetheless, the government always prefers voluntary return to forced return. In general, the realization of return is considered as the migrant's responsibility; to those who do not fulfil their responsibility certain assistance can be provided in order to motivate them to return.

This assistance is organized in two programmes. The first programme, which covers basic support as provision with information, tickets and personal support at the airport, is offered to almost all migrants in the Netherlands. Whereas the second programme, which additionally comprises financial assistance for reintegration in the country of return, is only open to rejected asylum-seekers. This is to prevent people from migrating to the Netherlands exclusively for the purpose of receiving this financial support. René van Schijndel pointed out that voluntary return not only is the preferred alternative to forced return, but also expands its potentials. While forced return to China or India for instance is difficult, assisted voluntary return to these countries can be successful.

The PowerPoint presentation from René van Schijndel is available [here](#).

Discussion

A thematically wide spread discussion followed. In reply to the questions as to why armed forces are not used to fight smugglers and why Greece does not ask the EU for help to protect the borders, Michail S. Kosmidis stated that first of all, the European Court of Justice does not allow pushback policies, but moreover this approach does not comply with the Greek intention of helping people in danger. Support from Frontex is on site. Some other questions referred to monitoring of reintegration measures and to experiences with the related financial support. The speakers replied that monitoring is conducted but that further information is not available. René van Schijndel reported that on the one hand, numerous persons migrated to the Netherlands in order to obtain financial means from reintegration measures; access to the programme thus had to be restricted. On the other hand he acknowledged that the amount paid is only a small beginning.

SHORT PRESENTATIONS: EMN STUDY “DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON VOLUNTARY RETURN: HOW TO REACH IRREGULAR MIGRANTS NOT IN CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORITIES”



Haleh Chahrokh from the IOM Country Office for Austria started her presentation outlining that the study focuses on a time period of four years, from 2010 until 2014. However, legal changes up to and including May 2015 have been taken into account. Haleh Chahrokh pointed out that Austria does not have any specific legal provisions concerning the issue of dissemination of information on voluntary return especially among irregular migrants. Information is often provided when receiving a notification of the return decision. But also before migrants become irregular, information is distributed by reception centres for asylum-seekers and by NGOs. The materials

include flyers and brochures, websites, posters as well as telephone hotlines, individual counselling and the important word of mouth. In this context, Haleh Chahrokh highlighted – besides state and other actors – the role of the Diaspora and migrant organizations in terms of information dissemination.

Haleh Chahrokh outlined the existing challenges in the dissemination of information on voluntary return in six points. First of all, there is a lack of motivation to return and the wish to avoid contact with the authorities. Furthermore, strong inhibitions against contacting institutions exist, which can be overcome by non-governmental counselling organizations. Also, language barriers and confidentiality considerations regarding the responsible handling of personal data were outlined. The interviews conducted in the framework of the study with actors providing information on voluntary return pointed to the importance of maintaining the voluntariness during the process of voluntary returns. Hence, according to some non-state actors the decision to return must always be one that is free and self-responsible and should not be pushed by too aggressive and active counselling. The sixth challenge that came up was the issue of time, which is needed by the majority of migrants in order to consider the option of voluntary return and to discuss it with family members.

The PowerPoint presentation from Haleh Chahrokh is available [here](#).

Anne-Cécile Jarasse from the Ministry of Interior in France started her presentation highlighting that in France most of irregular migrants are in contact with the authorities. The legal framework had changed due to the new system that came into force in May 2015. On the basis of this system, legal provisions regarding the dissemination and the promotion of assisted voluntary return in France have been codified for the first time.

In this context, the most important actors are the French office for immigration and integration (OFII), the regional divisions, as well as the Diaspora and migrant organizations.



The dissemination of information is usually carried out together with the written decision on deportation, after the release from a pre-removal detention centre, at a prefecture, in reception centres for asylum-seekers and at NGOs. However, one of the most important means is, according to Anne-Cécile Jarasse, word of mouth by the Diaspora and migrant organizations.

Furthermore, the French habitus in distributing information on voluntary return is characterized by initiatives on a local basis and executed mainly by the OFII and the IOM. One of the best practice examples Anne-Cécile Jarasse pointed out was the counselling of irregular migrants concerning voluntary return in different languages in Calais.

The main challenges Anne-Cécile Jarasse indicated were specifically connected to the perception of return, as the migrants perceive it only as last option. Furthermore, Anne-Cécile Jarasse underlined that migrants need time in order to consider a voluntary return.

The PowerPoint presentation from Anne-Cécile Jarasse is available [here](#).



Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem from the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration started her presentation by pointing out the scope of the study's target group. Irregular migrants include former asylum-seekers, visa or residence overstayers and immigrants who have never been in contact with the authorities. Furthermore Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem highlighted that dissemination of information on voluntary return starts very early in Norway. It begins with the first contact migrants have with the police. Then, during the asylum procedure, asylum-seekers are informed about the opportunity to return to their countries of origin voluntarily on a regular basis. In this context, the main actor is UDI, the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration, which implements government's policy on assisted voluntary return and assigns caseworkers.

Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem presented the methods used for the distribution of information. At this point she specifically highlighted the Norwegian poster campaign that was financed by UDI. These posters are spread all over public places and inform people in different languages about the possibility of voluntary return. Moreover, information is being spread by means of websites, brochures, newsletters, on the radio, at festivals as well as in clinics.

The challenges that Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem identified within the Norwegian context are that return is strongly perceived as connected to removal. Furthermore, she highlighted that the migrants' access to information can pose challenges, as a variety of actors is involved, which often leads to differing answers and perceptions. This causes uncertainty and unawareness. In addition, the migrants perceive the information on voluntary return as too technical. As a consequence, migrants feel that their respective complex situation is not taken into account.

The PowerPoint presentation from Dobromira Tjessem is available [here](#).

Discussion

After the three presentations the audience had the chance to pose some questions. The first question referred to the Norwegian return campaign and asked whether it has been criticized by the public, as it could be interpreted as transmitting the message that migrants are not welcome in Norway. Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem answered that the campaign actually faced a lack of interest and that she had expected more enthusiasm not only from migrants themselves but also from NGOs. However, the result of the campaign has been a thirty per cent increase in the number of applicants for assisted voluntary return. In this context Anne-Cécile Jarasse and Haleh Chahrokh stressed that neither France nor Austria have discussed launching similar campaigns.

CLOSING REMARKS: CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

Katerina Kratzmann, Head of Office at the IOM Country Office for Austria, closed the conference by summarizing the most important outcomes and discussions. At this point she highlighted once again the difficulty of reaching irregular migrants who are not in contact with the authorities in order to inform them about the opportunity of voluntary return. Katerina Kratzmann emphasized the importance of getting in touch with the Diaspora and migrant organizations in order to reach target groups. She said that it is crucial to provide counselling also outside of the usual institutions and state actors as it was done, for example, in Calais. Katerina Kratzmann reaffirmed the importance of the fact that irregular migrants need time to consider the option of voluntary return. In conclusion, she thanked the speakers, the participants and the organizers for the successful conference.



ANNEXES

Annex 1: Short Biographies

09:30 – 09:45 **WELCOME NOTE AND OPENING**

Julia RUTZ

Julia Rutz is the head of Research and Migration Law Department of the IOM Country Office for Austria and is responsible for implementing the National Contact Point Austria in the European Migration Network (EMN). Prior to her assignment with IOM, she was a lecturer at the degree programme International and European Law at The Hague University of Applied Sciences. In addition to foreign assignments for several years with EUPOL COPPS in Palestine and the OSCE in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ms. Rutz conducted many trainings and consultations in the area of human rights. Her background is composed of legal studies as well as practical work as a lawyer at an international law firm.

Thomas MÜHLHANS

Thomas Mühlhans was born in Leoben (Austria) in 1980. He graduated in law from the Karl-Franzens University in Graz in 2005. After completing his practical internship at an Austria court of law, he worked in the private sector. Since 2008 Mr. Mühlhans has been working at the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior in the field of migration funding, since 2009 in a senior management position. He is currently the head of the Asylum and Return Funding Unit, which is the competent authority for executing the EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) in Austria. In addition, he has successfully completed training as a mediator.

09:45 – 10:15 **INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATION: IRREGULAR MIGRATION ROUTES TO THE EU**

Katie KUSCHMINDER

Katie Kuschminder is a researcher and migration studies project manager at the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance (MGSoG)/ UNU-Merit. She has ten years of research experience and has managed and worked on several migration projects funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Australian Department of Immigration and Border Protection, GIZ, IOM and UNHCR. Most recently, Ms. Kuschminder was the lead researcher on the *Irregular Migrants Decision Making Factors in Transit* study (results expected early 2016) and *Comparative Research on Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Migrants* project. Ms. Kuschminder teaches in the Masters in Public Policy and Human Development and the Migration Management Diploma Programme at MGSoG/ UNU-Merit.

10:15 – 11:00 **KEYNOTE SPEECH: EU POLICY ON IRREGULAR MIGRATION UND RETURN**

Fabian LUTZ

Fabian Lutz is principal administrator at the European Commission, DG Migration and Home Affairs, Unit C1 – Irregular Migration and Return. He has been working for the European Commission for 20 years. Prior to this position, Mr. Lutz worked in the Austrian public administration. As a Commission official he contributed to the elaboration of several pieces of the EU's migration acquis covering the field of: legal migration (2001 proposal on economic migration, Directive 2004/114/EC on third country students and Directive 2005/71/EC on third country researchers), irregular migration (Carriers Liability Directive 2001/51), return (Return Directive 2008/115/EC) and Schengen ("technical" amendment of Schengen Borders Code – adoption pending). He currently primarily deals with return related issues, including the preparation of the September 2015 EU Action Plan on Return and the preparation of the Commissions "Return Handbook".

Michail S. KOSMIDIS

Michail S. Kosmidis works as head of the Migration Policy Unit at the Greek Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reform. He is responsible for legal and operational issues related to the EU and for national legislation on legal migration. Mr Kosmidis is furthermore a deputy member of the European Migration Network (EMN) Steering Board and head of the delegation to the Working Group for Integration, Migration and Expulsion of the Council of the EU, which he also chaired during the Greek Presidency of the Council of the EU in the first half of 2014. From 2004 to 2010 Mr Kosmidis was posted as Home Affairs Counsellor (*CONS JAI*) at the Greek Permanent Representation to the EU responsible for issues on legal migration, integration, free movement and fundamental rights. He studied modern history at the University of Athens and holds an MSs in diplomatic history. He is also a graduate of the National School of Public Administration and Local Government.

René van SCHIJNDEL

René van Schijndel has been working for the Migration Policy Department within the Ministry of Security and Justice of the Netherlands since 2002, first as a financial-economic advisor and later as a (senior) policy advisor. He works in the policy fields of the EU SOLID funds, the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF), voluntary return policy, migration and development as well as medical care for asylum-seekers. Mr. Schijndel holds a bachelor of economics from the Rotterdam School for Business Administration and Economics. Furthermore, he participated in a master's programme in public administration at the Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Haleh CHAHROKH

Haleh Chahrokh is a legal associate at the IOM Country Office for Austria. Within the framework of the National Contact Point Austria in the European Migration Network (EMN), she is responsible for conducting studies and responding to ad-hoc queries in the field of migration and asylum. Moreover, she acts as focal point for migrants' rights and supports other departments in legal matters. Prior to her assignment with IOM, Ms. Chahrokh – who graduated in law at the University of Vienna – worked as a research officer for the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), as a researcher for Human Rights Watch and as consultant for the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Austria.

Anne-Cécile JARASSE

Anne-Cécile Jarasse has been a policy officer of the French National Contact Point in the European Migration Network (EMN), hosted by the Ministry of the Interior, since 2002. She graduated in political science with a focus on international relations from Sciences Po Toulouse. She also holds a master's degree in European politics from Sciences Po Strasbourg. Prior to joining the EMN, Ms. Jarasse gained experience in the area of migration and mobility, and worked for the French Embassy in Vienna from 2010 to 2012.

Dobromira Ilkova TJESSEM

Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem has been with the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI) since 2009. She began as a case worker at the Department of Asylum and gained experience with a broad spectrum of case profiles. Since February 2014 she has acted as the coordinator of the National Contact Point Norway in the European Migration Network (EMN), hosted by the UDI. Previously Ms. Tjessem worked with a program for integration of refugees in Norway and participated in short-term research studies on various asylum and migration topics. Overall, she has eight years of experience with advocacy projects related to refugees' rights, based at the Norwegian Refugee Council and the Bulgarian Helsinki Committee. Ms. Tjessem graduated as a lawyer in Bulgaria and has a master's degree in Human Rights from the University of Oslo.

Katerina KRATZMANN

Katerina Kratzmann has been working for the IOM Country Office for Austria since April 2010, starting as head of research coordinating the National Contact Point Austria in the European Migration Network (EMN). She has been Head of Office since October 2011, and is responsible for all projects and activities in the office. In addition to her position at IOM, Ms. Kratzmann is a member of the expert council on integration in Austria as well as a member of the UN Task Force for the measurement of circular migration; she is also engaged in teaching migration and integration issues in several fora. Ms. Kratzmann graduated in European ethnology and cultural science at the Humboldt University Berlin and wrote her doctoral thesis in European ethnology at the University of Vienna.

Annex 2: Agenda

National EMN Conference *Irregular Migration and Return in the EU and Austria*

21 September 2015
Albert Schweitzer Haus, Schwarzspanierstraße 13, 1090 Vienna

Agenda

09:00 – 09:30	<i>Registration</i>
09:30 – 09:45	WELCOME NOTE AND OPENING <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Julia Rutz, IOM Country Office for Austria▪ Thomas Mühlhans, Federal Ministry of the Interior, Austria
09:45 – 10:15	INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATION: IRREGULAR MIGRATION ROUTES TO THE EU <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Katie Kuschminder, Maastricht Graduate School of Governance <i>Questions and discussion</i>
10:15 – 11:00	KEYNOTE SPEECH: EU POLICY ON IRREGULAR MIGRATION UND RETURN <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Fabian Lutz, European Commission <i>Questions and discussion</i>
11:00 – 11:15	<i>Coffee break</i>
11:15 – 12:30	SHORT PRESENTATIONS: NATIONAL POLICIES AND MEASURES ON IRREGULAR MIGRATION AND RETURN <p>Moderation: Saskia Koppenberg, IOM Country Office for Austria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Michail S. Kosmidis, Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction, Greece• René van Schijndel, Ministry of Security and Justice, the Netherlands <i>Questions and discussion</i>
12:30 – 13:30	<i>Lunch</i>

<p>13:30 – 14:45</p>	<p>SHORT PRESENTATIONS: EMN STUDY “DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON VOLUNTARY RETURN: HOW TO REACH IRREGULAR MIGRANTS NOT IN CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORITIES”</p> <p>Moderation: Julia Rutz, IOM Country Office for Austria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haleh Chahrokh, IOM Country Office for Austria (AT EMN NCP) • Anne-Cécile Jarasse, Ministry of Interior, France (FR EMN NCP) • Dobromira Ilkova Tjessem, Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (NO EMN NCP) <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p>
<p>14:45 – 15:00</p>	<p>CLOSING REMARKS: CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katerina Kratzmann, IOM Country Office for Austria