The U.N. Migrant Workers Convention:

Steps Towards Ratification in Europe

Positions of Civil Society Actors, Government Agencies and Policy Makers in the EU Member States

epmwr

European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights

Produced by December 18 vzw
for the European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights (EPMWR)

Principal Researcher: Amandine Guilbert
Editor: René Plaetevoet

Lay-out & Print:
Crossmark bvba
Rijmenamseweg 21
2820 Bonheiden
Belgium

Published by:
European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights
c/o December 18 vzw
164 rue Gaucheret
1030 Brussels
Belgium

Tel: +32-2-2741435
Fax: +32-2-2741438
E-mail: epmwr@december18.net
Website: www.epmwr.net

This publication is supported with a grant from the Network of European Foundations through the EPIM programme.

NETWORK OF EUROPEAN FOUNDATIONS

european programme for integration and migration

Content

Introduction	4
1. Methodology	6
2. Governmental positions	7
2.1 Main governmental arguments against ratification	7
2.2 Governmental bodies in favour of ratification	11
2.2.1 Mayors of European capital cities	11
2.2.2 Regional governments	11
2.2.3 National level	12
3. Identification of stakeholders and tools for campaigning	13
3.1 Migrant organisations, church groups and NGOs	13
3.1.1 Awareness raising	13
3.1.2 Petitions	14
3.1.3 Reports, conferences and consultation processes	15
3.2 Trade unions	17
3.3 Political parties	18
3.4 National human rights institutions	20
3.5 The institutions of the European Union	21
3.6 The Council of Europe	23
3.7 UN agencies and related actors.	24
3.8 The role of the media	26
4. Conclusion and recommendations	27
Annex I: List of respondents to the questionnaire	28
Annex II: Select bibliography on the UN Migrant Workers Convention	30

Introduction

With this publication, the European Platform for Migrant Workers Rights presents the results of a mapping exercise it undertook in 2006. The aim is to provide an overview of the positions of the various actors in Europe vis-à-vis the U.N. Migrant Workers Convention[1] (hereafter the Convention), and to identify tools and strategies that are being used to achieve ratification of this particular Convention in the European Union.

The Convention was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on 18th December 1990. It is the first legally binding international instrument specifically designed to protect the particularly vulnerable category of people that are migrant workers and their families.[2] It incorporates the full range of fundamental human rights – civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights. One of the key innovations of the Convention is that for the first time minimum standards are explicitly guaranteed for undocumented migrant workers.[3]

Central to the Convention is the idea that migrant workers and members of their families are first and foremost human beings; they can not be viewed as economic entities only.

The Convention also seeks to play a role in preventing and ending the clandestine movements of migrant workers and their irregular situation. In summary, this Convention provides a set of benchmarks against which national legislation and practice can and should be measured.[4] The Convention entered into force in July 2003, after the required minimum number of 20 ratifications was finally reached. To date, it has 36 states parties, with Argentina being the latest to have ratified it (27 February 2007).[5]

None of the EU Member States has ratified the Convention yet. The current economic and political climate is apparently not favourable, and in several countries anti-immigrant sentiments are on the rise.[6] But, the situation of migrant workers has become increasingly alarming, showing the need for such a specific human rights instrument and, therefore, for more involvement and cooperation of all those stakeholders who are in favour of ratification.

The European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights

The European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights (EPMWR) was set up on 1st October 2004 in Brussels, bringing together civil society organisations with an interest in working towards ratification of the U.N. Migrant Workers Convention in the European Union. The EPMWR has 19 organisations/platforms from 13 different EU Member States, some working at the national level and others at the European level.

The aim of the EPMWR is to advocate for a better promotion and protection of the human rights of all migrant workers and members of their families. More precisely, the Platform seeks to share information on and harmonise whenever possible national-level campaigns and activities across Europe in favour of the Convention.

1 *Official name: International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.*

2 *The Convention is not the only available tool. Other UN Conventions, ILO Conventions, regional human rights mechanisms as well as national legislation can and should be used by civil society organisations to protect the human rights of migrant workers. The following two publications offer concrete examples of how these instruments can be used: Strengthening Protection of Migrant Workers and their Families with International Human Rights Treaties, International Catholic Migration Commission (Geneva, 2006) and ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (Geneva, 2006).*

3 *Migrant workers and member of their families who are documented or in a regular situation in the State of employment enjoy a set of additional rights (set forth in part IV of the Convention).*

4 *This publication does not seek to provide a detailed overview of the Convention. Annex II provides a list of publications for further reading.*

5 *For an up-to-date list of ratifications go to this website: http://www.december18.net/*

6 *See, for example, Special Eurobarometer 263 "Discrimination in the European Union" (January 2007). Available on the Eurobarometer site: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm*

The Platform also promotes the Convention as the international benchmark against which the policies and practices on labour migration of the European Union and its Member States should be measured.

epmwr
European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights

Members

National Level

Belgium	December 18
Cyprus	KISA
Czech Republic	Multicultural Centre Prague Counselling Centre for Citizenship
Denmark	mixEurope
Estonia	Legal Information Centre on Human Rights
France	Collectif pour la ratification de la convention des Nations Unies sur les Droits des Migrants[7]
Greece	Hellenic Forum of Migrants
Ireland	Migrant Rights Centre Ireland Immigrant Council of Ireland
Italy	ARCI
Netherlands	Projectgroep Migrantenweek
Spain	Xarxa 18 de Desembre (Catalan Platform)[8]
Sweden	Immigrant-institutet
United Kingdom	Migrants' Rights Network

European Level

Amnesty International – EU Office
Association Européenne pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (AEDH)
Churches' Commission for Migrants in Europe (CCME)
Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)

7 *Members : Agir ici, Amnesty International (section française), ACORT - Assemblée citoyenne des originaires de Turquie, ATF - Association des tunisiens de France, ATMF - Association des travailleurs maghrébins de France, CADTM - Comité pour l'annulation de la dette du tiers monde, Confédération paysanne, CIMADE – Service œcuménique d'entreaide, GISTI - Groupe d'information et de soutien aux immigrés, FTCR - Fédération des Tunisiens citoyens des deux rives, LDH - Ligue des droits de l'homme, MRAP - Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peoples, Service national de la pastorale des migrants, Solidarité Laïque*

8 *Members: Càritas Diocesana Barcelona, CITE-CONC, Associació de Veïns pel Benestar Ciutadà (AVBC), Institut de Drets Humans de Catalunya, Comissió Defensa Drets Humans Col·legi Advocats, MigraStudium, Portal de solidaritat OneWorld, AMIC - UGT Catalunya, Associació Sociocultural Ibn Batuta, Pagesos Solidaris (Unió de Pagesos), Benestar Social - Diputació de Barcelona, Associació Salut i Família, Consell Municipal de la Immigració de Barcelona, Federación de Asociaciones Americanas en Catalunya (FASAM-CAT), SOS Racisme Catalunya, Casal Argentí, Servei Immigració i Refugiats de Creu Roja, ASMIN.*

1. Methodology

This mapping exercise across the European Union and the wider Europe compiles information related to the U.N. Migrant Workers Convention. It notably looks at the positions of civil society actors, government agencies and policy makers vis-à-vis the Convention, as well as the campaigns and actions that have been undertaken to date in some of the EU Member States.

The aim of this exercise is to provide a solid basis to develop a comprehensive strategy and plan of action for future interventions in favour of ratification of the Convention in the European Union. It is also hoped for that this publication will serve as a tool for other NGOs and networks interested in becoming engaged in national actions or campaigns.

Finally, this publication seeks to raise the awareness about this important international human rights instrument by showing the wide range of actors – not only from civil society – that have expressed their support for ratification.

Tools used for the mapping exercise

The primary tool used for this report was a questionnaire sent to non-governmental organisations, national human rights institutions, and relevant national ministries and representations to the European Union. Questions asked concerned the official position of the government on the ratification of the Convention, recommendations made by national human rights institutions or ombudsmen, the level of awareness of the general and specialised public, the campaigns for ratification, and the positions of trade unions and political parties.

In total, 178 stakeholders were contacted, and 38 replies were received.[9] Information was collected on 24 EU Member States.[10]

In addition to the questionnaire, complementary information was obtained through desk research. In particular, the authors used the following three sources:

- UNESCO studies on the Convention, which focus on the prospects for and obstacles to the ratification of the Convention[11]
- The Migration Country Reports 2005 published by the Migration Policy Group[12]
- Submissions to consultation processes, including the OSCE Human Dimension Implementation Meetings 2005[13] and 2006,[14] the EC Green Paper on an "EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration" from 2005[15], the UN High Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2006,[16] and the International Call for Ratification from 2005.[17]

9 See Annex I

10 No information was collected on Bulgaria and Slovenia.

11 For information on the UNESCO Series of Country Reports see: http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=8028&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=-465.html

12 http://www.migpolgroup.com/reports/

13 http://www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2006/04/18648_en.pdf

14 http://www.osce.org/conferences/hdim_2006.html?page=documents&group=author

15 Submissions can be found by searching http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/

16 See http://www.un.org/migration/statements.html

17 Petition launched by December 18 on the occasion of the consultation on the EC Green Paper on Economic Migration.

2. Governmental positions

2.1 Main governmental arguments against ratification

From the research carried out and replies received from the various ministries and governments, six main arguments can be drawn, that are either of a political, legal or financial nature. It is not the aim of this publication to provide an in-depth analysis of these arguments. They are presented here in order to give the reader an overview of the current positions across the European Union. A comprehensive campaign for ratification of the Convention will have to include a component of research and action to address these arguments. The latter, however, can build on the work already done by a range of actors, as is shown in the second part of this publication.

Argument 1: Migrant workers' rights are already protected efficiently

The first argument appearing in the governmental responses is that either their national law, the European Union law or the other core UN Human Rights instruments[1] that they have ratified already guarantee the protection of migrant workers' rights. Hence, there is no need for another international instrument that specifically deals with the situation of migrant workers.

Estonian officials underlined that, under their country's legislation, all rights and conditions are the same for all workers. The State does not see the need to ratify the Convention as the obligation to equal treatment of all residents of Estonia despite their ethnic background, citizenship or length of stay in the country is already guaranteed by the national Constitution and other legal acts adopted in order to transpose the EU Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC. It therefore does not make any difference whether or not the worker is of migrant origin.[2]

According to the former Spanish Government, the national legal system guaranteed adequate protection of the human rights of all individuals regardless of their nationality (including asylum seekers and migrants), which made it unnecessary to ratify the Convention.[3]

> "A comprehensive campaign for ratification needs a component of research and action to address the arguments commonly used by governments for not ratifying the Convention."

In Sweden, the Ministry of Justice said that the human rights of migrant workers and their families are protected under existing Swedish legislation, as well as under other human rights standards, notably the other six core UN human rights conventions, that the country has ratified.[4]

1 *The other instruments are: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).*

2 *Reply from the Estonian Ministry of Interior Citizenship and Migration, received on November 16, 2006;*
Official reply from the Ministry of Interior, nr 11-2-1/13483, sent by the Legal Information Centre on Human Rights, January 11, 2007.

3 *See p.19 of the note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Spain addressed to the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (February 12, 2004). Website of the OHCHR: http://www.ohchr.org/english/*

4 *Reply from the Swedish Ministry of Justice, Division for Immigrant Integration and Diversity, received on November 24, 2006*

This view is shared by the German authorities,[5] as well as by the United Kingdom,[6] and Ireland.[7] Some Hungarian experts also said that both the national Hungarian and European Union legislation provide higher standards and rights for migrants than the Convention.[8]

Argument 2: The Convention presents legal obstacles

Several EU Member States argue that certain clauses of the Convention are in contradiction with their national law. The major changes that would have to be introduced to comply with the Convention's requirements are a serious obstacle for ratification.

Austrian officials said that their country has a very well-established set of rules for the protection of the rights of domestic as well as of foreign workers, which takes into account their specific situation and the needs of the labour market. Therefore, the authorities do not plan to undertake steps to ratify a Convention that could put into question parts of their national system.[9]

Belgium,[10] Denmark,[11] France[12] and the Netherlands[13] have no current intention to ratify the Convention because of the consequences it would have for their national legislation. Namely: for the Danish alien and criminal law areas, for some fiscal dispositions in France, and for the Dutch "Linkage Law" (Koppelingswet).[14]

The Irish government underlined that before the country could even consider ratifying the Convention, significant changes would have to be made across a wide range of laws, not only concerning the asylum and immigration areas, but also with respect to employment, social welfare

5 *Reply from Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, received on January 23, 2007. The Federal Ministry for Economy and Labour said that the basic human rights were already covered in the other international instruments without distinction between migrants and nationals, and that, as the international community, in general, felt that the state parties were respecting those rights for migrant workers, there was not need for an additional protection.*

6 *Migration and Development: How to make migration work for poverty reduction: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2003-04: "The rights of migrant workers are already protected in UK legislation and the UK's existing commitments under international law, including the Human Rights Act 1998" See: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmintdev/163/163.pdf*

7 *Immigration and Residence in Ireland, Outline policy proposals for an Immigration and Residence Bill, p.64: "It should also be noted that the rights of migrant workers and their families are already comprehensively protected under existing national legislation and under the Irish Constitution. In addition, the rights of migrant workers and their families are addressed by Ireland's commitments under international human rights instruments to which the State is already a party. These international instruments include, for example, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." See: http://www.justice.ie/80256E010039C5AF/vWeb/flJUSQ6BDEMU-en/$File/discussion.pdf*

8 *Nandor Zettish and Irina Molodikova, International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Needs of the Hungarian Labour Market, in The Protection of the Rights of Migrants Workers in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS and Perspectives of Joining the 1990 UN Convention. See: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001395/139533E.pdf*

9 *Reply from the Permanent Representation of Austria to the EU, received on November 29, 2006.*

10 *Reply by Minister of Foreign Affairs to a question asked by Nahima Lanjri in the Commission for External Affairs (13 March 2007). See: http://www.dekamer.be/doc/CCRI/pdf/51/ic1239.pdf However, a study commissioned by the IMD Platform Vlaanderen shows that legal obstacles to ratification by Belgium are minor. See http://www.december18.net/d-VNconventiestudie.PDF for the Dutch version and http://www.december18.net/web/docpapers/doc1358.doc for the French version.*

11 *Reply from the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, received on January 10, 2007.*

12 *Minister of Foreign Affairs, Philippe Douste Blazy, said that the Convention contradicts national law on many points. See: http://www.commission-droits-homme.fr/binInfoGeneFr/affichageDepeche.cfm?ildDepeche=159*

13 *Additional motivations for not ratifying the Convention were given in the written reply to parliamentary questions by Bussemakers and Koenders on January 15, 2003. See: http://docs.szw.nl/pdf/34/2003/34_2003_3_3280.pdf*

14 *See http://www.december18.net/web/general/page.php?pageID=84&menuID=36&lang=EN. This position was confirmed in 2006, saying that certain provisions of the Convention are not in conformity with Dutch legislation, and also contrary to Government policy. Reply from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs received on November 28, 2006*

provisions, education, taxation, and the electoral law.[15]

The same approach is defended by the government of the United Kingdom, which stated that "incorporating the full terms of the UN Convention into UK law would mean fundamental changes to legislation" and also "allow migrant workers to circumvent current immigration controls and remain in the UK even when they are not fulfilling the conditions on which they were granted entry to the UK (pursuing the specified employment)." [16]

The issue of cultural rights has been mentioned in France as a major legal obstacle to ratification, because the country does not accept that distinct rights would be granted to certain groups of the population, based on their ethnic origin.[17]

Argument 3: Administrative and financial obstacles

The administrative and financial burden is often invoked by "new" EU Member States, whose priority is to harmonise their legislation with the EU standards before considering ratifying a new international instrument.

For example, in the Czech Republic, the legal system largely corresponds to the requirements in the Convention, but there is no political will for ratification.[18] Hungary argued that the ratification of the Convention was not required for joining the European Union.[19] Therefore, the Hungarian government considers this not to be an urgent matter.[20] Similar arguments were being used by the Polish Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, confirming that there were no immediate plans concerning the ratification of the Convention.[21]

A financial obstacle can be found in France's argumentation against ratification, i.e. the remittances issue. The Convention requires from the receiving State that it facilitates the transfer of remittances. But in France, this represents a huge amount of governmental and bank fees. So, ratifying the Convention would imply a general financial loss which the government is not willing to take.[22]

Argument 4: There is no ratification by any of the EU Member States

An argument often heard for non-ratification by national governments in the European Union is that none of the other Member States ratified the Convention. This reason has been given notably by Belgium,[23] Estonia,[24] France, [25] and the Netherlands[26].

---

15 Irish Government's position in 'Presentation by Irish Presidency to the ECOSOC hearing on the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and their Families' on May 4, 2004. See: http://www.amnesty.ie/user/content/view/full/3379

16 Migration and Development: How to make migration work for poverty reduction: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2003-04. See: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmintdev/163/163.pdf

17 See: http://www.commission-droits-homme.fr/binTravaux/AffichageAvis.cfm?IDAVIS=748&iClasse=0

18 Z.H A. Zayonchkovskaya, The Protection of the Rights of Migrants Workers in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS and Perspectives of Joining the 1990 UN Convention, July 1, 2004, p.21. See: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001395/139533E.pdf

19 Ibid.

20 Reply received from the International Law Research and Human Rights Monitoring Centre on November 8, 2006.

21 Reply from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, received on December 8, 2006.

22 See: http://www.commission-droits-homme.fr/binTravaux/AffichageAvis.cfm?IDAVIS=748&iClasse=0

23 Reply by Minister of Foreign Affairs to a question asked by Nahima Lanjri in the Commission for External Affairs (13 March 2007). See: http://www.dekamer.be/doc/CCRI/pdf/51/ic1239.pdf See also: Question and Answers – House of Commons 2002 – 2003, bull. 3, nr. 23, Question nr 23 by Mr. Yves Leterme on September 10, 2003.

24 Reply by the Ministry of Interior Citizenship and Migration, received on November 16, 2006; Official reply from the Ministry of Interior, nr 11-2-1/13483, sent by the Legal Information Centre on Human Rights, January 11, 2007.

25 See: http://www.commission-droits-homme.fr/binInfoGeneFr/affichageDepeche.cfm?ilDepeche=159

26 Reply from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, received on November 28, 2006.

Germany contested the international recognition of the Convention, and added that there was no sign that any EU Member State was planning to ratify the Convention. Hence, a one-sided move to support the Convention would isolate Germany.[27]

Sweden's view follows the German one, saying that the Convention has not acquired universal recognition as a standard for the protection of the rights of migrant workers, and that none of the major migrant receiving states has yet signed or ratified the Convention, neither did any indicate their intention to do so.[28]

Argument 5: The issue of the rights for undocumented or irregular migrants

Countries facing major immigration flows also expressed their fear that the ratification of the Convention could act as a "pull factor" for irregular immigration. The Convention grants a set of rights for undocumented or irregular migrants and, according to the German government, the Convention goes far beyond what is needed in order to guarantee them their basic human rights. Therefore, granting rights to undocumented migrants could encourage them to choose Germany as a destination. This would impede the new immigration law which has as one of its main goals the fight against "illegal immigration."[29]

The main reason why the Dutch government has not signed the Convention and is not planning to do so is that the Convention contains rights for "illegal workers."[30]

The former Spanish government's argument was that undocumented migrants should be entitled only to the most basic human rights, and not to all those granted by the Convention.[31]

The United Kingdom fears that "giving all migrant workers access to public funds from the date of entry would (…) create an unnecessary 'pull factor."[32]

Argument 6: Community competence

A few countries have argued that the national governments would not be able to engage in a unilateral ratification anymore. Because of the EU Treaty, which defines immigration as an issue of common interest, this competence would now belong to the EU. This argument was put forward notably by France[33] and the former Spanish government.[34]

27 Reply from Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, received on January 23, 2007

28 Reply from the Ministry of Justice, Division for Immigrant Integration and Diversity received on November 24, 2006.

29 Reply from Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, received on January 23, 2007

30 Reply from the Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the European Union received on November 15, 2006.

31 See Boletín Oficial de las Cortes, 9 de Julio de 1999, Serie D. Núm, 461, (184).

32 Migration and Development: How to make migration work for poverty reduction: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2003-04. See: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmintdev/163/163.pdf

33 Argumentation of Ms Brigitte Girardin, Minister for Cooperation, Development and of French-speaking communities, translation by the author: "According to Articles 61 and 63 of the EC Treaty, the Council is competent to adopt norms relating to immigration and third-country nationals' rights, notably regarding the residence conditions. The Directive 2003/109/CE on the status of third-country long term residents was adopted on November 25, 2003 on this basis and the dispositions of this Directive correspond partly to the specifications of the Convention. As it results from the AETR case law from the European Court of Justice, every time that, for the implementation of a common policy considered by the Treaty, the Community has adopted dispositions establishing common rules, Member States have no competence to enter into contracts, that would affect these rules, with third countries. Consequently, EU Member States have no right to ratify the convention in a unilateral way, but only jointly with the Community." See: http://senat.fr/basile/visioPrint.do?id=qSEQ05100826S

34 The former government considered that any action regarding the possibility of ratifying the Convention should derive from a consensual decision made within the EU institutions. According to the Treaty of Amsterdam and the conclusions of the Tampere Summit, immigration would be a common policy. See Boletín Oficial de las Cortes, 9 de Julio de 1999, Serie D. Núm, 461, (184).

2.2 Governmental bodies in favour of ratification

2.2.1 Mayors of European capital cities

In 2005, the Mayor of London, Ken Livingston, in his comments on the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration, stated that "(…)the European Union's policy on managing economic migration must (…) secure the rights of migrant workers, as defined in international conventions (…). An appropriate package of rights could for example be drawn from international legislation, such as the International Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families."[35]

In France, the Mayor of Paris, Bertrand Delanoé, from the Socialist Party, signed the Emmaüs petition asking for a French ratification of the Convention.[36]

2.2.2 Local and regional governments

On April 30, 2004, the Flemish government decided to officially support a Belgian ratification of the Convention. It confirmed this support in its contribution to the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration in April 2005.[37]

In Italy, the Tuscany Region approved a motion in 1992, asking the national government to ratify the Convention.[38]

In Spain, the Catalan Parliament approved a Resolution in April 2003 urging the national Government to ratify the Convention. This resolution was supported by all parliamentary groups represented in the regional assembly, even the Partido Popular, who at that time formed the government at the national level.[39] This petition was renewed in July 2004, urging the new cabinet to ratify the Convention.[40]

> "On April 30, 2004 the Flemish government decided to officially support the call for Belgium to ratify the Convention."

35 The full contribution is available from the Newsroom section (consulting the public) on the European Commission's Justice and Home Affairs site: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/intro/fsj_intro_en.htm

36 See http://www.emmaus-international.org/fr/petition/petition.php

37 The full contribution is available from the Newsroom section (consulting the public) on the European Commission's Justice and Home Affairs site: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/intro/fsj_intro_en.htm

38 Reply from Kristina Touzenis, received on February 7, 2007.

39 See Butlletí Oficial del Parlament de Catalunya Nr 423, May 6, 2003, Resolució 1850/VI del Parlament de Catalunya, sobre la ratificació de la Convenció de les Nacions Unides per a la protecció dels drets de tots els treballadors migrants i de llurs familiars p.14.

40 See Butlletí Oficial del Parlament de Catalunya Nr. 87, July 27, 2004, Resolució 130/VII del Parlament de Catalunya, sobre la signatura i la ratificació de la Convenció de les Nacions Unides per a la protecció dels drets de tots els treballadors migrants i llurs familiars, p.40

2.2.3 National level

Spain

Following up to the Catalan Parliament's resolution, on November 10, 2003, the spokeswoman of the Socialist Party (PES) Ms. María Teresa Fernández de la Vega (who is currently Vice-President of the Government), and the MP Mr. Jordi Predet, urged the Spanish Government to ratify the Convention. They notably gave as arguments in favour of ratification that (1) the practice of hiring undocumented migrant workers would be discouraged if their fundamental human rights were more extensively recognised, and (2) that the Convention, by granting additional rights to documented migrant workers, would encourage the migrant workers to respect and comply with the laws and procedures established by the receiving states.[41]

Italy

Prime Minister Romano Prodi's party, the Union (***l'Unione***), mentioned in its electoral program that, if elected, they would make an effort for the ratification of the Convention.[42]

Finland

There was no official reply to our questionnaire from the government of Finland on its position regarding the ratification of the Convention. However, the country is soon to adopt new legislation on immigrants, and seemed to be responding positively to the advocacy and awareness raising around the Convention.[43]

Luxembourg

In 2003, the Luxembourg Ministry for the Advancement of Women was undertaking several initiatives towards ensuring effective respect for human rights regardless of citizenship. Luxembourg's ratification of the Convention was envisaged to follow as soon as appropriate legislation would be adopted[44]. Again, no official reply to our questionnaire has been received.

Malta

In Malta, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs said that the ratification of the Convention was still under consideration by the pertinent authorities.[45]

41 Congreso, Serie D, Nr. 636, December 9, 2003, pp. 11-12. See : http://www.congreso.es/public_oficiales/L7/CONG/BOCG/D/D_636.PDF

42 See page 251 : "Dobbiamo impegnarci a ratificare e promuovere la ratifica della Convenzione Onu sui diritti dei lavoratori migranti e delle loro famiglie." http://www.unioneweb.it/wp-content/uploads/documents/programma_def_unione.pdf

43 Before the Committee on Migrant Workers in December 2005, Ms. Dieguez (from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Guatemala) declared that Finland, who would soon be adopting legislation on migrants, was the country where her advocacy of the Convention had elicited the most promising response. See CMW, third session, 12 December 2005, point 16, p.4. Available on: http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cmw/index.htm

44 The National Collegiate Conference Association, Annual Report 2002- 2003, Delegation from Luxembourg, (Represented by Florida International University), Position paper for the IOM, p.20. See: http://www.nmun.org/download/ncca_02_03_ar.pdf

45 Reply from the Maltese Ministry for Foreign Affairs received on November 29, 2006.

3. Identification of stakeholders and tools for campaigning

3.1 Migrants organisations, church groups and NGOs

The initiative to start campaigns for ratification in some of the EU countries has often been taken by NGO coalitions or church groups active in the field of migration and migrants' rights, sometimes in collaboration with trade unions and/or international organisations. The tools for campaigning may differ according to the group targeted, as set forth below.

> "In all EU Member States the level of awareness about the Convention is very low."

3.1.1 Awareness raising

The research carried out to date shows that in all of the EU Member States, the level of awareness about the Convention is very low. Even among people working in the field of migration and integration, the Convention is often barely known, and they are hardly familiar with its provisions. There is, therefore, a lot of confusion about what the Convention stands for and what the implications of ratification would be. These misunderstandings have led to strong opposition to ratification.

Therefore, the first action to be undertaken when starting a campaign is to raise awareness about the existence of the Convention, emphasising that this is the seventh core international human rights instrument. Obviously, the tools used for this will depend on the target group. Political parties, unions, civil society actors and the public at large have to be approached in different ways. The Convention is a rather tedious and long document, a leaflet summarising the key principles can therefore be quite useful. In addition, advocates of ratification should explore how the media could be brought into the campaign.

Usually, the campaign is carried out by means of distributing documentation explaining the Convention in a non-juridical language and by emphasising the mutual benefits for both nationals and migrants. Often, public events are organised to promote the Convention, especially around 18 December, which the United Nation designated as International Migrant's Day.[1]

In Belgium, the IMD Platform Vlaanderen[2] first started with a campaign (in 2003) targeting civil society organisations, informing them about the existence of the Convention and the importance to work on the protection of migrant workers' rights. On 1st March 2003, Wereldsolidariteit, a member of the IMD Platform, launched their third public spring campaign entitled 'Stop the Injustice, not the People!.' This campaign focused on the Convention and targeted the general public.[3]

In France, in October 2004, the Collective for ratification[4] was set up to promote the Convention, notably with a campaign specifically targeting public opinion. In addition, the Collective started a campaign for young people and teachers. In December 2006, in the framework of the campaign "Assez d'humiliation"[5] and on the occasion of International Migrants' Day, a week-end of

1 *A worldwide calendar of IMD activities can be found on: www.december18.net*

2 *ABVV, ACV, December 18, Forum voor Ethnisch-Culturele Minderheden, Kerkwerk Multicultureel Samenleven, Medimmigrant, ORCA, Vlaams Minderhedencentrum, Wereldsolidariteit*

3 *See http://www.wereldsolidariteit.be/campagnes/*

4 *The Collective was created under the supervision of the ATMF (Association des Travailleurs Maghrébins en France) and GISTI, and hosted by the campaign "Demain le monde – les migrations pour vivre ensemble".*

5 *Campaign "Enough humiliation"*
See: http://www.assezdhumiliation.org/modules/temoignages_4/index.php?id=11

public events was organised in Paris.[6] The Emmaüs groups in France are also engaged in a campaign for ratification, which is linked to the work of Emmaüs International (see below).

In Germany, in 2004, the Committee for Fundamental Rights and Democracy[7] distributed leaflets underlying the difficult situation of migrant workers in the country and explaining the rights they would be entitled to if the Convention was ratified.[8]

In Italy, the Italian National Committee for Migrants Rights[9] was formed on December 17, 2002 to create awareness about the Convention and promote its ratification, notably by contributing to a campaign on the theme of the human rights of migrant workers and their family.

In the Netherlands, a number of organisations[10] have been organising the "Migrantenweek" (since 2001). In 2003, the Convention was one of the main points on the agenda.[11]

In Spain, the Catalan Platform Xarxa 18 de Desembre[12] was set up in 2002. It carries out activities (mostly in Barcelona) for the promotion of migrants' rights and for the acknowledgement of the migrants' role within the Catalan society. The Platform has celebrated International Migrant's Day since 2002, and always includes a call for ratification in its activities.

In Sweden, the Immigrant Institute – together with other migrant organisations – organises meetings on the Convention, to which political parties are usually being invited. These meetings take place in the lead up to International Migrant's Day, and have been organised ever since 2004.

3.1.2 Petitions

Petitions are often used as a tool to reach politicians, whether they are members of political parties, parliamentarians or part of the government. Across the European Union a significant number of signatures has been collected by NGOs or coalitions and submitted to governments. Usually, these petitions are presented during public events (e.g. on International Migrant's Day), distributed through local branches of NGOs, churches or unions and of course via websites and email lists. Below are some examples.

In France, a national campaign,[13] mostly targeting the government, took place between March and September 2004. There was a week of mobilisation with 40 regional events organised, the participation of more than 20,000 citizens, the distribution of 70,000 documents and the publication of 12 newspaper articles.[14] Since June 2006, Emmaüs has been collecting signatures for a petition asking France to ratify the Convention.[15] At the end of 2006, a new campaign was

6 *These events were organised by Cimade in collaboration with the Forim; See: http://www.assezdhumiliation.org/modules/initiatives_6/index.php?id=5*

7 *Komittee für Grundrecht und Democratie*

8 *Reply from Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, received on January 23, 2007.*

9 *It was composed of representatives from civil society and international organisations such as IOM, ILO, the Federation of Evangelic Churches, the Migrantes Foundation, Caritas Italiana, la Casa dei Diritti Sociali and three big Union organisations: Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro (CGIL), Confederazione Italiana Sindacati dei Lavoratori (CISL) and Unione Italiana del Lavoro (UIL).*

10 *Organisers include: Stichting Oikos, Raad van Kerken, Kerkinactie, S.R.K.K., SKIN, Forum, FNV, CNV and Missionair Centrum*

11 *See http://www.migrantenweek.nl/ and http://www.migrantenweek.nl/mw2003/conventie.php*

12 *The group of NGO's and immigrants' associations includes Càritas Diocesana Barcelona, CITE-CONC, Associació de Veïns pel Benestar Ciutadà (AVBC), Institut de Drets Humans de Catalunya, Comissió Defensa Drets Humans Col·legi Advocats, MigraStudium, Portal de solidaritat OneWorld, AMIC - UGT Catalunya, Associació Sociocultural Ibn Batuta, Pagesos Solidaris (Unió de Pagesos), Benestar Social - Diputació de Barcelona, Associació Salut i Família, Consell Municipal de la Immigració de Barcelona, Federación de Asociaciones Americanas en Catalunya (FASAMCAT), SOS Racisme Catalunya, Casal Argentí, Servei Immigració i Refugiats de Creu Roja, ASMIN.*

13 *The campaign was initiated by Agir Ici. The leading NGOs were GISTI, CIMADE, and LDH, but some other bodies were involved, like associations for solidarity and development or for human rights.*

14 *See National NGOs Campaigns, France: http://www.december18.net/web/general/page.php?pageID=79&menuID=36&lang=EN#eight*

15 *The petition can be see online at: http://www.emmaus-inter-*

being prepared by Emmaüs and others,[16] primarily directed towards candidates for the presidential elections (taking place in April and May 2007). The campaign could be extended beyond the elections period. The goal is to get 100,000 signatures.

> "In February 2006, ARCI and CGIL collected 70,000 signatures calling upon the Italian government to ratify the Convention."

In Germany, the Committee for Fundamental Rights and Democracy started in March 2004 a petition in favour of a German ratification of the Convention.[17] The petition called for a public and parliamentary debate on the Convention and for a discussion on undocumented migrants who, although often contributing to the national economy, see their fundamental human rights continually restricted.[18] Between 1,500 and 1,600 signatures were collected for this petition, which was handed over to the federal government in December 2004.[19]

In Italy, on 14 March 2005, Diritti Senza Confini[20] started a petition in favour of an Italian ratification of the Convention. By the 18th of December of that year, the petition had collected more than 50,000 signatures.[21] In March 2006, a Diritti Senza Confini delegation met some Italian MEPs to present the petition results.[22]

The non-governmental organisation ARCI joined the three major unions[23] in a double campaign, for both the ratification of the Convention and for a European citizenship of residence. In February 2006, ARCI and CGIL had collected 70,000 signatures and wanted to hand them in to the Italian Government and to President Joseph Borrell.[24]

In Spain, since 2001, Amnesty International has included a petition for the Government to ratify the Convention in each of its documents on asylum and immigration. The AI-Spain website currently features a campaign entitled "Human Rights Do Not Know About Papers", which explicitly urges the Spanish Government to ratify the Convention. As of 1st February 2007, 5120 signatures have been collected.[25] The regional platform Xarxa 18 de Diciembre also prepared a petition calling for ratification, which more than one hundred associations and organisations in Catalunya signed. The platform submitted it to the Catalan Parliament.[26]

3.1.3 Reports, conferences and consultation processes

At the national level, organisations often use reports or conferences to call on trade unions to support the Convention and on the government to ratify it. These documents are used as a basis for meetings with politicians and government

national.org/fr/petition/petition.php

16 *As far as known, the following organisations have already joined the campaign : Gisti (Groupe d'information et de soutien des immigrés), Cimade (Service oecuménique d'entraide), ATMF (Association des Travailleurs Maghrébins de France), CRID (Centre de Recherche et d'Informations pour le Développement), MRAP (Mouvement contre le Racisme et pour l'Amitié entre les Peuples) and FORIM (Forum des organisations de solidarité internationales issues des migrations).*

17 *See http://www.labournet.de/diskussion/wipo/migration/petition.pdf*

18 *See National NGO Campaigns for Ratification, Germany, http://www.december18.net/web/general/page.php?pageID=79&menuID=36&lang=EN#eight*

19 *Reply from Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, received on January 23, 2007.*

20 *See http://www.dirittisenzaconfini.it/*

21 *Document available on http://www.tesseramento.it/immigrazione/*

22 *See http://www.anolf.it/download/comunicato_diritti_senza_confini_24_03_06.pdf*

23 *CGIL, CISL et UIL*

24 *Information received from ARCI in February 2006.*

25 *See http://www.es.amnesty.org/actua/acciones/espana-los-derechos-humanos-no-saben-de-papeles/*

26 *See http://cat.oneworld.net/article/view/75137/1/*

officials, and are usually more technical than the ones targeting the general opinion. The reports can be launched during special events to which political actors are invited to participate. Here are some examples.

I*n Belgium*, in November 2003, The IMD Platform Vlaanderen commissioned a comparative study on the national legislation and the Convention. This study, which was carried out by independent legal experts, turned to be a valuable tool in the campaign, precisely because it provided an answer to the often heard argument that ratification would require substantial changes to the Belgian legislation.[27]

In France, the Collective for ratification developed a specific campaign targeted at political actors and trade unions, and as a result, direct discussions and meetings were held with political parties.

In Ireland, the Immigrant Council of Ireland has consistently called on the Government to ratify the Convention in its various publications and relevant fora, such as public events and press releases. A number of its publications[28] include specific recommendations calling for the Convention to be ratified. At a legal seminar in Dublin on November 27, 2004, the Immigrant Council of Ireland, the Irish Refugee Council and the Irish Council for Civil Liberties called upon the Government to ratify the Convention and to place family reunification for migrant workers on a statutory footing.[29] On December 18, 2004, Amnesty International, the Immigrant Council of Ireland and the Migrant Rights Centre Ireland urged the Irish Government to immediately ratify the 1990 UN Convention.[30] This call was reiterated in 2005 in the comments on the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration submitted by the Immigrant Council of Ireland and the Migrant Rights Centre Ireland.[31]

In Italy, the Federazione delle chiese evangeliche in Italia (FCEI) emphasised the need to ratify the Convention in all its documents.[32] In December 2003, the Italian National Committee for Migrants Rights organised a conference in Rome and urged Italian politicians to promote ratification.[33]

In Luxembourg, a number of Christian organisations (Caritas, SeSoPI, Justice et Paix) are currently preparing a recommendation document regarding the future national migration law. In this document, the organisations will recommend the ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention.[34] In addition, in the documents of the 6th congress of the Foreigners Association,[35] it is mentioned that a new legislation concerning the entrance, the stay, and access to work would have to integrate the ratification of the Convention.[36]

In Spain, Amnesty International is preparing a document where the text of the Convention and the Spanish Immigration Law are compared. In November 2003, their document "Proposals for the political parties manifestos for the 2004 elections," included five urgent measures on human rights, one of which was the ratification of the Convention.[37]

---

27 De Internationale VN Conventie van 1990 – Rechtsgevolgen van een Belgische ratificatie: een verkennende studie. Prof. M.-Cl. Foblets (KU Leuven), Prof. D. Vanheule (U Antwerpen) en S. Loones (KU Leuven). The Dutch and French versions of the study are available here: www.december18.net

28 These include the policy paper 'Labour Migration into Ireland' (2003), the research report 'Voices of Immigrants, the Challenges of Inclusion (2004) and the policy paper ' Family Matters, Experiences of Family Reunification in Ireland' (2006).

29 See http://www.immigrantcouncil.ie/seminar.doc

30 http://www.amnesty.ie/user/content/view/full/3379

31 Submissions can be found by searching http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/

32 See http://www.fedevangelica.it/servizi/srm03.asp

33 At the time, this Committee brought together NGOs, church groups, unions as well as international organisations.

34 This recommendation is in line with the one expressed by Christian organisations at the European level. Reply from Service Réfugiés, Caritas Luxembourg, received on December 6, 2006.

35 The Congress took place on 25 and 26 November 2006.

36 Reply from Service Réfugiés, Caritas Luxembourg, received on December 6, 2006.

37 See AI Spain: http://www.es.amnesty.org/temas/refugio-e-inmigracion/pagina/trabajadores-migrantes/

In the United Kingdom, in December 2002, the office of the UN Association hosted a conference to form a coalition[38] for the ratification of the Convention. To mark the entry into force of the Convention in July 2003, the Trades Union Congress (TUC) and the Joint Committee on the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) organised a conference and launched the TUC report entitled "Overworked, Underpaid and Over Here: Migrant Workers in Britain."[39]

At the European level, a tool used notably by the non-governmental organisations is the participation in consultation processes. For example, in 2005, the European Commission launched a consultation on the Green Paper on an *EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration*. More than 120 written contributions were submitted, many from the broader civil society community.[40] This demonstrates that over the past couple of years European civil society networks, platforms and coalitions are increasingly calling for the ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention,[41] which they see as one of the international standards against which to measure the emerging Common European Migration Policy.

3.2 Trade unions

Trade unions are an important partner in campaigning for the ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention. Not only because they often have easier access to government officials, but primarily because they represent a large section of the population, have a well-established network of local branch offices and are working cooperatively across sectors and across borders. At the *European level*, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) indicated its intention to intensify actions and campaigns calling for the ratification of the Convention back in 2005.[42] This, of course, has to be carried out together with the ETUC members, such as the national trade union confederations, as is illustrated below.

In Belgium, the Flemish branches of the ABVV and ACV, the two biggest unions in the country, participated in the campaign for a Belgian ratification. They did this in their capacity as members of the IMD Platform Vlaanderen.[43] At the end 2006, the Social Alert International organised a roundtable discussion on the Convention with representatives from the Christian workers movement. As a result, the ACV-CSC is preparing a declaration and action plan, with the aim to start a new campaign for ratification.

> "In 2005 ETUC indicated its intension to intensity actions and campaigns calling for ratification of the Convention."

In Finland, the Finnish Public Service Unions (FIPSU) signed the international call for the Universal Ratification of the Convention in 2003.[44] In September 2006, the SAK, the Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions, recommended that the promotion of migrants' rights be included in ASEM's work programme,[45] and that leaders must instruct their governments to develop necessary

38 *The coalition included Anti-Slavery International, the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants ('JCWI'), Kalaayan (an organisation representing domestic workers) and Oxfam Great Britain and was supported by representatives from the Catholic Bishops' Conference (England and Wales), the TUC and UNISON.*

39 *"Migrant workers - overworked, underpaid and over here", July 14, 2003:*
See: http://www.tuc.org.uk/international/tuc-6850-f0.cfm

40 *See: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_public_en.htm*

41 *A petition calling for ratification of the Convention was launched by December 18 vzw on the occasion of this consultation. 369 organisations form 79 countries, including 24 EU Member States signed it.*

42 *See: http://www.etuc.org/a/1159*

43 *For more info on the Platform see 3.1.1 above*

44 *See: http://www.december18.net/web/general/page.php?pageID=81&menuID=36&lang=EN*

45 *Asia-Europe Meeting. See http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/asem/intro/index.htm*

measures to protect migrant workers and their families from any form of discrimination, exploitation and maltreatment, including human trafficking, on the basis of the principles enshrined, amongst others, in the UN Migrant Workers Convention.[46]

In Greece, the National Confederation of Workers Trade Unions (GSEE) expressed its support for equal rights for all workers through its Institution of Labour INE.[47]

In Ireland, in October 2005, the Irish Congress of Trade Unions recommended the government to "develop a comprehensive, clear and coherent immigration policy, and to give strong consideration to the minimum standards set out in the UN Convention on the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families."[48]

In Italy, the three major unions, CGIL, CISL et UIL, have included the call for ratification in their political agenda.[49] The CISL incorporated a call for ratification in its final statement at its congress held in July 2005.[50] The three unions, in their submission to the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration in 2005, asked the European Union to support the process of ratification and to urge the Member States to ratify the Convention.[51]

In Luxembourg, the ORK[52] invited the government to sign the Convention in its annual report of 2005.[53]

In the United Kingdom, the trade unions TGUW and Unison[54] started working for the ratification back in 2002 when they joined the coalition that was set up after the UNAC conference.[55] Already back in September 1995, the Trades Union Congress (TUC) - passed a resolution supporting the ratification of the Convention.[56] The TUC continues to fight for equal rights for migrant workers and assists its member organisations to recruit and represent migrant workers.[57]

3.3 Political parties

Since ratification of the Convention is the competence of national governments and parliamentary institutions, it is important to engage with political parties and their representatives. The information below – which is based on desk research – therefore gives a brief overview of how political parties have taken up the calls for ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention.

In Belgium, Meryem Kaçar, then-Senator for the Flemish Green Party[58] (Agalev), presented a resolution proposal in favour of the ratification of the Convention on October 15, 2002.[59] And on March 13, 2007 Nahima Lanjri, Member of Parliament for Christian-democratic party CD&V asked the Minister of External Affairs why Belgium had not yet ratified the Convention.[60]

In France, Noël Mamère called for the urgent ratification on behalf of the Green Party[61] and MP Boumediene-Thiery asked an oral question without debates before the Senate requiring the

46 *"10 years of ASEM: time to deliver!" Trade Union Recommendations to the VI ASEM Summit, 10-11 September 2006, p.9: http://www.sak.fi/liitteet/268.pdf.*

47 *Migration Policy Group, Migration Country Report on Greece 2005, p. 20: http://www.migpolgroup.com/multiattachments/3043/DocumentName/EMD_Greece_2005.pdf*

48 *Irish congress of trade unions call for ratification, October 2005, Congress Recommendations, p.22 http://www.ictu.ie/html/publications/ictu/Migrant%20Policy.pdf*

49 *Reply from Kristina Touzenis, received on February 7, 2007.*

50 *The call can be found on the CISL website: http://www.cisl.it/*

51 *Submissions can be found by searching http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/*

52 *Ombouds-Comité fier t'Rechter vum Kant*

53 *Reply from Service Réfugiés, Caritas Luxembourg, received on December 6, 2006.*

54 *The Transport and General Workers Union, largest private sector trade union, and UNISON, largest public sector trade.*

55 *For more info see 3.1.3 above.*

56 *Ibid.*

57 *As mentioned under 3.1.3 the TUC also organised jointly with JCWI a conference to mark the entry into force of the Convention.*

58 *At the time the party was known as AGALEV, it is now called Groen!*

59 *See http://www.december18.net/web/general/UNconventionBelgium.pdf*

60 *See:: http://www.dekamer.be/doc/CCRI/pdf/51/ic1239.pdf*

61 *See http://noelmamere.org/article.php3?id_article=474*

ratification by France.[62] In 2005, the Green Party (Les Verts) also launched two petitions for the ratification, one for local and national representatives,[63] and one for all citizens.[64] Robert Bret from the Communist Party (PCF) submitted a written question in January 2004,[65] and wrote to the Ministry of the Interior. His party continues to call for ratification of the Convention and has invited representatives from the NGO collective in favour of ratification of the Convention to its annual meeting.

There is so far no official interest from the Socialist Party, but two MPs asked individual written questions. MP Guinchard-Kunstler questioned France's denial of an essential human rights Convention,[66] and MP Lignière-Cassou recalled that there was a need to ratify the Convention, because the situation in the field of legal, social and human rights of migrant workers was worsening.[67] Also, the Mayor of Paris, Bertrand Delanoé, from the Socialist Party, signed the Emmaüs petition asking for a French ratification of the Convention.[68]

In the Netherlands, the Dutch Green Left Political Party (Groen Links) added the ratification of the Convention to its 2003 election programme.[69]

In Spain, the leftist coalition United Left (Izquierda Unida), which brings together notably the Communist Party (PCE) and the Green Party (Los Verdes), incorporated Amnesty International's proposal in its manifesto for the 2004 elections.[70] The coalition also launched an initiative for recognising the right to vote for immigrants in Spain.[71]

> "In 2006, the Mayor of Paris Betrand Delanoé signed a petition calling for a French ratification."

The socialists (PES) urged the previous Spanish Government to ratify the Convention in 2003.[72]

In the United Kingdom, the Green Party's 2005 general election manifesto included a commitment to ratify the Convention.[73] The Liberal Democrats adopted a resolution (at their annual conference in September 2004) on asylum and immigration, which included a commitment to ratify the Convention.[74] Tom Brake, MP from the same Party, also set down twice a motion in the House of Commons calling for ratification of the Convention, on October 14, 2004[75] and on December 20, 2004.[76] In each case, the motion attracted a high degree of support from across several political parties.

62 *See: http://senat.fr/basile/visioPrint.do?id=qSEQ05100826S*
63 *See petition from October 18, 2005: http://fedel.lautre.net//sn/article.php3?id_article=1*
64 *See petition from October 22, 2005: http://fedel.lautre.net//sn/article.php3?id_article=2*
65 *Robert Bret, written question No 10658, January 29, 2004, see: http://www.senat.fr/*
66 *Question No 39884, May 25, 2004, http://www.questions.assemblee-nationale.fr/visualiser-questions.asp*
67 *Question No 57336, February 8, 2005 http://www.questions.assemblee-nationale.fr/visualiser-questions.asp*
68 *See http://www.emmaus-international.org/fr/petition/petition.php*
69 *See http://www.e-quality.nl/e-quality/scan/pagina/partijen/groenlinks.html*
70 *See http://www.izquierda-unida.es/elecciones2004/elecciones2004/programa22.htm*
71 *See http://www.uv.es/CEFD/12/proposicion_LO.pdf*
72 *See 2.2.3 above*
73 *See Green Party's Manifesto, p.6, http://manifesto.greenparty.org.uk/site/downloads/file-1301ManifestoSection10a.pdf*
74 *http://www.libdems.org.uk/media/documents/policies/2004Bournemouth.pdf*
75 *This motion attracted 46 signatures (out of a total of 646 MPs) with among them 23 from Labour MPs and 19 from Liberal Democrat MPs. See: http://edmi.parliament.uk/EDMi/EDMDetails.aspx?EDMID=24745&SESSION=682*
76 *This motion was supported by a total of 57 MPs, with, among others, 33 from the Labour Party, 21 Liberal Democrats and 1 Conservative. See: http://edmi.parliament.uk/EDMi/EDMDetails.aspx?EDMID=26962&SESSION=873*

In Ireland, Sinn Féin proposed the ratification of the Convention by the Irish government in their manifesto for the 2002 general elections.[77]

3.4 National Human Rights Institutions.

Most of the EU countries have either a national human rights institution or an ombudsmen board which in many cases can make recommendations on human rights issues to the government. Although these recommendations are usually not binding, they do convey a certain impact on national policies, since these institutions have often been set up by the governments (although they are operating at arms-length).

> "National Human Rights Institutions should encourage their states to ratify and implement the Convention and report back on concrete measures taken in this regard."
>
> Santa Cruz Declaration (October 2006)

In Belgium, the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism,[78] in its contribution to the Green Paper on Economic Migration in April 2005, recommended to the European Union to urge the member states to ratify the Convention and to take into account the rights that it recognises when drafting new migration policies.[79]

In France, the French National Commission on Human Rights[80] delivered its opinion recommending the ratification on June 23, 2005. The French commission called for the promotion and the protection of migrants' rights, and the signing and ratifying of the Convention.[81]

In Greece, on December 12, 2002, the Greek National Commission for Human Rights urged the state to ratify the Convention. It regards this as necessary for the planning and implementation of a contemporary, human rights-based immigration law and policy by Greece.[82]

In Ireland, the Irish Human Rights Commission, on March 21, 2004, called on the Irish government to ratify the Convention.[83]

In the United Kingdom, the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission joined the Irish Human Rights Commission in a call for ratification in 2004. It reiterated its call in January 2007.[84]

In Sweden, the Ombudsmen, while taking part in the conference in Santa Cruz, supported the amendment of the declaration asking for ratification (see below), and declared that it would raise all the topics mentioned with the Swedish government.[85]

---

77 See: http://www.sinnfein.ie/elections/manifesto/19#7

78 Centre pour l'égalité des chances et la lutte contre le racisme – Centrum voor Gelijke Kansen en Racisme Bestrijding.

79 Submissions can be found by searching http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/

80 Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de l'Homme

81 Avis sur la convention internationale sur la protection des droits de tous les travailleurs migrants et des membres de leur famille, June 2005 http://www.commission-droits-homme.fr/binTravaux/AffichageAvis.cfm?IDAVIS=748&iClasse=0

82 The National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR) International Convention on Migrant Workers and the position of Greece (12 December 2002), p.21-22: http://www.nchr.gr/downloads/2002eng.pdf

83 Joint Committee of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Irish Human Rights Commission call on International Day Against Racism, Sunday 21 March 2004. http://www.nihrc.org/index.php?page=press_news_details&category_id=2&press_id=176&Itemid=65 See also p. 13 above.

84 Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, Launch of migrant worker advice guides, 8 January 2007: http://www.nihrc.org/index.php?page=press_news_details&category_id=2&press_id=289&Itemid=65

85 Reply from Anders Bergstrand, Legal Officer, The Office of

In January 2007, the German Institute for Human Rights published a study on the convention as a first step in its work to promote ratification by *Germany*[86]

At the Eight International Conference of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in Santa Cruz in October 2006, the Conference declared that National Human Rights Institutions should encourage their States to ratify and implement the Convention and report back to the next session of the conference on concrete measures taken in this regard. The National Human Rights Institutions were asked to promote the ratification of the Convention through appropriate means including campaigns, policy advice, conferences and publications on the benefits and the background of the convention. They were also advised to analyse the reasons behind non-ratification including misconceptions and other obstacles, and work on argumentation catalogues to counter these concerns, also by building relationships with civil society organisations.[87]

This international body of National Institutions includes the following members from the European Union: Danish Institute for Human Rights, French National Consultative Commission of Human Rights, German Institute for Human Rights, Greek National Commission for Human Rights, Irish Human Rights Commission, Luxembourg Consultative Commission of Human Rights, Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, Polish Commissioner for Civil Rights Protection, Portuguese Ombudsman Office, Spanish Office of the Ombudsman, and Swedish Ombudsman against Ethnic Discrimination (as well as the Swedish Disability Ombudsman).[88]

The International Conference, furthermore, asked the Danish Institute for Human Rights to carry out an expert analysis of the obstacles to ratification of the Convention in immigration countries.[89] Director Morten Kjærum of the Danish Institute for Human Rights chairs that global network.[90]

3.5 The institutions of the European Union

The position of the EU institutions – especially the European Commission – with respect to the UN Migrant Workers Convention has changed over the years, reflecting a political and public climate that is increasingly unfavourable to migrants and a policy approach that focuses more and more on the security agenda. The overview below, does give an indication of the current positions and demonstrates the change that took place over the decade. Although the European Union as such does not have the competence to ratify international human rights treaties, the close collaboration between the Member States and the EU institutions in the context of the Common Migration Policy, necessitates advocates of ratification of the Convention to focus on the European level, in addition to the work at the national level.

> "The European Parliament recommended ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention in at least seven resolutions."

the Ombudsman against ethnic discrimination, received on December 14, 2006.

86 *See: Die Wanderarbeitnehmerkonvention der Vereinten Nationen. Katherina Spieß, Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte (Berlin, 2007)*

87 *Eight International Conference of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights Santa Cruz, Republic of Bolivia, 24-26 October 2006: http://www.nhri.net/pdf/Santa_Cruz_Declaration_E.pdf*

88 *The Austrian Ombudsman Board, the Belgian Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, the Dutch Equal Treatment Commission, and the Slovene Human Rights Ombudsman have observer status at the Conference.*

89 *Reply from Michel Doucin, French Ambassador for Human Rights, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, received on November 28, 2006*

90 *See http://www.humanrights.dk/news/santacruz_en/. The Danish Institute for Human Rights was contacted on 17 November and 15 December 2006, but there has been no official response regarding this project.*

The European Parliament

The European Parliament recommended ratification of the UN Migrant Workers' Convention in at least seven resolutions. The first one, *Resolution on the situation of the human rights in the EU*, goes back to 1998.[91] Since then, the Parliament called "on the Council and the Member States to work for the universal ratification of the main human rights instruments available to countries, in particular (…) the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families" during the sessions of the UN Commission on Human Rights, in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005.

The European Parliament also adopted a *Resolution on Development and Migration* on July 6, 2006 where it urged "all Member States to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and fully honour their international commitments with regard to the protection of migrants and their families."[92] It reiterated this call on October 24, 2006 in its *Resolution on Women's Immigration*.[93]

The European Commission

In 1994, in a *Communication to the Council and the European Parliament on Immigration and Asylum Policies*, the Commission recommended the ratification by EU Member States, as this would be "an expression of the value the Union attaches to the improvement of the situation of migrant workers and their families residing in the Union and guarantees that the rights accorded to them correspond with the most high level international norms."[94]

In 2004, Commissioner Vitorino, in a reply on behalf of the Commission to a question asked in the European Parliament[95] stated that the Commission intended "to launch a study on the points in common with - and those on which it differs from - common immigration policy as it has developed at EU level since the entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam."[96]

But, in 2005, in a reply to a letter sent by the EPMWR, Commissioner Frattini concluded that he did "not consider as a priority the ratification

> "In 1994, the European Commission stated that ratifying the Convention would be an expression of the value the Union attaches to the improvement of the situation of migrant workers and their families."

91 See http://www.gisti.org/doc/plein-droit/38/europe.html; «Le Parlement européen (...) déplore qu'aucun État membre n'ait ratifié la Convention internationale pour la protection des droits des travailleurs migrants et de leurs familles approuvée par l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies le 18 décembre 1990 ; (…) presse les États membres d'engager les procédures de signature et de ratification (…).»

92 See point 80, European Parliament resolution on Development and Migration (2005/2244(INI)), 6 July 2006

93 European Parliament resolution on Women's Immigration: the role and place of immigrant women in the European Union (2006/2010(INI)) 24 October 2006; The Parliament "7. Calls on Member States, on the basis of their national legislation and international conventions, to guarantee respect for the fundamental rights of immigrant women, whether or not their status is regular, particularly protection from enslavement and violence, access to emergency medical care, legal aid, education for children and migrant workers, equal treatment with regard to working conditions and the right to join trade unions (UN Convention for the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families - 1990);" and "8. Calls on Member States, in compliance with their national legislation and international conventions (UN Convention for Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families - 1990), to ensure access to education for the children of immigrant women whose status is irregular."

94 Com (94) 23 final, see: http://aei.pitt.edu/1262/01/immigration_asylum_COM_94_23.pdf

95 Question asked by MEP Miet Smet on January 9, 2004

96 Reply by Commissioner Vitorino on 5 March, 2004

of this Convention by the Member States" nor the study that was mentioned by Commissioner Vitorino, "at least not for the time being."

This indicates the shift in thinking and approach from one Commission to the other, reflecting the changes in the political climate. However, the discussions around the ratification of the Convention are not finished yet. In the draft EU-Egypt Action Plan (7 June 2006), the Commission states that the EU would "examine the possibility for the EU Member States to sign the UN Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers and Members of their Families."[97]

References to the Convention do not only show up in documents regarding the relationships with third countries. Following up to the above-mentioned consultation process on the Green Paper on Economic Migration, the Commission drafted a proposal for a Policy Plan on Legal Migration which was adopted by the European Council and is now being implemented. One of the first steps is the development of a General Framework Directive which has as its main purpose "to guarantee a common framework of rights to all third-country nationals in legal employment already admitted in a member state, but not yet entitled to the long-term residence status.[98]" Off-the-record comments by EC officials indicate that during the drafting process some consideration might be given to the principles outlined in the UN Migrant Workers Convention.

European Economic and Social Committee

In its opinion on the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families from June 30, 2004, the European Economic and Social Committee encouraged "the Member States of the European Union to ratify the International Migrant Workers' Convention" and called "upon the President of the Commission and the current Presidency of the Council to undertake the necessary political initiatives to ensure that the Member States ratify the Migrant Workers' Convention within the coming twenty four months." It also proposed "that the Commission (should) carry out a study analysing national and Community legislation relating to the Convention."[99]

The European Economic and Social Committee called again for ratification in its opinion on the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration.[100]

Committee of the Regions

In its input to the consultation process on the European Commission's Green Paper on Economic Migration of July 7, 2005, the Committee of the Regions urged "all EU Member States to ratify the UN Convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and members of their families."[101]

3.6 The Council of Europe

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, in *New trends and challenges for Euro-Mediterranean migration policies* from 17 March 2006, recommended to the Committee of Ministers that they encourage the Council of Europe Member States to ratify the Migrant Workers Convention.[102] The Committee of Ministers replied to the

97 See point 2-1-1 b) of the Action Plan. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0282en01.pdf

98 COM (2005) 669 final, European Commission, December 21, 2005, p. 6.

99 The opinions can be found here: http://www.eesc.europa.eu/documents/opinions/avis_en.asp?type=en

100 Submissions can be found by searching http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/

101 See point 2-2; http://coropinions.cor.eu.int/coropiniondocument.aspx?language=en&docnr=82&year=2005

102 Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Recommendation 1737 (2006) New trends and challenges for Euro-Mediterranean migration policies, 17 March 2006, see point 12: "The Assembly also recommends that the Committee of Ministers (to) encourage Council of Europe member states and the countries that attended the 1st and 2nd Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Forums to sign and ratify the United Nations International Convention on the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families and other interna-

recommendation of the Parliamentary Assembly on September 13, 2006, saying that it shared the Assembly's view on this issue.[103]

The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance calls for ratification in most of its country reports.[104]

> "In March 2006 the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe recommended to the Committee of Ministers that they encourage the Member States to ratify the Convention."

3.7 UN agencies and related actors.

The UN Migrant Workers Convention is one of the seven core international human rights instruments. Calls for universal ratification are repeated regularly by various UN bodies. On the occasion of International Migrant's Day 2006, for example, both Secretary-General Kofi Annan and High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour called for ratification.

Perhaps more important than these calls is the work done by such agencies as UNESCO, the ILO, the Committee on Migrant Workers, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

In addition, mention should be made of the *Steering Committee of the Global Campaign for the Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Migrants*[105] as well as the *International Platform on the Migrant Workers Convention.*[106]
All of these bodies and organisations offer opportunities for building support for a comprehensive campaign in Europe for ratification of the Convention.

The Special Rapporteur, for example, usually calls for ratification when visiting a country. This was

tional conventions on the protection of migrant women and young migrants and encourage Council of Europe member states to sign and ratify the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers (ETS No. 93)"; http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/AdoptedText/ta06/EREC1737.htm

103 New trends and challenges for Euro-Mediterranean migration policies, Recommendation 1737, Reply from the Committee of Ministers adopted at the 973rd meeting of the Ministers' Deputies, 13 September 2006: "New trends and challenges for Euro-Mediterranean migration policies", 13 September 2006:
"2. The Assembly's call on member states to join and observe the existing conventional framework relating to migration is shared by the Committee of Ministers(…)"
http://assembly.coe.int/Main.asp?link=/Documents/WorkingDocs/Doc06/EDOC11022.htm

104 See, among others, country reports on Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland at: http://www.coe.int/t/e/human_rights/ecri/1-ecri/2-Country-by-country_approach/

105 Members are: December 18, Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Migration Commission, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, International Labour Office, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Organization for Migration, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Migrants Forum in Asia, Migrants Rights International, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Public Services International, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and World Council of Churches.

106 Members are: Amnesty International, Anti-Slavery International, December 18, Fédération Internationale des Ligues des Droits de l'Homme, Franciscans International, Human Rights Watch, Commission Internationale Catholique pour les Migrations, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Jesuit Refugee Service, Kav LaOved, Migrant CARE, Migrants Rights International, Organisation mondiale contre la torture, Public Services International, World Council of Churches

the case in Spain in September 2003[107] and Italy in June 2004.[108]

UNESCO from its part, has published a whole range of studies on the Convention and continues to actively promote its universal ratification.[109] It has set up a special project on the Convention in order to better understand the existing possibilities for further ratifications of the Convention and commissioned a series of studies on the obstacles to ratification.[110]

The ILO is one of the major promoters of the Convention.[111] It continues to include references to the Convention in its work on migration, most recently in the new ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration.[112] It considers the UN Convention together with the specific ILO Conventions 97 and 143, as a "comprehensive legal framework for migration policy and practice covering most issues of treatment of migrant workers and of inter-State cooperation on regulating migration" adding that "ratification of these instruments and their enforcement are crucial for the protection of migrant workers."[113]

Some of the other UN Treaty Monitoring Bodies also recommend on a regular basis the ratification of the Convention by EU Member States. For example, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights did so in its communication to Italy in 2004[114] and to Austria in 2005.[115] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended ratification of the Convention in its communication with Estonia.[116]

107 See §86: "The Special Rapporteur recommends that, in the medium and short terms, measures to ensure the more effective protection of the human rights of immigrants in Spain should be strengthened. These measures should include (…) Ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families" Report available on the OHCHR site.

108 See § 95:" Italy should consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (…). In particular, the Special Rapporteur advises a thorough analysis of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families for a correct assessment of its provisions." Report available on the OHCHR site.

109 For example: Information Kit on the UN Convention on Migrants Rights http://www.unesco.org/most/migration/convention/

110 Euan Macdonald & Ryszard Cholewinski (2007), "The Migrant Workers Convention in Europe" Paris, UNESCO

111 The ILO also takes up a special role in the application of the Convention, since Article 74.5 states that the ILO "shall be invited by the Committee to appoint representatives to participate, in a consultative capacity, in the meetings of the Committee."

112 The objective of the non-binding Framework is to give effect to the Resolution and conclusions on a fair deal for migrant workers in a global economy, adopted by the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference in 2004. The Framework provides practical guidance to governments, employers' and workers' organizations and other concerned parties on the development, strengthening and implementation of labour migration policies and practices. See: http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/multilat_fwk_en.pdf

113 See Contribution to the High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, 14-15 September 2006, §22: http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/download/perspectives.pdf

114 See Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Thirty-third session, 8-26 November 2004, §36: " The Committee recommends that the State party undertake measures to expedite the process of renewing the residence permits of migrant workers so as to enable them to enjoy their economic, social and cultural rights. The Committee further recommends that the State party consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families."

115 See Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Thirty-fifth session, 7-25 November 2005, §33: " The Committee encourages the State party to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families

116 See Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Sixty-ninth session, 31 July- 18 August 2006, § 24: "The Committee encourages the State party to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families." http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD.C.EST.CO.7.pdf

3.8 The role of the media

The media has not been involved to any significant extent in the campaigning for the ratification of the Convention. Media are often criticised by non-governmental organisations for picturing migrants in a negative way and, therefore, contributing to the current climate of racism against migrants. But they can be a very important stakeholder in the campaign as they represent the easiest way to reach the public at large. First and foremost, they can help raise awareness about the Convention and also correct misleading interpretations of it.

One opportunity to do so might be in the context of International Migrant's Day, in which the media are showing more and more interest. Moreover, in 2006, a global radio marathon was organised for the first time by the non-governmental organisation December 18 vzw. The pilot edition did attract participation from some 28 radio stations across Europe. In several cases, migrant organisations used this opportunity to call for the ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention.[117]

117 See: www.radio1812.net

4. Conclusion and recommendations

The main finding of this study is that the level of awareness around the UN Migrant Workers Convention is still too low in most of the European Member States. This is the case for political actors, government agencies and civil society alike. On the other hand, there is a wealth of experience at hand that should contribute positively to a successful comprehensive European campaign for ratification.

There is, therefore, an urgent need for increasing the number of national campaigns and in general for coordinating these campaigns at the European level. The European Platform for Migrant Workers Rights (EPMWR) is in a position to provide leadership. To be successful, however, a European campaign will have to include the participation of all stakeholders, i.e. migrants organisations, human rights groups, churches, unions, the European institutions, the international organisations, political parties, national human rights institutions and the media.

Some of the concrete steps that could be considered are:

- Develop a "popularised" version of the UN Migrant Workers Convention, listing the key principles and core rights.
- Using the Belgian 2003 study as an example, carry out a similar set of studies looking at the legislation in each of the other EU Member States as well as the EU legislation.
- Undertake a set of studies analysing the economic and social impacts of ratification.
- Start an EU-wide petition campaign, both aimed at getting support from individuals as well as organisations.
- Build support for the Convention through partnerships with European capital cities and their networks.
- Build support for the Convention at the regional level, including collaboration with the European Committee of the Regions.

Finally, it should be noted that the non-ratification of the UN Migrant Workers Convention in the European Union does not mean that this Convention should not be used as the international benchmark. To the contrary, the Convention represents the view of the international community and its provisions do provide a framework to assess the policies and practices of the European Union and its Member States.[1]

1 *See: "The Rights of Migrant Workers in the European Union – 2006 Shadow Reports for Estonia, France, Ireland and the United Kingdom" European Platform for Migrant Workers Rights (March 2007).*

Annex I: List of respondents to the questionnaire

Number contacted:	174
Replies received:	38
Austria	International Protection Permanent Representation of Austria to the EU Service-Centre Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit Federal Ministry of the Interior
Belgium	Centre pour l'Egalité des Chances et la Lutte contre le Racisme
Czech Republic	Office of the Public Defender of Rights Ministry of the Interior (Department of Press and Public Relations)
Denmark	miXeurope Ministry of Refugee, Integration and Immigration Affairs
France	GISTI MRAP Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ambassador for Human Rights)
Finland	KIPA
Germany	ProAsyl Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (Referat VIb 3 Internationale Arbeitsorganisation, Vereinte Nationen)
Greece	Hellenic Forum of Migrants
Hungary	International Law Research & Human Rights Monitoring Centre Artemisszió Alapítvány Governmental Information Center
Ireland	Immigrant Council of Ireland
Latvia	Latvian Centre for Human Rights
Lithuania	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU
Luxembourg	Service Réfugiés, Caritas Luxembourg Comité de Liaison des Associations d'Etrangers
Malta	Amnesty International Ministry for Foreign Affairs

The Netherlands	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Immigration and Naturalisation Service) Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the EU
Poland	Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (International Co-operation Department)
Portugal	Ministry of Labour and Social Solidarity Cabinet of the Minister for Labour and Social Solidarity
Slovakia	League of Human Rights Advocates
Slovenia	Amnesty International Slovenije
Spain	Caritas Barcelona
Sweden	Office of the Ombudsman against Ethnic Discrimination Ministry of Justice, Division for Immigrant Integration and Diversity

Annex II: Select bibliography on the UN Migrant Workers Convention

A Guide for NGOs on the Implementation of the UN Migrant Workers Convention, International Platform on the Migrant Workers Convention (Geneva, 2005)

Handbook on Migrant Workers, Franciscans International (Geneva, 2004)

ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (Geneva, 2006)

Information Kit on the UN Convention on Migrants' Rights, UNESCO (Paris, 2005)

Strengthening Protection of Migrant Workers and their Families with International Human Rights Treaties, International Catholic Migration Commission (Geneva, 2006)

The Migrant Workers Convention in Europe, Euan Macdonald & Ryszard Cholewinski, UNESCO (Paris, 2007)


epmwr
European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights

European Platform for Migrant Workers' Rights

EPMWR
c/o December 18 vzw • 164 rue Gaucheret • 1030 Brussels • Belgium
Tel: +32-2-2741435 • Fax: +32-2-2741438 • E-mail: epmwr@december18.net