



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Brussels, 20 March 2020

CM 1901/20

CODEC
JAI
ASIM
STATIS
PROCED

COMMUNICATION

WRITTEN PROCEDURE

Contact: Polona Tedesko

Tel./Fax: +32.2.281.70.36

Subject: Draft REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection (2018/0154 COD)
- Adoption of the Council's position at first reading and of the statement of the Council's reasons
– Outcome of the written procedure initiated by CM 1884/20

I am pleased to inform you that the written procedure relating to the adoption of the Council's position at first reading and the statement of the Council's reasons on the **draft Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection** was completed today, **20 March 2020**, with all delegations agreeing except Malta and Slovakia, which voted against. The statement submitted are given in the Annex hereto.

Statement by Malta and Slovakia

We acknowledge the efforts of the Presidency to reach a compromise with the European Parliament on the draft Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection.

However, we cannot accept the compromise as stated in the "Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on migration and international protection" (ST 15300/19).

Our concerns on this draft regulation, as already expressed during several Council Working Parties on Statistics, and during the COREPER meetings of 20 November 2019, 4 December 2019 and 15 January 2020, and also through the silence procedure that was launched, have not been addressed. The lack of real and relevant justification for the additional data and their added value for policy making persists, and the double-reporting problem has not been adequately catered for but left unclear. Furthermore, the change to recital 11, wherein requesting the prioritization of the inclusion of data requirements in the legal architecture of the regulation, has exacerbated our problem on the process since this is enabling the circumvention of an appropriate impact assessment vis-à-vis their policy-needs and creating unsubstantiated high resource and administrative constraints for Member States.