

Scorecard April 2010 – Schengen White List Conditions

Based on the assessments by the European Commission of five Western Balkan countries' progress in implementing the visa roadmap
(on 19 April 2010 and 18 May 2009)

1.	Macedonia	(May 2009)	score: 1.3
2.	Bosnia	(April 2010)	score: 1.4
3.	Albania	(April 2010)	score: 1.6
4.	Montenegro	(May 2009)	score: 1.9
5.	Serbia	(May 2009)	score: 2
	Kosovo	still missing	score: -

	Albania (April 2010)	Bosnia (April 2010)	Macedonia (May 2009)	Montenegro (May 2009)	Serbia (May 2009)
1. Document security	1	1	1	1	1.5
2. Illegal migration incl. readmission	1.5	1	1.5	2	2
3. Public order and security	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.5
4. External relations and fundamental rights	1.5	1	1	2	2
Average:	1.6 (1.625)	1.4 (1.375)	1.3 (1.25)	1.9 (1.875)	2 (2)

Excerpts from the Commission assessments:

	Albania (April 2010)	Bosnia & Herzegovina (April 2010)	Macedonia (May 2009)	Montenegro (May 2009)	Serbia (May 2009)
Block 1: Document security	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that Albania <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1.5</p> <p>“It appears that Serbia <u>generally meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary concerning the issuing of breeder documents to persons residing in Kosovo and the integrity and security of the procedures followed.”</p>
Block 2: Illegal migration incl. readmission	<p>1.5</p> <p>“It appears that Albania <u>generally meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary concerning the development of a strategy and policy to support the reintegration of returnees.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1.5</p> <p>“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has made substantial progress on migration-related issues and appears to <u>generally meet</u> the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>2</p> <p>“It appears that Montenegro meets <u>a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary on the implementation of the Law on Foreigners and additional information on a possible sustainable solution in the near future regarding displaced persons and IDPs.”</p>	<p>2</p> <p>“It appears that Serbia <u>meets</u> <u>a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary on the implementation of the Law on Foreigners and effective cooperation between different authorities at the boundary line with Kosovo needs to be ensured.”</p>

<p>Block 3: Public order and security</p>	<p>2.5</p> <p>“It appears that Albania <u>meets the majority</u> of benchmarks set under block 3 of the roadmap. Further efforts are needed regarding the strengthening of the capacities of law enforcement and the effective implementation of the legal framework for the fight against organised crime and corruption, including through allocation of adequate financial and human resources. In particular the implementation of the new legal framework in the area of confiscation of criminal assets needs to be pursued with determination.”</p>	<p>2.5</p> <p>“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>meets the majority</u> of benchmarks set under block 3 of the roadmap. Further efforts are needed regarding strengthening capacities of law enforcement and the effective implementation of the legal framework, including through allocation of adequate financial and human resources. The action plan following the agreement on establishment of electronic data exchange between police and prosecution bodies should be progressively implemented. Entity-level and the Brcko District criminal codes should be amended to harmonise them with the state-level criminal code.”</p>	<p>1.5</p> <p>“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>generally meets</u> the benchmarks set under block 3 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>2.5</p> <p>“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets the majority</u> of benchmarks set under block 3 of the roadmap. Further efforts are needed regarding implementation of the legal framework, including through allocation of adequate financial and human resources.”</p>	<p>2.5</p> <p>“It appears that Serbia <u>meets the majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 3 of the roadmap. Further efforts are needed regarding implementation of the legal framework, including through allocation of adequate financial and human resources.”</p>
<p>Block 4: External relations and fundamental rights</p>	<p>1.5</p> <p>“It appears that Albania <u>generally meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under block 4 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>2</p> <p>“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”</p>	<p>2</p> <p>“It appears that Serbia <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”</p>

Approach: The Commission uses six distinct phrases in its assessments to describe progress under each of the four blocks into which the visa roadmap is divided. They range from “meets the benchmarks” (best) to “does not yet fully meet the benchmarks” (worst). ESI has allocated grades from 1 (best) to 3 (worst) to each of the phrases to quantify progress. While in the past we have used only the grades 1, 2 and 3, now that Albania and Bosnia have caught up with the rest of the group, we have introduced interim grades (1.5 and 2.5) to be able to capture nuances.

The main assessments for Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia were issued in May 2009. At the time, the Commission still identified a few short-comings for Montenegro and Serbia, so it proposed visa-free travel for these two countries on condition that they reach the open benchmarks. In October 2009, the Commission 2009 verified that they had done so, without issuing full-fledged assessments anymore. This is why the tables are based on the main May 2009 assessments for these two countries.

In November 2009 then, the EU lifted the visa requirement for the Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, so that their citizens who possess biometric passports have been able to travel without a visa to the EU since 19 December 2009.

Albania and Bosnia had to continue with roadmap implementation. In December 2009 and February 2010, missions comprising experts nominated by the EU member states and Commission officials examined the situation on the ground, and the two governments have submitted regular reports on progress. Both provided input into the updated assessments for Albania and Bosnia, which the Commission issued on 19 April 2010.

ESI grading:

<u>Commission phrase:</u>	<u>Grade:</u>
“meets the benchmarks”:	grade 1
“generally meets”:	grade 1.5
“meets a large majority”:	grade 2
“meets a majority”:	grade 2.5
“on the right track, but...”:	was used in the previous assessments for Albania and Bosnia, but no longer in the April 2010 assessments; grade 3
“does not yet fully meet”:	was used in the previous assessments for Albania and Bosnia, but no longer in the April 2010 assessments; grade 3

All assessments and progress reports are available at www.esiweb.org/whitelistproject.