

## Scorecard – Schengen White List Conditions

22 May 2009

**Based on expert visits and internal assessments by the European Commission  
of the implementation of the visa liberalisation roadmaps  
by Western Balkan countries (18 May 2009)**

- |    |            |                                 |             |
|----|------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Macedonia  | <i>meets the benchmarks</i>     | score: 1    |
| 2. | Montenegro | <i>meets most benchmarks</i>    | score: 1.75 |
|    | Serbia     | <i>meets most benchmarks</i>    | score: 1.75 |
| 3. | Albania    | <i>does not meet benchmarks</i> | score: 3    |
|    | Bosnia     | <i>does not meet benchmarks</i> | score: 3    |
| 4. | Kosovo     | <i>no evaluation</i>            | score: -    |

Explanation: In its assessments, the Commission uses six distinct phrases to describe the countries' progress in four main areas, ranging from “meets the benchmarks” to “does not yet fully meet the benchmarks”. A number was allocated to each of these phrases:

- 1 = “meets the benchmarks” *and* “generally meets the benchmarks”  
 2 = “meets a large majority of the benchmarks” *and* “meets a majority of benchmarks”  
 3 = “on the right track, but...” *and* “does not yet fully meet the benchmarks”

	Albania	Bosnia & Herzegovina	Macedonia	Montenegro	Serbia
<b>Document security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Illegal migration incl. readmission</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Public order and security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>External relations and fundamental rights</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

## Detailed European Commission Assessments

On 24 November 2008, the European Commission presented EU member states officials (from the Council working group on the Western Balkans and a working group on justice and home affairs) with draft assessments of the Western Balkan countries' progress in meeting the visa roadmap requirements. Judging by the Commission's assessments, the countries fell into three groups. Macedonia was the most advanced; Serbia and Montenegro made up the second group; Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina made up the third. The assessments were based on "[readiness reports](#)" that the Western Balkan countries had submitted by September 2008. Later the Commission asked for additional information, clarifications and updates.

At the closed meeting in November, the Commission noted that it would be able to propose the lifting of visa restrictions in 2009 for the most advanced countries if the pace of reform was maintained. Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn made [similar comments](#). However, some member states' representatives, notably those from Germany, Spain and Belgium, objected, stating that 2009 might be premature. The Commission then invited the EU member states to nominate national experts for a series of fact-finding missions to all the Western Balkan countries. These took place between January and March 2009.

The reports from these missions, as well as additional information and updates supplied by the Western Balkan governments, [formed the basis for a new series of Commission assessments scheduled for May 2009](#). These have now been presented to the member states. These assessments conclude – based on the most thorough expert assessments ever undertaken in the fields of document security, border control, migration management and security – that Macedonia meets the conditions for visa-free travel, that Montenegro and Serbia meet most of the conditions for visa-free travel, and that Bosnia-Herzegovina and Albania do not (yet) meet the conditions for visa free travel. Kosovo, the sixth Western Balkan state whose citizens are required to obtain a visa to travel to the EU, is not yet included in this process leading to visa liberalisation and risks being left behind as an enclave in the region.

Next week, Monday, 25 May 2009, the Commission will discuss its findings with EU member states' officials. If EU member states follow the Commission's assessments and apply the strict conditionality they have themselves defined – then they will offer Macedonia visa-free travel, while (for the moment) denying it to Albania and Bosnia-Herzegovina. As for Montenegro and Serbia, the Commission and EU member states will need to weigh whether to reward the impressive recent progress made in both countries (particularly in recent months) or whether to withhold any concrete rewards until conditions are actually met in both. A third option, preferable to a negative decision, might be to make one more final assessment before the end of July.

The most problematic aspect of the current assessments is that they leave out Kosovo, the Western Balkan state where the European Union has assumed most direct responsibility. This creates problems not only for the citizens of Kosovo but also both Serbia and the EU. It is not clear why the EU would wish to forego such a powerful instrument to improve policing, border controls and the rule of law in Kosovo.

Further background information: ESI White List Project on [www.esiweb.org](http://www.esiweb.org)

[Strict but fair – The Declaration](#)

[Stories from the Balkan ghetto](#)

[The road to visa-free travel](#)

[The origin](#)

- [The visa facilitation and readmission agreements](#)
- [The visa roadmaps](#)
- [Visa roadmap A to Z \(glossary\)](#)
- [The readiness reports](#)
- [Assessments by the European Commission](#)
- [EU timetable](#)
- [Letters from EU foreign ministers](#)
- [Excerpts from EU policy documents](#)
- [Chronology](#)

	Albania	Bosnia & Herzegovina	Macedonia	Montenegro	Serbia
<b>Block 1: Document security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
	“It appears that Albania <u>does not yet fully meet</u> all the benchmarks specified under block 1 of the Road map. The issuance of biometric passports under a secure personalisation procedure could not be assessed during the period covered by this updated assessment report.” (Because too few passports issued so far.)	“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>does not yet fully meet</u> all the benchmarks specified under block 1 of the Road map, inter alia due to the introduction of biometric passports foreseen only in January 2010.”	“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”	“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under Block 1 of the roadmap.”	“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.”
<b>Block 2: Illegal migration incl. readmission</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
	“It appears that Albania <u>does not yet fully meet</u> all the benchmarks specified in block 2 of the Road map. Further progress remains to be made in	“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina <u>does not yet fully meet</u> all the benchmarks specified in block 2 of the Road map. Further progress remains to be	“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has made substantial progress on migration-related issues and appears to <u>generally meet</u> the benchmarks	“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary on the implementation	“It appears that Serbia <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 2 of the roadmap. Further verification is necessary on the implementation

	particular in the areas of border and migration management.”	made in particular in the areas of border and migration management.”	set under Block 2 of the roadmap.”	of the Law on Foreigners and additional information on a possible sustainable solution in the near future regarding displaced persons and IDPs.”	of the Law on Foreigners and effective cooperation between different authorities at the boundary line with Kosovo needs to be ensured.”
<b>Block 3: Public order and security</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
	“Albania has made some progress in the area of public order and security, but it appears that it <u>does not yet fully meet</u> the benchmarks under this block.”	“Bosnia and Herzegovina has made some progress in the area of public order and security, but it appears that it <u>does not yet fully meet</u> the benchmarks under block 3.”	“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>generally meets</u> the benchmarks set under block 3 of the roadmap.”	“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.”	“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.”
<b>Block 4: External relations and fundamental rights</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
	“It appears that Albania is <u>on the right track</u> to meet the benchmarks under this block. Additional efforts should be concentrated on protection of minorities and fight against discrimination.”	“It appears that Bosnia and Herzegovina is <u>on the right track</u> to meet the benchmarks under this block. Additional efforts should be concentrated on protection of minorities and fight against discrimination.”	“It appears that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <u>meets</u> the benchmarks set under block 4 of the roadmap.”	“It appears that Montenegro <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”	“It appears that Serbia <u>meets a large majority</u> of the benchmarks set under Block 4 of the roadmap.”