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Figure 1: Logical framework of the scenario-building methodology implemented by the study team
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Following the logical framework, and within the analysis of possible interplay between factors affecting different uncertainties the study team identified macroeconomic and political characteristics, which could affect co-existence or divergence between alternative developments in the four uncertainties, based on the key questions. These characteristics (economic downturn, upturn, vital divergence between countries and regions and different trends in euroscepticism) appear in the cross-impact analysis and scenario description, together with more direct factors affecting the four main uncertainties.

The team constructed first smaller cross-impact tables focusing on key questions within one uncertainty to identify possible correlations between alternative states of questions and then combined for all uncertainties (a table of 26x26 cells). Table 1 presents a part of the table, exploring the relationships for the key questions related to migration pressure and border management. The black square represents existing causality or strong correlation. The focus group outlined two paths of development for migration pressure uncertainty (based on the upper left quadrant of 64 cells in the table), four for border management, two for travel and visa and three for technological innovations.

**Table 1: Cross-impact table for migration pressure and border management integration**

The cross-impact table reflects considerations like “if efforts of EU to engage third countries are unsuccessful (2b) then we should admit that there will be lower cooperation with third countries and no sustainable operations of EBCG in third countries (7b)”. Similarly, effective efforts of EU to engage gatekeeper states or combat root causes of migration and implement effective readmission policies (2a and 3a) entail involvement of EBCG in capacity building projects in third countries (7a). Specific combinations of answers to the key questions are ruled out through this analysis. For instance, timely and
consistent deployment of new technologies (12a) entails improved control over the migration flow (13a) and hence a combination 12a, 13b is not possible.

As a result, the following plausible combinations of answers to key questions have been considered:

**Migration pressure:**
- 1a, 2b, 3b, 4b (high migration pressure)
- 1b, 2a, 3a, 4b (low migration pressure)

**Border management integration:**
- 5a, 6a, 7a, 8a, 9a (highly effective border management and more integration within EU)
- 5b, 6b, 7b, 8b, 9b (ineffective border management and disintegration within EU)
- 5b, 6b, 7a, 8b, 9b (somewhat effective border management by working beyond the borders but still disintegration within EU)
- 5b, 6a, 7b, 8b, 9a (effective border management for some countries, ineffective border management for others)

**Travel and common visa policy**
- 10a, 11a (visa liberalization and effective ETIAS implementation)
- 10b, 11b (suspension mechanism for currently visa-free origins and legal battles and obstruction to ETIAS)

**Technological innovations**
- 12a, 13a (all member states introduce new technologies and have improved control at borders)
- 12b, 13b (delayed deployment of innovations, no priority on facilitation of passenger flows)
- 12b, 13a (discrepancy of deployment of innovations but improved control at major countries)

Yet, not all combinations of combinations are possible. As stated above, 2a and 3a entails 7a, which makes impossible to have consistently low migration pressure and ineffective border management and disintegration within EU. Based on the possible combinations of alternatives for migration pressure and border management integration we have 5 scenarios out of $2^4 = 8$ theoretically. The scenarios are given in Table 2.

**Table 2: Five scenarios determination by two uncertainties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTS</th>
<th>MSEU</th>
<th>STEU</th>
<th>NMWS</th>
<th>ICEU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The remaining answers to questions related to the uncertainties of travel and visa are direct consequence of the already answered questions. For instance, if visa liberalization continues to grow and the European Travel Information and Authorization System is uniformly implemented, this means that many if not all answers to questions for migration pressure or border management integration should be “a”-s. For instance, it cannot happen without proper readmission mechanisms and the ETIAS will expedite the border checking process and so on. The only difference in the last two uncertainties is the fact that effective border management for some countries and ineffective for others allows for partial fulfilment of 13a (richest countries), while the other questions remain negative (disparities in technology adoption, limitations on travel, etc).

**Figure 2: Key uncertainties as axes to the five scenarios**
Scenario 5 could be depicted on two non-connected places on the coordinated system (bottom right and bottom left, as there are camps which are far more stable in the core/north than those in the periphery, where the pressure is higher). While the overall pressure (measured by numbers of immigrants per EU citizens or per square kilometer) is decreasing, those isolated camps in the periphery would require much more attention and policy action because of significantly higher migration pressure. The upper right quadrant is empty of scenarios because of the underlying assumption that higher EU border management integration required overall stronger and more integrated Europe, which limit the effect of migration pressure due to strategic shocks, simply because stronger Europe means also stronger foreign policy, efficient foreign aid and limiting the sources of migration.

The selection of scenarios and validation of the overall logic and rationale behind the scenarios was conducted using a panel of experts. Some of them have been interviewed in addition to responses on scenarios over skype, telephone calls or face to face meetings to solicit practical recommendations based on plausible scenarios.

The expert panel have been constructed in three steps.
- At the first, project partners nominated experts with academic, professional or diplomatic expertise in areas of migration, border management and international affairs.
- Then, a list of experts provided by DG Home was added.
- Then, experts have been asked to join the panel and to recommend someone knowledgeable on the subject matter to join as well.

The resulting more than 100 experts from most of the EU 28 countries were approached to assess and rank scenario outlines, its coherence, importance, effect on domains of interests, rapid increase of complexity or significant change, which would require specific preparation by policy makers. The invitees included former ambassadors in countries of origin of migrants; current and former border security officials, police officers, former deputy ministers of economy, interior and other areas, civil society activists, researchers and investigative journalists with expertise in the Home Affairs policy areas.

The response rate was about 25% and ranged between 1 and 10 pages of comments each. While there were conflicting assessments concerning scenarios proximity between each other and different assessments of probabilities of scenarios, there were no major opposition to scenarios or critiques that critical factors for uncertainties have been missed. So, the participating panel members validated the scenarios as the most important from policy planning perspective.
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