



# Second Steering Committee Meeting

---

26 September 2016, 9.45 – 13.00

## Minutes



## Participants

[REDACTED]	DG HOME – Chair of the Steering Committee
[REDACTED]	DG HOME – taking over the Chair of the Steering Committee
[REDACTED]	DG NEAR - member
[REDACTED]	EEAS - member
[REDACTED]	DG HOME - observer
[REDACTED]	DG HOME - observer
<u>ICMPD/Secretariat of the Steering Committee:</u>	
[REDACTED]	Head of Mission, MPF Project Director, ICMPD
[REDACTED]	MPF Programme Manager, ICMPD
[REDACTED]	MPF Project Manager, ICMPD
[REDACTED]	MPF Project Officer, ICMPD
[REDACTED]	MPF Junior Project Officer, ICMPD

## Discussions

### *Presence and composition of the Steering Committee (SC)*

The Chair of the SC took note of the presence of all member of the SC apart from DG DEVCO.

He also introduced [REDACTED], who will take over the Chair of the SC after this meeting.



## *MPF state of play: implementation of the AWP 2016 (scenarios A1), achievements and lessons learnt (ICMPD)*

ICMPD presented the state of play of MPF implementation focusing on:

- **The Call for proposal with an open deadline** launched on 18 April 2016.
- **Applications received** so far:
  - o Two rejected as ineligible (one from a private consultancy and one not covering a country concerned by MP/CAMM,
  - o An application between Romania and Moldova (border management, total draft budget of EUR 178,512.92 and a co-financing of EUR 169,587.27) currently still in the contracting phase due to requests for clarifications from ICMPD;
  - o An application presented by France on Armenia currently under evaluation (reintegration of returning migrants, proposed budget of EUR 493,165.00, and a co-financing of EUR 468.479.00).
- **Ideas for possible actions under MPF presented by EU MS** (20 in total);
- **The continuous outreach and promotion of MPF** among EU MS and partner countries;
- **The roles of consultations** (EC services, EU Delegations, EU MS, etc.) upon the submission of applications is important in view of receiving additional information and feedback to evaluate the proposal by the Grant Evaluation Committee (GEC). Therefore, this stage plays the role of collecting the relevant information and preparing the ground for GEC that is fully mandated to evaluate each proposal, on the basis of the established criteria and procedures, and take the necessary decisions.

The assessment of the past six months shows the following success factors:

- MPF is perceived as the only all-encompassing instrument completely dedicated to the implementation of MPs/CAMMs;
- The open nature of the Call for proposals is considered very positive;
- MPF has triggered the request of an EU MS (Latvia) to join the MP with Moldova.

MPF is also facing challenges:

- The short timeframe for action has been indicated as too narrow. This element will impact on proposals being granted/evaluated as well as those planned.
- Some EU MS have limited capacities in terms of human resources and project management. The request received by Hungary to trigger the scenario B1 (asking DG Home to task ICMPD to implement the proposed action) has to be framed in this context.
- The availability of other (larger scale) funding opportunities, such as the Trust Fund, may weaken the interest of EU MS/partner countries on MPF.
- The eligibility restricted solely to EU MS public bodies, limits the possibility of non-public bodies, such as NGOs, to be involved (i.e. only with minor roles based on sub-contracting). However, it should be borne in mind that MPF was devised predominantly for EU MS.
- The institutional setup and organisational changes in certain EU MS (e.g. Italy) shall be also considered as it may delay the submission of proposals;



The discussions were centred on:

- **A possible extension of the Delegation Agreement**

DG HOME suggested to ICMPD to consider the extension of the Delegation Agreement. A no-cost extension should be requested and presented with the necessary justifications. A revised description of tasks (Annex 1) and budget should accompany the request, providing for sufficient time for each action and MPF itself to be thoroughly evaluated. Before formal submission, the request will be informally discussed with DG HOME.

- **Priority countries**

EEAS mentioned that the Commission published on 7 June a Communication on establishing a new *Partnership Framework with third countries*. The Communication provided the priority for some countries. The suggestion was thus that MPF should explore the possibility of identifying project ideas for Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Nigeria and Tunisia. Further discussions between ICMPD and DG HOME will continue regarding the identification of potential areas for actions under the MPF and more targeted outreach strategies to various stakeholders.

DG HOME underlined that priority countries were already discussed during the elaboration of the Annual Work Plan (AWP) 2016. At that time, the focus was on the new MPs: Azerbaijan, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. It was also agreed that, to the extent possible, geographical balance should be ensured. For Nigeria and Ethiopia, which benefit already from EDF funds, MPF can be used to kick-off the implementation of the CAMM. MPs that are about to be signed (e.g. Belarus) should also be supported (though in the case of Lebanon negotiations have been suspended for the moment).

- **Evaluation tools**

The MPF team is now developing tools to evaluate and monitor actions implemented under scenario A. Monitoring and evaluation of MPF as such will be discussed with DG Home in the coming weeks.

### *MPF state of play: implementation of the AWP 2016 (B1 and B2), achievements and lessons learnt (ICMPD)*

Scenario B1 has been triggered for the first time by the Hungarian Ministry of Interior. A positive feedback from the Steering Committee was received on 23/09/2016.

DG HOME mentioned the importance of better structuring the information that will be formally shared with the Steering Committee when an EU Member State decides to trigger this scenario. In this regard, a quick fact-check stage, to be conducted by the MPF team, is required upon the submission of the B1 request in order to analyse the potential impact of the proposed action vis-à-vis other existing initiatives and projects, thus ensuring active synergies and overcoming duplications.



The discussion also tackled coordination tools of MPs, such as local cooperation platforms (LCP) and scoreboards. DG HOME suggested holding videoconferences with EUDEls to discuss possible creation of new LCPs. Methodology for MP scoreboards and their updating will be further explored by ICMPD together with DG HOME.

Regarding scenario B2 (horizontal activities), MPF has made progress on the following tasks:

- Analysis of the political and operational framework. The core activity was the update and analysis of the Tunisian scoreboard. The scoreboard provides now a consolidated picture of landscape and projects in Tunisia. This exercise has led to the identification of some gaps which could potentially be tapped by MPF. Besides, MPF is also collecting and sharing partner countries priorities among MS with a view to matching interests and proposing concrete actions.
- Knowledge management and dissemination of good practices. For example, the MPF team regularly identifies together with partner countries and on the basis of the existing scoreboards the priorities that could be tackled under the MPF and liaises subsequently with the EU MS in order to inform share this information with them and to discuss possible project ideas.
- Outreach, communication and awareness raising. A regional workshop gathering Eastern partnership countries that signed a Mobility Partnership, (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova plus Belarus as a future MP country and Ukraine as an observer), together with EU MS and international organisations/NGOs was held in July in Moldova. The workshop was instrumental to sharing experiences with actions implemented under MPs and in formulating priorities for the future. However, the underestimated budget for travels costs and visibility events impact on the effectiveness of activities aiming to promote MPF and foster cooperation among interested bodies.

DG HOME highlighted the importance of MPF visibility and more specifically of a more visible link to the Call for proposals on ICMPD website. Further outreach on MPF will be carried out with regard to police cooperation and legal migration, possibly involving DG EMPL.

### *Proposal for amendment to Annual Work Plan*

ICMPD presented an update of the AWP 2016. The biggest change concerns the Annual Conference that will not take place in 2016. Changes occurred to the Jordanian administration following the recent Parliamentary elections do not ICMPD to organise such event by the end of November 2016. Also, it was not deemed feasible to organise the workshop given that the simultaneous presence of all southern partners cannot be guaranteed, due to the stall of EU-Moroccan relations.

A number of estimated figures have also been amended for specific activities in order to reflect the changes made and the necessary budgetary adjustments. The



Steering Committee members were reminded that the costs of individual activities in the AWP are of estimative nature and their inclusion in the Plan is a means to monitor, in particular, the execution of different budget lines from which they are financially covered and the entire budget dedicated to the B2 scenario (horizontal activities).

In order to be able to organise and implement visibility and outreach activities, ICMPD will explore the possibility offered by Article 11.4 of the Delegation Agreement.<sup>1</sup>

As proposed by DG HOME after the SC meeting, some adjustments would still be made and the amendment to the Annual Work Plan would be shared with the SC. These will concern especially the timing of horizontal activities, such as workshops and conferences.

### *Proposals for amendments to the Rules of Procedures of the Steering Committee and the Grant Evaluation Committee (ICMPD)*

The main changes regarding the *Rules of Procedures of the Steering Committee* concern the methodology linked to Scenario B1. Despite the risks of parallel communication, the SC agreed that ICMPD should continue to consult EU MS, the SC and EU Delegations. DG HOME suggested extending the timeframe in order to give more time for reactions.

A document gathering facts and information about the proposed action will be drafted by ICMPD and shared before the consultation phase.

The amendments to the *Grant Evaluation Committee Rules of procedures* focus on:

- The terminology used for Scenario B1 (which should be different from the one used for Scenario A);
- The timetable in case clarifications are required;
- The signature of the Evaluation Report for Scenario B1.

The amendments to both documents will be adjusted based on the discussion of the SC. Subsequently, the *Rules of Procedures of the Grant Evaluation Committee* will be shared with the SC for information; the *Rules of Procedures of the Steering Committee* will be submitted to the SC for approval.

### *Conclusions and follow up*

- The SC took note of the progress in MPF implementation in the six months following the first SC meeting.
- The possibility of a no-cost prolongation of the Delegation Agreement will be explored by ICMPD.

---

<sup>1</sup> By derogation from Articles 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3, where an amendment to Annex I and/or Annex III does not affect the basic purpose of the Action, and the financial impact is limited to a transfer within a single budget heading, including cancellation or introduction of an item, or a transfer between headings involving a variation (as the case may be in cumulative terms) of 25% or less of the amount originally entered (or as amended by a written rider) in relation to each concerned heading the Organisation may unilaterally amend Annex I and/or Annex III and shall inform the Contracting Authority accordingly in writing, at the latest in the next report. The Indicators described in Annex I may be changed by the Organisation in agreement with the European Commission, without the need for a formal rider to the Agreement if the change does not affect the basic purpose of the Action ”.



- MPF reach-out to stakeholders dealing with police cooperation and legal migration will be boosted by ICMPD, with the support of DG HOME.
- Monitoring and evaluation tools for actions implemented under the MPF as well as for the entire MPF implementation will be developed by ICMPD and shared with DG HOME.
- Amendments to the AWP will be introduced based on the SC meeting discussion and shared with the SC for information.
- Amendments to the *Rules of Procedure of the Grant Evaluation Committee* will reflect the SC meeting discussion and shared with the SC for information.
- Amendments to the *Rules of Procedures of the Steering Committee* will reflect the SC meeting discussion and submitted to the SC for approval.

