



Third Steering Committee Meeting

10 March 2016, 10.00 – 13.00

Minutes



Participants

██████████	DG HOME – Chair of the Steering Committee
██████████	DG HOME – Observer
██████████	DG HOME – Observer
██████████	DG DEVCO – Member
██████████	EEAS – Member represented by G. Rizza
<u>ICMPD/Secretariat of the Steering Committee:</u>	
██████████	Head of Mission, MPF Project Director
██████████	MPF Programme Manager
██████████	MPF Project Manager
██████████	MPF Junior Project Officer

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 NEAR. ██████████, Chair of the SC, was appointed by ██████████ to represent EEAS in her absence.

MPF state of play: Second Interim Report, implementation of actions (scenarios A1, B1), achievements under scenario B2 and lessons learnt (ICMPD)

DG HOME opened the meetings with some short **introductory remarks** and considerations on the current fast changing political and operational landscape in the external dimension of migration, including the existence of different financial instruments, the future of MPF and their relevance with regard to migratory challenges and (political) agreements/dialogues with third countries, considering also including some activities of the Prague Process under the MPF umbrella via an amendment to the existing delegation agreement or altogether under a second delegation agreement. The latter is a priority deriving from the necessity to ensure increased coherence and complementarities among various tools established by DG HOME within the framework of the EU external dimension of migration policy. Yet, two assumptions need to be considered: the adoption of the Annual Work Programmes for all three funds and a high absorption capacity/solid projection of the available funds under the ongoing delegation agreement.

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

- **The eight Grant Applications received** under the call for proposal launched on 18 April 2016:
 - o Three proposals rejected;
 - o Three actions granted: an action between Romania and Moldova (border management); an action between France and Armenia (return and



- reintegration) and an action between Italy, Morocco and Tunisia (circular migration); and
- o Two contracts under preparation: an action between Estonia and Georgia (Asylum) and an action between Latvia, Georgia and Moldova (Border management).

More **details about each action under implementation were briefly presented.**

- **Evaluation of proposals:** the process has been improved, reviewed and streamlined. The evaluation procedure is now below the limit of 15 working days.
- **Contracting phase:** actions are contracted between six to eight weeks from the application date.
- **Monitoring tools** including field notes and on-spot missions for MPF actions have been developed and tested with positive feedback from beneficiaries. Internal monitoring tools at facility level are now being consolidated into a single overarching strategy.
- **Regarding Scenario B1:** a proposal under B1 is under preparation (triggered by Hungary). The action aims at strengthening strategic and operational cooperation on (Integrated Border Management) IBM between training schools of EU MS and Eastern Partnerships (EaP) countries and among EaP countries themselves. **Eight countries are involved:** four EU MS (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia) and four partner countries (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia and Moldova). The action will last eight months and be implemented by ICMPD. The validity of the idea has been verified in close coordination with FRONTEX (management team of the action Cap-Bui-Pro), EU Delegations and ICMPD in-house experts on IBM. ICMPD informed the SC that the proposal will be submitted for evaluation in the coming days.
- **The following horizontal activities** (B2 scenario) are being prepared:
 - o The Second MPF **Regional Workshop** targeting Southern Neighborhood countries will take place in May (Brussels) with a focus on labour migration;
 - o A draft common methodology for MP **scoreboards** has been developed. The possibility to have an online platform where information on each scoreboard can be downloaded through different filters is being explored;
 - o A more **targeted approach in the outreach and promotion of MPF to EU MS:** is being developed as MPF Focal Points (FoPs) are not always responsive. Regular contacts with **partner countries are also kept** in order to have a clear updated picture of their priorities. MPF has also been presented in various meetings; and
 - o The first edition of the **Newsletter** is pending approval from DG HOME. It will be sent to all MPF contacts (not only MPF FoPs) together with **info-notes** developed for each implemented action.
- **Lessons learned:**
 - o The importance of **knowledge management** which gives the opportunity to find ideas that could be implemented by EU MS;
 - o The development of **Local Cooperation Platforms** (LCPs) is a key factor. Where LCPs are in place (such as in EaP countries), articulated priorities and ideas are easier to extract (and the number of applications received under MPF being a key indicator); and



- MPF has triggered the request of an EU MS (**Latvia**) to join the MP with Moldova.
- A **collection a large number of ideas on MPF actions** and a **chart on a tentative funds absorption plan** were presented to the SC.

Some **challenges** (echoed in previous meetings) were highlighted:

- Some EU MS have **limited capacities in** terms of human resources and project management;
- 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 **institutional setup and organisational changes** in certain countries (e.g. Italy, Belarus) shall be also considered as it may delay the submission of proposals;
- MPF **Focal Points** are not as active as expected. Information on MPF is not always communicated to other ministries or departments; and
- Difficulties to have ideas submitted under **ISF Police**.

The discussions were centred on:

- **MPF Focal Points**

MPF Focal Points are often GAMM experts who come from different EU MS administrations. DG HOME is working on the idea to nominate permanent GAMM experts. DG HOME suggested, when possible, to have EMLOs included in the list of MPF focal points (and also work with EU Representation in each country).

- **Outreach – ISF Police**

DG HOME underlined the importance of sharing information on MPF in different Funds Committees that are gathering EU MS ministries of foreign affairs. However, given the low share of ISF Police budgets used so far, it was deemed more prudent to consider this idea at a later stage.

- **Collection of ideas**

Regarding a possible idea between Malta and Nigeria on irregular migration/migrant smuggling, DG HOME suggested to contact Maltese authorities in order to better define their intentions. ICMPD will follow up through its well-established channels. DG DEVCO advised to get in touch with colleagues dealing with the Trust Fund as this idea may be submitted through this specific instrument.

MPF Draft Annual Work Plan 2017

ICMPD presented a draft Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the year 2017. The main focus per scenario will be:

- **Under Scenario A**
 - **Management of the Call for Proposals** and grant applications. In this respect a **projection plan** to absorb available budget was presented, highlighting the likelihood of AMIF budget to be fully allocated by summer 2017 and the probability of ISFB and ISFP budget to be committed by the end of 2017;
 - **Monitoring and Evaluations** of actions and at Facility level; and
 - **Regular reporting**.
- **Under Scenario B1**
 - **Direct implementation** of actions by ICMPD;
 - Support to **LCPs**; and



- Development of a scoreboard methodology.
- **Under Scenario B2**
 - Invest in **knowledge management** to generate ideas;
 - **Methodology and Evaluation of MPs**; and
 - Strategic **communication** with stakeholders.

The draft AWP 2017 accompanies this document for SC review and approval.

The discussion was centred on:

- **The inclusion of the Prague Process in MPF**

DG HOME suggested that some adjustments could be made to the draft AWP in view of the possibility to include, if need be, some activities of the Prague Process in order to ensure continuity of the project. ICMPD and DG HOME will hold dedicated meetings on this matter.

- **Scoreboard methodology**

DG HOME welcomes the idea of a harmonised online tool where information can be extracted easily according to the GAMM pillars. It could be similar to the online tool developed for the Trust Fund. ICMPD and DG HOME will meet to further discuss the idea, also with regard to the concomitant existence of other approaches being developed by partner countries.

- **MP architecture**

DG HOME is working on an internal paper which aims to describe the “architecture” of Mobility Partnerships. Once ready, further meetings could be held to discuss how MPF could support this process, including partner LCPs.

- **MPF events**

The SC welcomed the idea of a conference in Belarus to launch the Mobility Partnership. The idea is favoured by Belarussian authorities.

As one of the objectives of MPF is to support the preparation of MPs, ICMPD suggested the possibility of organising a workshop in Lebanon with the aim to clarify various subjects and issues of concern and to raise awareness on the benefits of the MP. The MPF Team will further contract DG HOME (officer in charge of Lebanon) and liaise with Expertise France (who might be responsible of implementing a project in Lebanon once the MP is signed).

- **Evaluation of MPs**

ICMPD informed the SC that the evaluation exercise (impact and the way forward) will take more or less a year and results will be presented at the an MP Conference in 2018 (coinciding with the 10th anniversary to the first MPs).

[Proposals for amendments to the Rules of Procedures of the Grant Evaluation Committee \(ICMPD\)](#)

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

- Clarify the steps during rounds of consultation in case of request for clarification on a given application; and
- Insert specific steps in the evaluation process in case of a possible interest of other EU MS to participate in a proposed action.



Conclusions and summary of next steps

The SC took note of the progress in MPF implementation in the six months following the second SC meeting. It was agreed that the points below will be addressed:

- The **AWP 2017** will be shared with the SC for approval;
- MPF **reach-out** to stakeholders dealing with police cooperation will be boosted by ICMPD;
- ICMPD will further explore synergies with **GAMM experts and EMLOs**, in coordination with DG HOME;
- DG HOME and ICMPD will keep discussing the options available under the current delegation agreement and in view of a **second phase of MPF**, considering also including (some activities of) the Prague Process. Preparatory works in order to amend the current delegation agreement and launching the next one will be initiated in the coming weeks.
- A **stock-tacking SC meeting** may be convened by June 2017 in order to look at progress made and results achieved;
- The **Second MPF Regional Workshop** for southern MP countries will be organised in Brussels in May;
- ICMPD will explore the feasibility and modalities of setting up a “**scoreboards platform**”;
- MPF will **contribute to LCPs**, based on an MP ‘**architecture**’ document being prepared by DG HOME;
- A concept note on the **evaluation of MPs** will be produced and discussed with DG HOME;
- The idea of a **study on migrant smuggling** will be further assessed and discussed with DG HOME;
- The possibility to support **MPs in Belarus and Lebanon** (still under negotiation) will be discussed with DG HOME; and
- A revised **MPF Communication and Visibility Plan**, reflecting the approved AWP 2017, will be submitted to the SC for approval.

