



CONFÉRENCE DES RÉGIONS PÉRIPHÉRIQUES MARITIMES D'EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS OF EUROPE

6, rue Saint-Martin - 35700 RENNES (F)
Tél.: + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50 - Fax: + 33 (0)2 99 35 09 19
e.mail : secretariat@crpm.org - web : www.crpm.org

**MEETING OF THE
CPMR TASK FORCE ON MIGRATION MANAGEMENT
- BRUSSELS, 21 JANUARY 2016 -**

- MINUTES -

Participants:

Regional representatives

CATALONIA(*)	Amadeu ALTAFAJ, Permanent Representative, Government of Catalonia Delegation to the EU Xavier ALONSO, Cap de l'Àrea d'Estrangeria i Relacions Laborals Romina CALVET, Delegation to the EU
ABRUZZO(*)	Nadan PETROVIC, IPA-JTS Coordinator (by teleconference) Assunta JANNI, Office Manager (by teleconference) Paola DI SALVATORE (by teleconference)
ANDALUCIA(*)	Isabel SEGURA VELASCO, Jefa de Servicio de Coordinación y Relaciones Institucionales (by teleconference)
AZORES(*)	Melanie SILVA, Services Director, Directorate of Emigration, Immigration and Return Services (by teleconference)
BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG(*)	Ulrike CONRAD, Brussels Office
BALEARIC ISLANDS	Margarita PROHENS SALOM, Head of Immigration Dept. Rosa Maria CAÑAMERAS
BRITTANY	Claire LE TERTRE, EU Cooperation Programmes Officer
CALABRIA(*)	Francisco MOLICA, Deputy Director, Brussels Office
CRETE REGION(*)	Dimitris ANDROUTSOS, Brussels Office
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	Graziana GALATI, Policy Officer, Brussels Office
HELSINKI-UUSIMAA	Janne TAMMINEN, Helsinki EU Office
GOZO	Steve MIFSUD
MECKLENBURG-VORPOMMERN	Henning MACHEDANZ
MOLISE	Carlo MARINELLI
MURCIA	Antonio GARCÍA-NIETO, Consejería de Política Social, Mujer e Inmigración (by teleconference)
NORTH AEGEAN(*)	Nikos LAMPROPOULOS, Brussels Representative
ÖSTERGÖTLAND	Madeleine KOSKULL, EU Office
SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT	Alex DOIG
SHKÖDER	Greta BARDELLI, President of the Regional Council
SICILY	Bruno CORTESE, Brussels Officer Ilia MAZZONE, Sicily-COPPEM (by teleconference)

SKÅNE(*)	Annika ANNERBY JANSSON, Vice-President Maria LINDBOM, Senior Advisor International Relations
TIRANA	Aldrin DALIPI, President of the Regional Council
TUSCANY(*)	Maria-Dina TOZZI, Director of International Affairs
VALENCIA(*)	Gustavo MARTINIE, Director, Fundación Comunidad Valenciana - Región Europea
VÄSTRA-GÖTALAND	Emma BROBERG
VENETO	Camilla DEL LATTE Raffaella PAPES
WESTERN GREECE(*)	Dimitris KARAMPOULAS, Expert collaborator of Head of Region (by teleconference)
ZUID-HOLLAND	Iris FERRENI, Policy Officer

(*) *Regions interested in participating in the MIPEX-REG Project*

European Commission

DG HOME	Marta CYGAN, Director, Directorate A
----------------	--------------------------------------

Committee of the Regions

CIVEX Commission	Paulo ROCHA TRINDADE, Administrator
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisations

MIGRATION POLICY GROUP	Thomas HUDDLESTON, Director of the Migration and Integration Programme
-------------------------------	--

CPMR

Alexis CHATZIMPIROS, Responsible for the Task Force at CPMR General Secretariat Åsa BJERING, Executive Secretary, CPMR Baltic Sea Commission Davide STRANGIS, Executive Secretary, CPMR Inter-Mediterranean Commission Elodie NUNES, Policy Officer Emmanuel MANISCALCO, Policy Analyst Claire STREET, Policy Assistant (by teleconference)
--

Note: Sicily is the Leading Region of the Task force, Skåne is the political rapporteur at CPMR Political Bureau Level.

All useful information for the Task Force is available in the Dropbox "[CPMR-Migration](#)" ([LINK](#))

1 -Welcome & Objectives of the Meeting

Amadeu Altafaj Tardio, Permanent Representative, Government of Catalonia, Delegation to the European Union, welcomed participants to the meeting and stressed the [Government's commitment](#) to the Task Force and "the "[All Mediterranean](#)" campaign". He highlighted the importance for the regions of addressing migration issues within an EU strategy, especially in the current context where Catalonia and other regions were active especially in the reception and integration of refugees. He indicated that Catalonia was in support of creating a regional MIPEX which would be a useful tool in migration management.

2 – Focus on MIPEX-REG Project

Link to Documents: [Powerpoint Presentation](#) – [Background Document](#)

For more information on MIPEX, see www.mipex.eu-. Also the **Migration Policy Group - MPG** (www.migpolgroup.com) & CIDOB (www.cidob.org)

PRESENTATION

Thomas Huddleston, Director of the Migration and Integration Programme, Migration Policy Group, presented the main outlines of the project.

What is MIPEX?

MIPEX is a tool to assess, compare and improve integration policies allowing international analysis and identification of trends in 8 different areas:

- Labour market mobility
- Family reunion
- Long-term residence
- Access to nationality
- Political participation
- Education
- Anti-discrimination
- Health

MIPEX is the most comprehensive and reliable index of its kind, containing the most indicators and countries. It works with independent experts to ensure credibility. It uses clear indicators based on law to give a comparable picture of what exists and the strengths and weaknesses in different countries. On this basis, it helps to initiate discussion encouraging weaker countries to learn from best practices.

Many studies have shown that national integration policies are highly related to public opinion. The most inclusive countries (e.g. Nordic countries) see migrants as opportunities and not threats. The opposite is true of countries that do little to invest in integration. It is important to bring public opinion along. Integration policies can have positive effects for general societal development, and at international level, MIPEX can be used to demonstrate this, to learn from one another and to capitalise on best practices.

Why MIPEX-Regions?

There is no such tool offered to the regions at present. As a result of the current crisis, immigration is now the top priority for EU citizens, the European Union and national governments. Everyone is expected to do something including the Regions, who are being given more competences in this area. It is therefore becoming more important to know what Regions can and are doing on integration.

How will MIPEX-Regions work?

Phase I

Identify which regions are interested to be part of the full study then select a representative sample and find independent experts in the regions. It will be important to have several regions from the same country and several countries. MPG & CIDOB will carry out explorative research with the independent experts appointed by the regions. This will be a mapping exercise through a questionnaire looking at how national policies are implemented at regional level and where regions can be proactive in integration. Indicators can then be designed and expanded to a larger number of regions.

Phase II

If Phase I proves conclusive, proceed with the full study and final questionnaire. Once a baseline is provided, other policy areas can be added if necessary.

Methodology

Each participating region appoints two independent experts (not internal experts from the regional administrations). The first fills in the questionnaire and sends it to MPG which examines it for clarity and coherence. The second independent expert carries out a peer review coming back with comments. MPG resolves any differences then compiles the data in comparable database. MPG & CIDOB write regional profiles (similar to the MIPEX country profiles cf. www.mipex.eu). These profiles give all data on policy strengths and weaknesses within a general policy context and then detailed for each policy area. The data is short, comparable and easy to read.

There will be a section of the MIPEX website dedicated to regions and the profiles can be translated into the relevant languages.

Dissemination events are organised in the participating regions or in a country between regions, bringing together departments responsible for integration, service, providers, researchers, etc. who can discuss how the policy can develop. MPG & CIDOB participate in these events to provide international inspiration.

Timeline

- 2 months for explorative research
- 4 months to draw up final questionnaire
- 4 months to carry out field work
- 4 months to process results
- 2 months to hold multi-stakeholder dialogues in the Regions

Deliverables

- Regional profiles
- Website
- Dissemination events

Budget

The budget is broken down into two parts:

1. Expenses per region based on the estimated cost of research by 2 experts appointed by the region at €400 per day; and also including work carried out by CIDOB & MPG such as collecting results, analysis by region, regional event, etc.
2. Share of total fixed cost for work carried out by CIDOB & MPG covering the cost of identifying regional specific policies, design and edition of the questionnaire, comparative analysis, website, etc. This cost is shared equally between the number of participating regions.

Cost per region for the 1st phase in a simulation with 8 regions:

1. Cost of experts in the region: €6 140
 2. Share of total fixed costs (€11 350 divided by 8): €1 418
- TOTAL BUDGET PER REGION: €7 558**

Cost per region for the OVERALL project in a simulation with 8 regions:

1. Expenses per region: €27 020 (including regional experts, analysis)
 2. Share of total fixed costs (€45 910 divided by 8): €5 738
- TOTAL BUDGET PER REGION: €32 758**

Please look at the concept note of the project for more detailed information.

Funding possibilities (scouting ongoing)

- Regions' own resources
- EU funds covering actions for refugees and migrants at EU and Member State level (including European Social Fund at regional level and - in the medium-long term - the programmes for Territorial Cooperation; other programmes like "Europe for Citizens")
- EU Commission through discretionary funds (to be further investigated)

Mr Huddleston concluded by pointing out that the study should be big and comprehensive. We need to seize the political opportunity that is open at present. It is important to invest time to see what everyone is doing in order to be more efficient.

QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

Maria-Dina Tozzi asked if it would be better to first carry out a feasibility study to check if MIPEX could be implemented in the regions or not.

Thomas Huddleston (TH): Without immediate possibility for funding this was not possible and in any case he felt this would cause the project to lose momentum.

Annika Annerby Janssen (Region Skåne), indicated that her Region expressed preliminary interest. However Pieter Bevelander, Director of University of Malmö Institute of Migration who had been working with the national MIPEX, had expressed some scepticism since the national MIPEX deals with laws and policies which in Sweden are made on a national level, and does not take into account implementation. She asked for clarification about how MIPEX-Regions would differ and also about the decision-making process – who was doing what and paying what to whom?

TH: The questionnaire would not be the same as for the national MIPEX. Some questions would be directly related, but others would be more relevant to the regional level. These would be defined during the first phase and in line with the regional competences (e.g. employment, health, education, language learning, political participation and discrimination). A pilot questionnaire would be developed before expanding it further.

Regarding experts, they need to be functionally independent from the authority, have proven expertise and work in English. MPG & CIDOB has a network of researchers but regions can also propose their own candidates who can be selected by MPG & CIDOB.

Annika Annerby Janssen also highlighted that the national MIPEX was missing information regarding the period of the asylum seeking process which is one area where there are great difference and which could be crucial for future integration

TH: The national MIPEX does not cover entitlements for refugees as the subject is too complex. It is treated as a separate issue in a specific index for refugee integration evaluation in 17 countries. However, MIPEX-REG could possibly be opened up to include this issue.

Davide Strangis (CPMR-IMC) raised the issue of co-funding by each region. There were several possible funding strategies. One is to see if there is any line in the regional Operational Programmes for the ESF that could be used for this kind of research activity (Catalonia is looking into this possibility).

Maria-Dina Tozzi (Tuscany): indicated her Region's preliminary interest in the MIPEX-REG Project. She asked why it was necessary to go through independent researchers to gather information on the actions being led by Regions, when this could be provided quickly by the relevant people from within the Region. She highlighted the importance of establishing and capitalising on best practices.

Regarding funding, she mentioned that the general part of the research could perhaps be financed by the Committee of the Regions, since they were interested in having this kind of information.

TH: From a functional point of view, it could be envisaged that a regional coordinator in an authority could be the focal point for providing information to the appointed expert. It was necessary however that the evaluation was done by the expert. Regarding best practice, the aim of the project was to give basic information through regional profiles. These profiles are designed to help a Region understand how it compares nationally and internationally. However, there are no other international exchanges or peer reviews foreseen in the project.

Davide Strangis added that a benchmarking or learning platform could be a theme for a future cooperation project. Based on the demands of the European Commission, Territorial cooperation programmes also can adapt to migration issues. However it is a process that will take time and the opportunities will not come very soon.

TH: In 2012, MPG looked at best practices with the Committee of the Regions. This exercise can give ideas, but does not have a scientific basis. MIPEX can give an evidence base for arguments and gives credibility to implement certain policies. It will help to be more systematic and build future platforms. The review of practices helps to understand the areas that should be the focus of study. The aim is to have a real mapping of what Regions are doing. The national MIPEX contains 167 indicators. It is possible to be just as ambitious at regional level. The indicators need to measure the most crucial elements.

Another member of the TF asked if the study will look at how regions work with irregular migrants.

TH: This issue is addressed in MIPEX through access to health and education.

Claire Le Tertre (Brittany): In the French regions there are no funds from the ESF at regional level, but the Regions are asked by national government to take decisions and implement actions. In France there is also the case that migration is closely related to security issues.

TH: indicated that France was a specific case in which there were some incoherencies. Generally he evoked the difficulty of adapting existing funds. Since 2006 the MPG has been trying to explain why migration management is important, with little success. However, since last summer, there has been hyperactivity to make policies with an urgent focus on services. Decision-makers are writing strategies, looking at funding and raising the question of urgency. This is a window of opportunity.

Davide Strangis suggested organising a lobbying activity gathering several representatives from within the EC (DG HOME, DG REGIO, DG EMPL) to see if there was room for more direct funding for this kind of broad-based project.

TH: At the EU level, Juncker has told every DG in the Commission that they must do something clear on migration integration, but most do not know what to do! It is difficult to get things to happen at EU level. By identifying clear needs through dialogue with stakeholders, this may facilitate the process.

Isabel Segura Velasco (Andalucia) indicated her Region's interest in MIPEX, since the matter of integration is fundamental in Spain and the Regions are competent in the areas of education, health, employment, etc. They have already identified experts in the territory from universities and expert NGOs. Andalucia also has a Standing Observatory on Migration, which could provide useful support. The Region needs to further study the funding possibilities.

Anton García-Nieto (Murcia) also indicated that the study was interesting but co-funding was necessary to conduct it.

Nikos Lampropoulos (North Aegean): North Aegean was currently facing very specific problems, notably with huge numbers of people arriving from Turkey. He was not sure that the Region could contribute effectively to a project on more long-term issues.

TH: There is an emphasis at present on migrant newcomers, but these people will stay. Three-quarters of non EU citizens have already been in the EU for five years or more. Even if some Regions are not affected by newcomers, they are still concerned by long-term integration. The index will cover issues such as social cohesion, so will not be restricted simply to the reception of migrants.

Paulo Rocha Trindade (Committee of the Regions) stated that it is important for the COR to work with associations like CPMR which also have common members. The COR is currently developing a study on the integration of refugees in the labour market. One part of the study is looking at the framework and employment conditions for refugees in the Member States. There are many studies at EU level, but not much about the role of the regions. MIPEX-REG is a significant pioneer initiative and should be welcomed. He could not answer on the possibility of financing from the COR, but he did indicate interest to work together and cooperate on these policies.

Annika Annerby Janssen (Region Skåne) appreciated the fruitful discussion and from a research point of view, believed the project can be interesting. Regarding the groundwork for the project, she indicated that in Skåne there were at Malmö University already identified researchers that work with this Mipex and migration/integration. The issue was therefore mainly to convince these experts that the project is viable.

TH: The experts need first of all a questionnaire to be able to work from. Regarding the breakdown of costs, there is a fixed cost of €24 000 for MPG & CIDOB to design and test the questionnaire with the experts. To involve experts at regional level is estimated at €8000 per region, but of course this depends on each particular case.

Maria-Dina Tozzi (Tuscany Region) asked what exactly the deliverables of the project were. Also nothing had been mentioned about capitalisation.

TH: Deliverables are:

- regional profiles (profiling also best practices)
- comparative results with sections on health, education, labour market, language skills, etc.
- dissemination events in the participating Regions with the involvement of MPG and CIDOB, in which it could be possible to gather more information, conduct interviews, etc.
- production of a section on the MIPEX website.

A brochure and translation would require an extra budget, but a publication could be made from the website which can generate pdfs files.

Dimitris Karampoulas (Western Greece) asked if it was possible to provide guidelines for selecting experts, so that the relevant persons could be contacted to check availability.

TH: Experts should have experience in analysing programmes on social issues in a specific region. They can be from an academic background in political science/sociology or NGOs involved in policy analysis. Experts should be specialists in political science rather than sociology or anthropology. Previous participation in international studies would be an asset but is not absolutely necessary.

To conclude this session, **Davide Strangis** (CPMR-IMC) indicated that

- Regions should have one month at least to confirm their formal interest, check funding possibilities (e.g with ESF), identify how they could select proposed experts and come back to the CPMR Secretariat and the LPs of the project. This will give Regions time to outline any concerns or questions so that MPG & CIDOB can prepare some practical feedback and possible CPMR fund raising meetings. Deadline: 7 March 2015.
- Once a minimum of 6/8 Regions from different countries have committed to the project, the 1st phase could begin with a brainstorming meeting to be organised in Barcelona between CIDOB, MPG and the regional experts (possibly in April/May 2016)
- CPMR (in parallel and after the 7/3) could look at global fundraising at EU level. If relevant, it could set up a meeting with some officers from DG EMPL, HOME, REGIO, CoR and representatives of regions interested in MIPEX-REG to explore the possibility of European direct funding.

3 – Other Ideas and Proposals for Cooperation

Nikos Lampropoulos (North Aegean) re-explained the project that had initially been presented at the Task Force meeting of 14 October 2015. The idea is to develop a project to map the needs of the regions and collect best practices for mutual benefit. Migration flows are rapidly changing. After migrants enter the EU it is not known which routes they are taking and how many are going from one country to another, one region to another. It would therefore be useful to set up a system of exchanging information on the ground and not just relying on data from the national states and Commission. This system could consist of a centralised team and local antennae.

Mr Lampropoulos had expected to have some feedback from DG REGIO which had shown initial interest, but unfortunately no feedback had been received as yet. Other organisations are interested in doing similar mapping (e.g. a small mapping of routes had already been done by ESPON-CEMR). If there was still sufficient interest, it was necessary to finalise the proposal and look at how to implement and finance it. In this regard, it is possible to take advantage of the flexibility in the Operational Programmes to include migration actions, but only if there is a concrete proposal. It was not feasible to go through Interreg since it would take around two years to launch, which would be too long.

Alexis Chatzimpiros (CPMR) pointed out that the CPMR had already begun to collect good practices which had served to produce the policy position last November. In reception countries, Regions should look at how to change the Operational Programmes for using funds for infrastructures. In destination countries, Regions should look whether the cohesion fund needs to be used more for integration purposes. A mapping could be carried out on priorities and actions.

Maria-Dina Tozzi (Tuscany Region) stressed that we should decide not to put too many things in the project, but focus on priority areas.

Claire Le Tertre (Brittany Region) believed that we should prioritise how each region fits in with the issue. DG REGIO did indeed indicate that such a mapping project was needed, but not all Regions have the competence to do so. Through the new Urban Innovative Actions programme for example, Regions can work in collaboration with the cities on the issue and keep funding for their own actions.

Nikos Lampropoulos (North Aegean) stated that all regions are facing different urgencies, not only those on the front line. It is important to map the different needs that regions have. As a first stage, we need to see what is happening in order to compare figures. This will make it easier to evaluate for future projects.

Annika Annerby Janssen (Region Skåne) indicated that in its decision last November, the committee for regional development of Skåne had decided to check all ongoing programmes and projects to see if they could include a focus on migration integration.

Davide Strangis (CPMR-IMC) suggested that this mapping project could be a pilot action for the CPMR for mapping both, good practices and short&mid/long term needs in terms of migrant reception & integration measures. It could be carried out in a pilot phase with its own resources (staff) with the help of the regions and possibly using other EU funds in the near future. It could be done in the immediate term, for example through a questionnaire, in order to have a general overview to be showed in a sort of interactive map. Besides, we should be careful not to overlap other initiatives such as the report on migrant flows that have been done by different organizations and the report of the European Parliament (MEP Cécile Kyenge) which will have been released in its draft version (publication foreseen for April). Our work could contribute to reports like this adding the perspective of the regions.

Henning Machedanz (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) indicated that the mapping needs to be as comprehensive as possible, so what about involving non-CPMR Regions?

Annika Annerby Janssen raised the issue of multi-level governance. We need cooperation from local authorities, state regional officers, etc. How can other regions and stakeholders be involved if the project is led by the CPMR?

Nikos Lampropoulos indicated that every region should be responsible for gathering the data needed. Each region should be left to decide how it collects the information and its contacts with other stakeholders and the local authorities.

Alexis Chatzimpiros urged to take a decision on the next steps since time was of the essence. Options were to go forward as CPMR, allocate the resources needed and evaluate if we have the capacity, and/or go through a funded project.

Henning Machedanz (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) indicated that it would be difficult to get the approval of the region unless we could demonstrate the added value of the project.

Annika Annerby Janssen agreed, since there were many projects currently in the air. Because the project is also linked to the future of the CPMR Migration Task Force, she suggested that the project should be communicated to the Political Bureau and all the CPMR member regions in a more organised way through a formal proposal describing the added value.

Alexis Chatzimpiros and **Davide Strangis** agreed with this suggestion. The CPMR Secretariat will therefore update the Terms of Reference of the Task Force and prepare a concept note to share with the members in order to receive their opinion and decide how to further proceed.

4 - Funding Opportunities - Exchange with DG HOME

Link to [Draft Background Note on Funding Opportunities](#)

Alexis Chatzimpiros welcomed **Marta Cygan**, Director, Directorate A of DG HOME and invited her to comment on the project proposals made during the meeting and the funding note.

Mapping

Ms Cygan began by speaking of the current dynamics of migration flows. These are constantly changing, first being concentrated in the central Mediterranean and then moving to the eastern Mediterranean. We are now also seeing secondary movements through Europe.

2016 is a crucial year to ensure that hotspots are working. With the implementation of the relocation plan and people moving to other regions within member states, it is important to understand what is happening.

Mapping is therefore used as an instrument by the European Commission particularly after the Western Balkans Conference where on-site visits have been organised to understand better the situation and address immediate needs (hotspots), reception centres, relocation and integration.

An internal report (not publicly available) is in preparation within the Commission. Work in progress gathering data and statistics is done on a weekly basis with contacts in the member states and assessments in the EC missions. The aim is to make the information more reliable.

If the CPMR can provide a clear terms of reference from its side it would be useful to understand the situation at regional level in order to corroborate information given at national level. It is important for DG HOME to have feedback from the Regions to check that national authorities work in close cooperation with their Regional and Local Authorities in order to correct or adjust assessments and understand needs, both in terms of immediate urgent needs and longer-term needs on integration and returns.

Mapping is a wise thing to do, but it needs a good understanding of the type of needs and statistics required. She encouraged CPMR members to go on with the mapping process and give the European Commission information that can be used when dealing with the member states as a follow-up to their on-site visits.

With regard to actions in the Regions, Ms Cygan was interested to hear about the initiatives in Tuscany. **Maria-Dina Tozzi** replied that Tuscany is not a first place of entry but has a pilot project to accommodate big numbers of refugees. Money was being allocated from the national authorities for this action. Small groups of migrants (no more than 100) were being located in different municipalities. There was much evidence of best practice and it was necessary to show the EC what was being done and to capitalise on these good practices. **Maria-Dina** asked about the possibility for regions to be distinguished from other non-state actors in the same way as for development cooperation, where one part of the funds had been directed specifically to regional and local authorities.

Funding

In terms of financing, President Juncker has asked all EC departments to find synergies. Within the European Commission they are looking for ways to help with direct access to funds. Money was being made available on top of other funds for emergency actions (shelter, reception centres, sanitation). In the immediate term mapping of emergency needs was a priority, but more information was to come from Juncker concerning the more long term actions.

Under the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) a transnational cooperation worth EUR 5 million is open to public bodies. It regards the integration of migrants in the workplace. It was published on 18 December and the deadline for applications is 29 February 2016.

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/migration-asylum-borders/asylum-migration-integration-fund/calls/2015/inte/index_en.htm

DG REGIO has launched an Urbact programme for cities focusing on integration and access to the market for migrants <http://urbact.eu/migrants> .

At DG HOME, there will be a mid-term review soon of the AMIF. Signals on changes to the architecture are good and it is expected to increase the value of money for the years after the review. There should be more flexibility for the complementarity of funds.

For the long-term purposes of integration, the Member States are under obligation to use a certain percentage of funding. The national authorities are responsible for this but should work in cooperation with the regional authorities.

Ms Cygan was also trying to check to see if any funding could be provided through DG HOME for the MIPEX-REG project. She mentioned the Europe for Citizens programme, which was previously managed by DG EAC and is now under DG HOME. She would ask colleagues if there are elements in this programme to support MIPEX-REG.

Regarding ENP, migration has always been an integral part of this policy, but has now been reinforced. After the Valletta Summit with African partner countries there has been a boost to concrete projects, but at the level of partner states using the trust fund. These projects should help to improve the situation and contain the crisis. A way for the participation of the regions is through the projects included in the annexes of the EU Mobility Partnerships with the third countries.

Institutional Agenda

At the European Parliament LIBE Committee a draft report by Roberta Metsola and Cécile Kyenge was presented on Monday 18 January. It would be useful to try to meet these MEPs.

(more information at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/libe/subject-files.html?id=20151019CDT00421>)

There is currently a case for more border control to contain the migration flows and stabilise the situation in order to focus more on integration for those who are already in Europe.

There will be a review of the Dublin system by March this year in order to learn lessons. It will be a very crucial period since the Schengen agreement will be at stake.

There needs to be work to deliver on short-term and operational solutions and long-term action. We cannot wait for things to be solved. We need to have a good understanding of where needs are and make instruments more flexible to adapt to the situation.

With regard to the joint letter sent to President Juncker by CPMR with CEMR and Eurocities, Ms Cygan indicated that there would be a reply coming soon from President Juncker (see <http://news.crpm.org/cpmr-news/migration-cpmr-cemr-and-eurocities-address-a-letter-to-jean-claude-juncker/>)

Paolo Rocha Trindade (Committee of the Regions) recalled the [European Migration Forum](#) (6-7 April in Brussels) in which the CoR is organising a seminar building on the study it is currently conducting on the integration of refugees in the labour markets. Regional and local authorities are invited to send their applications to take part in the Forum (deadline 1 February). The event is targeted at experts rather than politicians and there is room for 20 participants. The application is published on the CoR website: <http://cor.europa.eu/en/events/Pages/2nd-meeting-of-the-European-Migration-Forum.aspx>

The [ARLEM](#) (where the CPMR has a seat) will also be present in the Forum.

Summing up

Ms Cygan indicated that she would take away the comments she had received and proposed to keep in contact. She will find a way to pass on information to colleagues working on the Migration Forum, which was an important event at a time when new proposals on legal migration and integration were already at stake.

She will check the MIPEX issue and be in constant touch for information on concrete elements which she will promote in DG HOME and in other DGs including information on potential mapping to assess the needs of the Member States.

5 - Task Force Work Plan 2016

The CPMR Secretariat will update the Terms of Reference of the Task Force and in particular:

- The elements concerning the migration context and the most recent outputs of the TF in its first year of activity (e.g. "We are all Mediterranean" campaign, seminars in Palermo and Brussels, Exchange of experiences & Policy Position, meetings...)
- The situation & perspectives concerning MIPEX-REG
- The proposal regarding the mapping exercise about the needs and the good practices of the regions concerning migrant reception and integration
- New project proposals to be developed and submitted (AMIF, ETC...)
- Possible new lobbying actions (to be defined)