



**CPMR
CRPM**

Conclusions

CPMR MIGRATION TASK FORCE MEETING

18 October 2017 (17.00-18.00) – Helsinki

PARTICIPANTS

REGIONS

ANDALUCIA:	Lucas J. RUIZ DÍAZ, Policy Officer
ATTICA:	Dimitra POULANTZA, Representative
CATALONIA:	Orland CARDONA, Head of Institutional Relations and Participation Unit, Secretary for Equality, Migrations, and Citizenship Xavier ALONSO, Policy Adviser, Delegation to the EU
CRETE:	Michail DELIGIANNAKIS, Representative in Brussels
BASQUE COUNTRY:	Marta MARIN, Delegate of the Basque Country to the EU Amaia BELOKI, EU Policy Adviser, Delegation of the Basque Country to the EU
MECKLENBURG- VORPOMMERN:	Henning MACHEDANZ, Advisor Steffen BARTZIK, Trainee
MOLISE:	Carlo MARINELLI, Head of Brussels Office
ROGALAND/NSC:	Geir SØR-REIME, International co-ordinator/Advisor of North Sea Commission's Smart Regions Group
SKÅNE:	Annika ANNERBY JANSSON, Vice-President and Rapporteur on migration issues to the CPMR Political Bureau Maria LINDBOM, Senior Advisor International Relations
VALENCIA:	Miguel ROMERO
VÄSTRA-GÖTALAND:	Birgitta ADOLFSSON, Councillor Katrín URBÄCK, Policy Adviser
VENETO:	Sara SABBADIN, Assistant

INSTITUTIONS

Diana GARCIA ALCUBILLA, Policy Officer Migration, Committee of the Regions

CONSULTANTS TO CPMR

Anna TERRÓN CUSÍ, President, INSTRATEGIES, Consultant to the CPMR on migration issues
Gemma PINYOL, INSTRATEGIES

CPMR

Davide STRANGIS, Executive Secretary of the CPMR Intermediterranean Commission and in charge of the Task Force

Nicolas BROOKES, CPMR Director in charge of Regional Policy

Giuseppe SCIACCA, Executive Secretary of the CPMR Islands Commission

Stavros KALOGNOMOS, Policy Officer

Claire STREET, Policy Assistant

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>Reminder of Migration Task Force priorities 2017-18 validated by the CPMR Political Bureau:</p> <p>1. Mapping exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey to gather Regions' views and experiences in the reception and integration of migrants and refugees: innovation, lessons learned, needs, potential. [LINK TO QUESTIONNAIRE AND REPLIES] • Issue paper with scenarios and initial recommendations • Mapping with google mymaps • Matrix of key players in migration issues at EU, Euro-Med and international level. [LINK TO MATRIX] <p>2. Recommendations on recast CEAS and funding instruments for migration</p> <p>The first reflections are already included in the issue paper</p> <p>3. Support for projects.</p>	
<p>2. CPMR Questionnaire and Mapping</p> <p>A questionnaire had been circulated among CPMR members and responses were received from 22 regions from 10 countries. As well as providing input for the draft issue paper (see point 3 below), the results will be used also to produce a visual mapping. The mapping can provide qualitative information on experiences relevant for multi-level governance of migration and asylum issues. The mapping could be interactive where Regions could potentially have access to update their data. The mapping is being developed by the Secretariat. A beta version will be available for June, checked by members and then published for the General Assembly.</p>	<p>CPMR Secretariat to produce mapping based on qualitative information (highlighting governance systems, experiences).</p> <p>First version in June. Regions to update their data. Presentation of final version at CPMR AGM in Madeira (Oct 2018)</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>3. Overview of CPMR Issue Paper</p> <p>PART 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State of play of the situation today. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic context of the EU migration and asylum process and legislation. • Overview on funding of migration and asylum policies feeding into MFF proposals. • Idea of permanent tension between Member States and EU institutions. How is this affecting other areas of the EU construction, especially free movement of people. • How current difficulties and tensions give little space to regions and cities. <p>PART 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shows how regional and local authorities are key actors in many areas related to migration and asylum, and what are the lessons learned <p>PARTS 3 & 4 (based on CPMR member Regions' replies to questionnaire, but non-exhaustive)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional competences on reception & integration of asylum seekers and migrants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reception of asylum seekers often falls within the regional competences (if not full then shared). There should be a formal reception capacity for asylum seekers since it is an obligation to provide reception services. • For migrants it is less clear (no binding regulations), but they should nevertheless be accommodated in society - Diversity management, social inclusion and integration as cross-cutting issues where Regions have an important role for both asylum seekers and migrants (Focus in Chapter 4). - Underlines some relevant actions of the Regions and demonstrates how things would be more difficult without concrete actions in the territories. (Note: the issue paper is non-exhaustive. More detailed regional information will be included in the mapping) - Highlights the need to tackle issues with a multi-level governance approach. 	<p>Member Regions:</p> <p>Send comments to issue paper until 15 February</p> <p>Check if relevant practices are included</p> <p>CPMR Secretariat/Instrategies:</p> <p>Integrate feedback from members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check the mentions on unaccompanied minors - Check if any reference to regional level in EC Migration Agenda (Note: checked, only "local") - Ensure consistency with CPMR paper on future MFF <p>Possibly identify concrete points in the Executive Summary to highlight political messages.</p> <p>Submit issue paper and Executive Summary (translated) to CPMR Political Bureau for approval on 8 March 2018</p> <p>For outreaching to EU institutions and Member States, maybe evaluate</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>- Cites some innovative and unique proposals designed to help share knowledge and awareness among all Regions</p> <p>PART 5 Conclusions & recommendations</p> <p>This is a key part of issue paper. The main points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aim to have common wording and start building a common strategy. - Including migration as an issue for regional development and inter-regional relations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognition of migration and asylum policies as multi-level and cross-cutting policies • difficulties facing Regions owing to lack of solidarity within the EU (relocation system not working) • dealing with <i>de facto</i> residents who fall out of state responsibility, i.e. those whose claim is not accepted but who are not returned • impact of “hard legislation” on the territories - EU financial instruments: distinguishing which funds to tackle which issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMIF / other home affairs funds managed by DG HOME to cover first reception and mainly short-term needs (if not medium-term, but surely not long-term). • Cohesion Funds for cross-cutting issues and additional objectives related to migration: interculturality, diversity management, long-term integration, education. Criteria for funding reception infrastructures should be with a more long-term view to increasing capacities of territories lacking such facilities. • Special governance system for money to fund work with countries of origin (La Valletta funds). Not yet clear if the MFF will tackle this or if it will be a purely intergovernmental structure. 	<p>whether to produce a short version only underlining the main political messages/recommendations</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES

DECISION/FOLLOW-UP

1. Discussion

The main conclusions of the discussion are summarised below:

ON COMPETENCES

- Example of “**Partnership Skåne**”: A platform with accumulated experience and research on the impacts of forced migration on health and wellbeing and cited by the World Health Organisation as an inspiring example.

[\[LINK TO PRESENTATION\]](#)

- In the context of the regional reform in Norway, an expert panel is looking at new tasks for regions. One suggestion is to close the current national agency for integration and intercultural issues and transfer its competences to the regions.
- Many contributions to the questionnaire underlined the issue of unaccompanied minors that Regions are required to deal with. This situation is already mentioned in the issue paper (chapter 3 and 4). Notably there are 2 different streams: one linked to refugees and one to minors arriving to work. To be evaluated if it is necessary to include further comments in the chapter 5 of the issue paper. In any case this will be an important issue to be addressed in the future.

ON FUNDING

Keywords: Governance, simplification, direct funding.

- **Current funding instruments: AMIF & Cohesion Funds**

AMIF should not be holistic, but specially targeted to the welcoming and reception of refugees.

There is a big margin of flexibility in Member States as to how they allocate AMIF funds and whether they share them or not with their regional and local authorities (e.g. problem in Spain where these funds mainly stay in Madrid).

Recommendations on funding instruments

- Simplification
- Better access to direct funds for the Regions
- Clear guidelines on which funds for which actions (AMIF vs. Cohesion Funds)
- Multilevel governance of EU funds

Issue of unaccompanied minors needs to be addressed in the future

SUMMARY OF DEBATES

DECISION/FOLLOW-UP

Is a legal argument on AMIF useful? In the AMIF Regulation approved in 2014, it is or not a binding requirement for Member States to share decisions on fund distribution with the regions (to be checked-unlikely)?

Cohesion Funds are NOT adapted to emergency actions. However, in the Regions' experiences (e.g. Crete) ESF and ERDF have been used to finance emergency actions, since these were the only immediate sources of funding available. However, it is difficult to justify to citizens the use of structural funds for this purpose.

Migration should be included as a cross-cutting issue in regional development strategies and international relations. Given the current political climate, it is not advisable to cite figures spent on "migrants" as a specific target group.

- **Omnibus Regulation (revisions to the EU's multiannual budget 2014-2020)**

Under the chapter on flexibility, there is the possibility to use ESI funds to create an investment priority, to bundle support from, ESF, ERDF and to some extent EARDF for reception and integration of migrants and refugees. This is not obligatory but encouraged. This follows the promise Commissioner Cretu made in 2015 to explore how structural funds could be used to address migration issues.

- **Governance with NGOs**

Regional authorities often work with NGOs in their territory. We are facing new approaches, where sometimes social agents are playing even an even more leading role than the regional and local authorities. The governance of funds needs to be taken into account in this respect.

- **Post-2020 funds**

We should stress the need for clear prospects and funding rules. Both AMIF & Cohesion Funds need more money globally to tackle effectively asylum and migration issues. Cohesion Policy could not achieve the same objectives as it is in the current programming period plus the migration challenges, at the same time, with the same amount of funding.

The European Commission needs to be more reactive and should find a balance between emergency responses and more long-term actions.

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>In the future period, there needs to be an emergency fund at least at national level with an adapted architecture.</p> <p>One of the outputs of the Task Force could be to address these concerns not only to EU institutions but also to Member States' Ministers of Interior Affairs, who only see a part of the whole picture related essentially to borders, security and control.</p> <p>There is a clear recommendation in the post 2020 period for states to include a binding requirement to involve regions in the implementation of national plans (currently the states are using 88% of AMIF and a small part of the AMIF is currently kept by EC for pilot actions where Regions are directly eligible).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thematic Objectives post 2020 <p>At this stage of the discussion on the post-2020 Cohesion Policy, it is likely that there will be fewer thematic objectives and they will be less binding. There might be a thematic objective on social inclusion which would be supported by 'human capital funds' instead of the ESF.</p> <p>Experience has shown in the current programming period that thematic objectives that are a priority at one stage may be replaced with other priorities depending on changing circumstances (e.g. Sweden focused on energy and development but did not foresee the migration crisis which has had a major impact in this country).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Territorial Cooperation Objective post 2020 <p>The territorial cooperation objective could also address migration issues. Will 3 strands be maintained post 2020, what will be their missions, what actions can be funded (e.g. integration, benchmarking of reception and integration policies...), what will be added value regarding migration? We need to follow this discussion.</p>	
<p>2. Committee of the Regions' activities on Migration</p> <p>Presented by Diana García Alcubilla, Policy Officer Migration</p>	<p>COR to send information by email</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>The CoR has been working on migration questions even before the crisis in 2015 and has issued many opinions on all aspects of migration and how it affects regional and local authorities. Although DG HOME insists that the role of RLAs is sufficiently acknowledged, the CoR considers that this is not reflected in funding and rules.</p> <p>The CoR is currently focusing on 2 main messages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Urgency of approving the CEAS. We need to showcase more clearly how it affects the cities and regions and highlight their role in relocation and reception. 2. Funding for the regional and local level should be increased and simplified. The toolkit from DG REGIO is very complex and difficult to understand, while it is supposed to be simplified. RLAs request direct funding if possible and simplified access. There is an urgent need to analyse figures on how much funding has already been implemented and from which sources (EU, Member States, etc.) <p>The theme of unaccompanied minors is also an area of priority for the Committee of the Regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upcoming calendar <p><u>2 March 2018</u>: Presentation of an opinion on the delivery of the EU Agenda on Migration (mid-term review) during the Plenary Session</p> <p><u>2 March 2018</u>: Debate on integration with a focus on market integration in the presence of the business community. Both Commissioners Avramopoulos and Stylianides have been invited.</p> <p><u>4 July 2018</u>: Back-to-back with the plenary session, there will be an open event to discuss the Future of Europe based on the EC White Paper. There will be 3 thematic workshops with one on migration (others are climate change and cohesion policy)</p>	<p>CPMR Secretariat to circulate information to members (once the CoR secretariat provides it)</p>
<p>3. MIPEX-R Project</p> <p>Orland Cardona first apologised for the delay in the project due to political circumstances in Catalonia. Now the responsible politicians willing to restart the project, which should kick off in March-April.</p>	<p>Catalonia to inform on kick-off date for MIPEX-R (March-April 2018).</p> <p>Contact person:</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>9 regions are committed to the project, and he invited others to join</p> <p>The project will comprise 5 phases and the timeline will be May 2018 to June 2019.</p> <p>[Link to MIPEX-R presentation]</p>	<p>Orland Cardona (Catalonia) orland.cardona@gencat.cat Tel. +34 93 2701687</p>
<p>4. AMIF Calls</p> <p>The latest AMIF calls include 5 priorities. There are some interesting strands for regions. The deadline for submissions is 1 March.</p> <p>A number of partner searches have been launched by CPMR members, and the CPMR itself is positioning itself within a consortium with the NGO Emergency in Italy.</p> <p>PROJECTS/PARTNER SEARCHES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuscany Region: Project In Vino Veritas – Highlighting the contribution of migrants in EU agro-food local excellences (AMIF-2017-AG-INTE-01 Raising Awareness on migrant's contribution to EU Societies).- LINK TO PROJECT DESCRIPTION • Murcia: "ARCO IRIS" (Rainbow), a project of intercultural community development in areas of high diversity intercultural community development (AMIF-2017-AG-INTE-02 Community building at local level for integration including through volunteering activities) – LINK TO PROJECT DESCRIPTION • Catalonia: Project on Improving school performance for students with a migrant background through leisure and training activities at the school premises (AMIF-2017-AG-INTE-02: Community Building at local level for integration including through volunteering activities) LINK TO PROJECT DESCRIPTION • CPMR: Project Common Place– Migration as a driving force behind heritage and interculture in the European Union. The project will produce a toolkit for school children 11-13 years on changing the narrative and breaking stereotypes, awareness raising videos on contribution of migrants, interactive replicable exhibition. (AMIF-2017-AG-INTE-01 Raising Awareness on migrant's contribution to EU Societies). CPMR's would have a light role, mainly in dissemination in the later phase of the project, 	<p>CPMR Regions to inform CPMR of projects and partner searches they would like to disseminate</p> <p>Regions to indicate if they are interested in joining projects</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES	DECISION/FOLLOW-UP
<p>making instruments available to its member regions and stakeholders, enhancing their role in this area and contributing to a change in the migration narrative which has been raised as priority by the TF. 90% EC funded. LINK TO PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	
<p>5. Upcoming Calendar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPMR & Attiki Region high-level conference, half day, 24th of April 2018 (Brussels). Date and exact venue tbc. Probably the 24th in the afternoon at the Committee of the Regions as unfortunately there is finally no availability at the European Parliament, despite the willingness of MEP Mercedes Bresso to host the meeting. <p><u>Objective:</u> Raise attention of institutions on the need for multi-level governance and added the added value of RLAs for more effective results.</p> <p><u>Proposed Format:</u> Institutional opening session Key speech on issue paper Specific sessions on reception and integration of refugees and migrants showing MLG (speakers from all levels). Session on external dimension of migration. Final keynote speech.</p> <p><u>Proposed Speakers:</u> 1-2 Commissioners (e.g. Stylianides/Avramopoulos) Several MEPs: Mercedes Bresso, Cecilia Wikström (EP report on Common Asylum System) 1-2 from Member States: Brussels Permanent Representatives, Representatives from competent ministries that have shown to be collaborative DG NEAR & DG DEVCO ARLEM (on cooperation with 3rd countries linked to migration) UCLG (for cities working on South-South cooperation on integration policies) UN (on Global Compacts)</p>	<p>The CPMR Secretariat will inform the members on the conference in the following weeks</p>

SUMMARY OF DEBATES**DECISION/FOLLOW-UP**

Politicians from the CPMR Regions

- [European Migration Forum](#) organised by the EESC, 6-7 March 2018 (by invitation only – registration/slots for regions now closed)
- [Lost in Migration](#), Conference on unaccompanied minors organised by “Missing Children Europe” 11-12 April, Brussels