



PARTICIP GmbH
Germany



Aide à la Décision Economique
Belgium



Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik

German Development
Institute

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik
Germany



Development
Researchers'
Network

Development Researchers' Network
Italy



European Centre for Development
Policy Management
Belgium



Overseas Development Institute
United Kingdom

A consortium of
Particip -ADE-DIE-DRN-ECDPM-ODI
c/o Particip GmbH, leading company:

Headquarters

Merzhauser Str. 183
D - 79100 Freiburg / Germany
Phone: +49-761-79074-0
Fax: +49-761-79074-90
INFO@PARTICIP.DE

BELGIUM OFFICE

Avenue des Arts 50 (5th floor)
B-1000 Bruxelles / Belgium
Phone: +32-2-5501160
Fax: +32-2-5501169
INFO@PARTICIP.DE

Framework contract for
**Multi-country thematic and regional/country-
level strategy evaluation studies and synthesis
in the area of external co-operation**
Ref.: EuropeAid/122888/C/SER/Multi

**LOT 5:
Evaluation of EC main policies and strategies in
the areas of external cooperation**

**EVA 2007 – Lot 5
Request nr: Version 1**

**Evaluation of Visibility of
EU external action**

**Final Report
Volume 7 – Thematic Report
on Migration
Part 1 - Mali**

**Authors: Federica Petrucci (thematic
expert – mission lead) with Alexis
Kalambry (local consultant)**

June 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	NORMATIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	1
3	EU INSTITUTIONAL SETTING	4
3.1	European Migration DG Home affairs Instruments.....	4
3.2	FRONTEX	5
3.3	Policy Dialogue.....	5
4	COMPETENCES OF THE EC EXTERNAL RELATIONS DIRECTORATE GENERALS	6
4.1	Geographic Instruments	6
4.2	Thematic Programme for Migration & Asylum	7
5	EC MECHANISMS OF COORDINATION.....	8
6	EU VISIBILITY ON THE MIGRATION THEME.....	9
6.1	Overall Commission Level.....	9
6.2	EC External Relations level.....	11
7	RATIONALE FOR THE CHOICE OF CASE STUDY AND COUNTRY	12
7.1	Case selection.....	13
7.2	Country selection.....	13
7.3	Hypotheses to be tested during the field mission	14
8	METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	15
8.1	Data collection during the field mission.....	15
8.2	Interviews with multiple stakeholders.....	16
8.3	Media coverage analysis.....	16
8.4	Focus Groups	17
8.5	Sites visit	17
9	FINDINGS FROM FIELD MISSION	17
9.1	Context for EU visibility.....	17
9.2	Evidence from Media Coverage.....	18
9.3	Responses to EQs.....	19
9.4	Conclusions.....	22
9.5	Recommendations.....	22

ANNEXES

- ANNEX 1: STANDARD FORMAT FOR EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO EQS (MALI)**
- ANNEX 2: THE WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMISSION 2010-2014 – A COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT ISSUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 17 (6) TEU**
- ANNEX 3: A COMPREHENSIVE COMMON MIGRATION POLICY (2008)**
- ANNEX 4: FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND SECURITY POLICY AREAS, FOR THE PERIOD 2007-2013**
- ANNEX 5: NEW PROGRAMME TO COOPERATE WITH THIRD COUNTRIES IN THE AREAS OF MIGRATION AND ASYLUM WITH A BUDGET OF €380 MILLION FOR 2007-2013**
- ANNEX 6: COMMUNIQUE DE PRESSE: REUNION DE HAUT NIVEAU UNION EUROPEENNE – MALI SUR LES MIGRATIONS ET LE DEVELOPPEMENT**
- ANNEX 7: CONSULTATIONS SUR LES MIGRATIONS (ART. 13) - UNION EUROPEENNE – MALI (26 -27 SEPTEMBRE 2006)**
- ANNEX 8: LIST OF PERSONS, INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED**
- ANNEX 9: BIBLIOGRAPHY**

ACRONYMS

AAPs	Annual Action Plans
ACP	Africa Caribbean and Pacific countries
AENEAS	Financial assistance to third states for Migration and Asylum
AIDCO	EuropeAid Co-operation Office
ALA	Community financial instrument for support to Asia and Latin America
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asia Nations
ASEM	Asia-Europe Meeting
CCI	Cross-Cutting Issue
CFA	Comprehensive Framework of Action
CIGEM	Centre d'Informations et de Gestion des Migrations - Information and Management Center on Migration
CODEV	Committee on Development
COM	Commission Communication
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DCI	Development Cooperation Instrument
DEL	EU Delegations
DG	Directorate General
DG COMM	Directorate General for Communication
DG DEV	Directorate General for Development
DG JHA	Directorate General for Justice And Home Affairs
DG JLS	Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security
DG RELEX	External Relations
EEAS	European External Action Service
EAC	East African Community
EC	European Community - European Commission (when referring to Lisbon)
ECOWAS	Economic Community Of West African States
EDF	European Development Fund
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ENPI	European Neighborhood Partnership Instrument
EP	European Parliament
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EPCIP	European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection

ERF	European Refugee Fund
EQs	Evaluation Questions
ERF	European Refugee Fund
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
EUD	Delegation of the EU
EULEX	EU Rule of Law Mission
FRONTEX	External Borders Agency
GAERC	General Affairs and External Relations Council
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human Rights
HRFASP	High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
HRVP	High Representative/Vice President
HLTF	UN High Level Task Force
I&C	Information and Communication
IBC	International Business Consulting
IL	Intervention Logic
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JEU	Joint Evaluation Unit
LA	Local Authority
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
LDC	Least Development Country
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M EUR	Million Euros
MME	EU-Africa Partnership on Migration and Employment
MMEIA	Ministère Malien de l'Extérieur et de l'Intégration Africaine
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIP	National Indicative Programme
NSA	Non-State Actor
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OFII	Office Français de l'immigration e de l'intégration
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe

PCA	Partnership and Cooperation Agreements
PCD	Policy coherence for development
PD	Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
PSC	Political and Security Committee
PT	Project Team
RABITs	Rapid Border Intervention Teams
RG	Reference Group
RIC	Relex Information Committee
ROM	Results-Oriented Monitoring system
RSP	Regional Strategy Paper
SEC	Commission Staff Working Document
TACIS	Technical Assistance for the Commonwealth of Independent States
3 Cs	Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence
TEC	Treaty of the European Community
TEU	Treaty of the European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TOKTEN	Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals programme / Programme Transfert de connaissance par les expatriés nationaux
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

1 INTRODUCTION

This Thematic Report on migration is part of the global Evaluation of the Visibility of EU External Action and is structured as follows: Chapter 2 analyses the normative and policy framework that defines how migration is integrated in the EU's relations with third countries. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 present the EC institutional architecture by outlining the key services having the responsibility to manage migration issues and the existing coordination mechanisms; also the main instruments to support projects and activities in this domain have been considered.

Chapter 6 opens the discussion on the visibility of the EC external action in migration. The subsequent chapter presents the criteria through which the case and the country for the field mission were identified as well as the hypotheses that were tested during the field mission and the related evaluation questions (EQs). Chapter 8 describes the methodological approach that was followed to reply to these EQs, while chapter 9 presents the main findings of the field mission distinguishing between evidence obtained through interviews across different actors (i.e. representatives of the EU Delegation in Mali, government officials, non-state actors and journalists in the country) and evidence from the media coverage analysis. This chapter concludes by presenting the key messages coming from the field mission and by providing recommendations.

2 NORMATIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

The EU is seeking to integrate migration issues into the Union's overall relations with third countries. From the approval of the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) and the conclusion of Tampere Council (1999) the external dimension of migration has been included in the European Union external action.

The Tampere European Council (1999) laid the foundation for a common EU immigration policy which included an important external dimension. The conclusions clearly state that “The European Union approach to migration needs addressing political, human rights and development issues in countries and regions of origin and transit.” The European Council stresses also the need for more efficient management of migration flows at all their stages and of the importance of involving and cooperating with third countries (i.e. transit and destination countries) in border management policies. Border management was from the beginning a focus of this EU common policy. The conclusions underline for example the need to develop “, information campaigns on the actual possibilities for legal immigration, and for the prevention of all forms of trafficking in human beings”. They further call for “assistance to countries of origin and transit to be developed in order to promote voluntary return as well as to help the authorities of those countries to strengthen their ability to combat effectively trafficking in human beings and to cope with their readmission obligations towards the Union and the Member States”. They invite the Council “to conclude readmission agreements or to include standard clauses in other agreements between the European Community and relevant third countries or groups of countries”.

The approach agreed in Tampere in 1999 was confirmed in 2004 with the adoption of The Hague programme¹, which sets the objectives for strengthening freedom, security and justice in the EU for the period 2005-2010.

This ‘external dimension’ of migration has since been growing. There has been rapid evolution in the EC’s external engagement with migration issues, characterized in general by a re-orientation from considering migration as primarily a security problem to considering it more as an area of opportunity for constructive cooperation with Third Countries in pursuit of mutually recognized policy goals.

The main features of the EC’s approach are:

¹ Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament of 10 May 2005 – The Hague Programme: ten priorities for the next five years. The Partnership for European renewal in the field of Freedom, Security and Justice [COM(2005) 184 final – Official Journal C 236 of 24.9.2005].

- i) A call for political dialogue based on the principle of shared responsibility between countries of origin, transit, and destination.
- ii) A Global Approach to Migration consisting of three components:
 - management of legal migration,
 - prevention and reduction of illegal migration, and
 - promotion of links between migration and development in the interests of the country of origin;

Since its adoption in 2005, the Global Approach has been at the centre of the EC's engagement and the subject of four specific Commission Communications:

- Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration: First follow-up to Hampton Court – COM (2005) 621;
- The Global Approach to Migration one year on: Towards a comprehensive European migration policy – COM (2006) 735;
- Applying the Global Approach to Migration to the East and South-Eastern regions neighboring the European Union – COM (2007) 247, and
- Strengthening the Global Approach to Migration: Increasing coordination, coherence, and synergies – COM (2008) 611 final.

In addition, A Common Immigration Policy for Europe: principles, actions, and tools – COM (2008) 359 - highlighted the need to strengthen the Global Approach.

- iii) Promoting a common asylum policy.
- iv) Protection of migrants.
- v) Mainstreaming migration into the EC's development cooperation strategies and other external policies.

In the following paragraphs, we look at policy in each of the three pillars of the Global Approach – legal migration, illegal (or, the preferred term, irregular) migration, and migration and development.

Legal migration including labour migration

The need for a comprehensive approach and partnership with Third Countries was laid down by the European Council of Tampere (October 1999). Emerging from the spirit of Tampere were Directives on the status of long-term residents (2003/09/EC), on family reunification (2003/86/EC), and a communication on integration issues (COM (2003) 336 final). Following substantial deliberation and consultation, a landmark Policy Plan on Legal Migration (COM 2005 669) was approved at the end of 2005. The policy promotes, in particular, circular migration and mobility partnerships as instruments aiming to address the labour shortages in the EU and to encourage returning migrants to participate in their countries' development while addressing the danger of the "brain drain" phenomenon through partnerships with countries of origin. Furthermore, the EU will support efforts to strengthen Third Countries capacities to manage legal migration including by facilitating the work of the national services or of autonomous centers in charge of counseling potential migrants and/or their nationals abroad (COM (2008) 611 final).

Illegal or irregular migration

In the area of irregular migration, the goal of Community policy has been to establish an effective, common policy regime in line with international obligations and recognizing the vulnerable position of many illegal migrants. The November 2001 Communication on Common Policy on Illegal Migration (COM (2001) 672 final) recognized the need for a broad approach, from preventive actions to severe sanctions. This was followed by a Communication on Community Return Policy of Illegal Residents (COM (2002) 564 final). The Communication on a Common Policy on Illegal Migration,

Smuggling, and Trafficking of Human Beings, External Border, and Illegal Residents (COM (2003) 323 final) consolidated EC policy in the area. In 2005, the EC adopted a Communication and Action Plan on trafficking. The COM (2008) 611 indicates various fields of assistance offered to Third Countries: strengthening border management, capacity building for border guards and officials, information campaigns, improving the reception conditions and the use of new technologies to secure travel documents.

Migration and development

On the basis of the Amsterdam Treaty and following the policy orientations established by the European Councils of Tampere and Seville, the integration of migration and development issues in EU relations with Third Countries was reaffirmed in the COM (2002) 703 with the aim to reduce the “push factors” behind migration by supporting sustainable growth and development and reducing poverty. EU policies and actions aim to foster the contribution of migrants to the development of countries of origin, including through remittances; to improve the management of economic migration – including South-South migration – in the mutual interest of countries of origin and destination; to limit brain drain and to foster circular, temporary, seasonal and virtual migration (COM (2005) 390). COM (2008) 611 recommends in particular that Third Countries should ensure that migration policies are incorporated in a structural manner into policies on health, education and human capital, and into social development strategies

In strengthening the Hague Programme the European Council acknowledges the need for the EU to contribute in a spirit of shared responsibility to a more accessible, equitable and effective international migrant protection system in partnership with Third Countries and to provide access to protection and durable solutions at the earliest possible stage. The EC strategy includes the promotion of international protection and reinforcing the capacities of Third Countries in refugee and migrant protection legislation and policies. Further to the adoption of the Hague Programme and of its Action Plan (Council 9778/2/05 dated 10.06.2005), the EC communication COM (2005) 514 final further consolidated the EC approach and made proposals for fighting trafficking in human beings. The protection of human rights remains a fundamental concern with an emphasis on the protection of women and children. Law enforcement and fight against organised crime, protection and assistance to victims as well as reintegration issues, inter-state cooperation are main identified areas of action.

Important keystones of the EU migration policy are the agreements signed with third countries. Since they are international agreements they are the responsibility of the Council. Commission has the power to negotiate and to monitor within a specific mandate. The main treaties are the Readmission agreement and the Mobility partnership. Here below a description of their features.

Community Readmission agreements

Readmission Agreements are part of the EU’s broader strategy for combating illegal immigration, adopted by the European Council in Tampere, Laeken and Seville.

These are one of the main forms of agreement between EU and third Countries in the migration sector. Since the entry into force of the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1999, the European Community has had the power in its own name to enter into such agreements and not just the Member States. Such agreements involve reciprocal undertakings by the European Union and third-country partners to cooperate over the return of illegal residents to their country of origin or transit. A readmission agreement facilitates the expulsion of third-country nationals. Contracting parties will readmit to their territory without any formality persons with the nationality of those countries who are residing without authorization in the other country or who have crossed its frontier illegally. Upon application, transit is possible through the territory of the two contracting parties without any special documents. A Committee of Experts is to be set up to monitor the application and interpretation of the agreement.

Based on the Community’s powers under Article 63 (3) (b) TEC, the Council has so far approved the mandate for the Commission to negotiate Community Readmission Agreements with 11 third

countries/entities: Morocco, Sri Lanka, Russia, Pakistan (September 2000), Hong Kong, Macao (May 2001), Ukraine (June 2002) and Albania, Algeria, China, Turkey (November 2002).

Mobility partnership agreement

A cornerstone of the EU's policy for encouraging labour migration is Mobility Partnerships.

COM(2007)248 final states that mobility partnerships necessarily have a complex legal nature as they involve a series of components that fall in the Community remit and others that are the concern of Member States.

Mobility Partnerships are a new concept aimed at better managing migration, included in the recent Commission Communication on circular migration and mobility partnerships. The underlying thinking is that specific 'packages' could be established between the EU and interested third countries that contain benefits for both sides. Mobility partnerships joint declarations encompass a broad range of issues ranging from development aid, to temporary entry visa facilitation, circular migration schemes and the fight against illegal migration including readmission. Their successful conclusion therefore is also dependant on the level of commitments which the Third Country is ready to take on in terms of action against illegal migration and facilitating re-integration of returnees (re-admission).

The EU has negotiated and mandated four Mobility Partnerships to date (Cape Verde, Georgia, Moldova and Senegal). Senegal has not yet signed. A proposed Mobility Partnership with Ukraine will not enter into force before 2011. Only two Mobility Partnerships have reached the stage of being implemented: Cape Verde and Moldova.

3 EU INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

The *Directorate-General for Home Affairs* has the main responsibility at the EU Commission for the *migration policy*. The Directorate General was created on July 1, 2010 from the division of DG Justice, Freedom and Security into two Directorates-Generals, a move brought about due to the growing importance of policies related to this area in the work of the Union.

In the domain of *migration*, the DG Home focus is to ensure a balanced migration policy that addresses the irregular migration problems and clears the way for legal migration to the EU, an asset for a sustainable economic recovery. A priority is the consolidation of a genuine common migration and asylum policy that will include actions such as developing new and flexible admission systems for economic migration; initiatives to support smooth integration of migrants into our societies; and the proposal of a common European Migration and Asylum system based on solidarity and respect of human rights.

Home affairs policies have two dimensions, an internal and an external one. That is why the Directorate-General will continue and enhance dialogue and cooperation with third countries.

3.1 European Migration DG Home affairs Instruments

Financially, the *Directorate-General for Home Affairs* and the former DG Justice, Freedom and Security main financial instruments are included in the Framework Programme: "*Solidarity and Management of migration Flows*" (2007-2013) namely the *European Refugee Fund (ERF)*, the *European Border Fund*, *European Integration Fund* and the *European Return Fund*. Both Funds can finance national and transnational actions, as well as actions that are of interest to the EU as a whole. National actions are implemented by EU countries within the framework of multiannual programming consistent with the EU's strategic guidelines. These funds can also deal also with emergency situation. New European Office on Asylum has been created to support the national authorities dealing with the asylum requests

3.2 FRONTEX

An important body in the EU border and migration management is Frontex. The activity of this agency is becoming increasingly important as far as the public perception of the EU migration policy goes. Frontex has become more visible due to recent events but also to the continuous flow of people from Africa. It began its operation in 2005.

Frontex, an EU agency based in Warsaw, was created as a specialised and independent body tasked to coordinate the operational cooperation between Member States in the field of border security. The activities of Frontex are intelligence driven. Frontex actively promotes the cooperation among border related law enforcement bodies responsible for the internal security at EU level and it is a key player in the implementation of common EU policy for Integrated Border Management.

Frontex is a community body having legal personality and operational and budgetary autonomy. Strategic guidelines for Frontex are defined by its Management Board, which consists of operational heads of national services responsible for border guard management or their representatives as well as representatives of the Commission. This Board is entrusted with the necessary powers to establish the budget, verify its execution, adopt the appropriate financial rules, establish transparent working procedures for decision making by the Agency and appoint the Executive Director and his/her Deputy.

There are also many occasion of operational cooperation between EU Member States for:

- Frontex coordinated joint operations
- Feasibility studies and Risk analyses
- RABITs - Rapid Border Intervention Teams. Member States shall contribute to a pool of border guards. The total target number for the pool and the required profiles will be defined by FRONTEX some three weeks after formal adoption of the draft Regulation. The total number should be somewhere between 250 and 500. RABIT teams will be deployed for a limited period in situations of urgent and exceptional pressure, especially the arrivals of large numbers of third-country nationals trying to enter illegally.

3.3 Policy Dialogue

Dialogue is a key component of the Global Approach to Migration, notably for the migration and development agenda.

At the regional level the EU is active in promote the use of dialogue in migration issues. *Political dialogue sessions are conducted at high ministerial level and fall under the remit of the **CFSP**, hence the **primary competence is of the EU Council***. The Commission is not in the driving seat but has an important role in promoting coordination, complementarity and coherence within the limits of its competences and power. The new political and institutional configuration established by the *Lisbon Treaty* (and the related creation of EEAS) put the basis for a morecoherent action and for an increased role of the Head of Delegations in dialogues.

In relations with the ACP political dialogue on migration is guided by *Article 13 of the Cotonou Agreement* that provides the basis for a balanced and comprehensive approach. Individual Member States are increasingly aligning themselves with this EU approach, through reference to Article 13 in bilateral agreements with third countries.

Two major ministerial conferences on migration and development were held in 2006, the first focusing on West Africa in Rabat in July (followed by Paris in 2008), and the second covering the whole of Africa in Tripoli. Ministers responsible for foreign affairs, migration and development from Africa and European Union member states met in Tripoli Libya from 22- 23 November 2006 to address various aspects of migration. Since migration is caused by and aggravated by a variety of causes, the Tripoli conference emphasized that the illegal or irregular migration cannot be addressed by security considerations only but should be based on broader development frameworks and on mainstreaming migration in development strategies, within a framework of partnership for development.

The conference also recognised that well managed migration is of benefit to both Africa and the EU and can help in the achievement of the MDGs.

Follow up to the joint declaration² will take place in the context of the joint EU Africa strategy and the joint implementation matrix. A joint ministerial conference should take place every three years.

The EU was actively involved in preparing and financing both conferences and for the administrative follow-up. The focus was on the link between migration and development but the Tripoli Conference was also the occasion to adopt the EU-Africa Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, especially women and children with indication of areas of prevention and awareness-raising, protection and assistance to victims, as well as law-making and law enforcement in the Action plan.

In relation to Africa, the EU also supported a number of actions in the areas included in the EU-Africa Partnership on Migration and Employment (MME).

Other high level conferences have been organised with other regions in relation to migration. In Eastern Europe the EU supported the Ministerial Conference of Prague in April 2009 and the project “Building Migration Partnerships”, which aims at ensuring its follow-up.

The EU-Latin American Countries Structured Dialogue on Migration was launched on 30 June 2009. The first High Level Migration Meeting dedicated to migration and development was organised on 25 September 2009 and the EU-LAC Brussels-based working group took place on 14 December 2009.

In relation to Asia, the annual meeting of the EU-ASEM Directors General on Migration was organised in Goa on 1 and 2 December 2009, under this framework EU and authorities of India decided to develop a bilateral dialogue on migration.

Support projects to accompany international dialogue on migration and asylum and political commitments are financed by the EU through the Commission. This is an important achievement to ensure the link between the EU political role and the financial cooperation which is under the responsibility of the Commission.

4 COMPETENCES OF THE EC EXTERNAL RELATIONS DIRECTORATE GENERALS

The main responsibilities of the External relations Directorate Generals (former DG Development, DG RELEX, EuropeAID, actual EEAS and DEVCO) is the design and the implementation of the external dimension of the EU’s migration and asylum policy through two types of instruments:

- the *implementation of the policy at national and regional level by geographical instruments*, such as the European Development Fund (in the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries), the Development Co-operation Instrument (in Latin America, Asia and South Africa), and the European Neighborhood & Partnership Instrument (in the neighboring regions),
- by a specific *thematic programme for migration and asylum*. The thematic programme aims at supporting third countries in their efforts to ensure better management of migratory flows in all their dimensions. The programme is the successor to the 2004-2006 AENEAS programme.

4.1 Geographic Instruments

A relevant part of the financial contributions in the migration sector are given to third countries through thematic instrument and few CSP/RSP included migration within the main objectives.

In many cases where migration issues are at the core of national development but flows to Europe are not significant, there was no discussion of migration integrated into the situation analysis of those countries.

² Joint Africa-EU Declaration on Migration and Development, Tripoli 22-23 November 2006.

Recently in the new programming cycle (2007-2011) migration is progressively being integrated into the CSPs but the approaches in the different regions are different.

Migration profiles are now annexed to the new CSPs of relevant ACP countries and migration is mentioned in some 18 ACP CSPs. The migration profile contains any information relevant to the design and management of a joint migration and development policy. It includes information on migratory flows (refugees and economic migrants), taking into account gender issues and the situation of children. It also provides information on the country's needs in terms of skills available in the diaspora and remittances to the country. Where relevant, the profile analyses the routes taken by illegal migrants and the activities of people-trafficking networks. One of the main issues mentioned is brain drain, particularly in the health sector, trafficking of human beings, and visa restrictions. The entry point is becoming the link between migration and development less controversial than illegal migration or border control, no specific mention to the rights of migrants.

Migration is also mentioned in other developing countries, being addressed in some 19 CSPs in Eastern European, Central Asian, and Latin American countries, but more rarely in the CSPs of Asian and Middle Eastern countries.

4.2 Thematic Programme for Migration & Asylum

The thematic programme doesn't directly address the root causes of migration but puts the emphasis on capacity building in countries of origin, transit and encourage cooperation initiatives to develop and share experience, working methods and best practices regarding various aspects of migration. To achieve its main objective, the programme focuses on the following areas:

- Fostering the links between migration and development,
- Promoting well-managed labour migration,
- Fighting illegal immigration and facilitating the readmission of illegal immigrants,
- Protecting migrants against exploitation and exclusion and supporting the fight against trafficking in human beings,
- Promoting asylum, international protection and the protection of the stateless persons.

The Thematic Programme is intended to be complementary to instruments such as the ENPI, EDF, and the geographical programmes of the DCI, through which the root causes of migration may be addressed directly. The Thematic Programme does not support specifically humanitarian interventions. It is particularly suited to capacity building, including staff training. All Third Countries covered by the ENPI, DCI, and EDF are eligible under the Thematic Programme. Pre-accession countries are not eligible.

Indicative funding of Euro 205 million was foreseen in the Strategy Paper for 2007-2010, Euro 157 million for the five migratory routes taken together under the geographic component, Euro 28 million for global and multi-regional initiatives in the five theme areas and Euro 20 million for special measures. The total number of the projects approved in 2010 is 62, with commitments totalling amount of Euro 93,608,279. 56 of these have been selected through the Call for Proposals mechanism (for a total of Euro 61.6 million) and 7 through direct negotiation (for a total of 31.9 million).

The overall programme's strategy paper for the period 2007-2010³ matches thematic objectives with specific geographic priorities based on the ***“migratory routes” concept***:

- the *Southern migratory route* (South/North migration), including flows originating from or transiting through the Sub-Saharan African countries and Northern Africa,
- the *Eastern migratory route* (East/West migration): including flows originating from or transiting through Russian Federation, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia,

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/migration-asylum/documents/strategy-paper2007-2010.pdf>

- other migratory flows i.e. those coming from the Middle East, Southern and Eastern Asia and the Pacific region, Latin America and the Caribbean.

5 EC MECHANISMS OF COORDINATION

Migration, being a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, requires a mixture of policy actions covering a wide range of issues and fields: demographic constraints, economic needs, social expectations, health impacts, trade commitments, development needs, education opportunities, security dimension, etc. Moreover, as a consequence of a shared competence policy area, coordination between the EU Directorate Generals and the national level, especially on economic, social and development policies is essential.

From Commission side the lead on migration issues and on coordinating relation with the Council and Member State is of the DG HOME (former JLS). In relation to the external dimension EEAS (former DG Relex) and DEVCO (former DG Development and AIDCO) have their responsibilities as well as mentioned in the above chapter.

Mechanisms of coordination described here regard the external dimension of migration.

Concerning the drafting of the CSPs/RSPs the relation and communication among the DGs for migration issues follows the general rules. Delegations have the leadership in the preparation of the Country Strategy Papers in the different countries. When a draft is completed a meeting with the country team is organised. The country team meeting discusses the substance of the strategy in the country concerned and gathers for comments all interested DGs include JLS (Home) for migration matters.

Concerning the Thematic Programme, former DG JLS has been the initiator of programme and plays a key role in the identification of priorities in the Strategy and Multi-annual Programmes. DG Relex (now EEAS), according to a number of experts, plays a smaller role; though, DGs JLS and Relex officially carry equal weight. DGs JLS, Relex, and Development are responsible for developing the Multi-year Annual Programme; a process during which EuropeAid is consulted. DG Dev focuses its role on ACP countries.

EuropeAid is responsible for the Annual Action Plans (AAPs), the management of Call for Proposals, Action Fiches, contracts, evaluation, and follow-up on lessons learnt. EuropeAid is currently managing about 150 projects, including AENEAS “leftovers” still running

Delegations played so far a limited role in programming unless migration is a priority sector for the country concerned; they are involved mainly with selection of projects of the call and, in the case of important projects, of the follow-up in coordination with EuropeAid. The concentration of programme management in Brussels does not promote close EU Delegation relations with Government and since the EC Delegation is Government’s first point of contact with the EU, this is in conflict with the goal of engaging Governments as active stakeholders in the Thematic Programme and in the external dimension of migration in general. Visibility and perception at the level of third countries are influenced by this institutional structure.

Evidence from the mid-term evaluation of the Thematic programmes for Migration & Asylum⁴ pointed out that the over-centralised process in Brussels with insufficient involvement of EC Delegations deprive them to develop expertise and limited the dialogue with governments on this issues. In addition EC did not organise consultative processes with different stakeholders in order to have their views and experience integrated in the development process. Hence, the level of information dissemination regarding the Thematic Programme or the EU policies in the areas of migration and asylum has not been sufficient to ensure that all potential beneficiaries had access.

⁴The distribution of the Final report is internal to the Commission.

6 EU VISIBILITY ON THE MIGRATION THEME

6.1 Level of Overall Commission

The external dimension of the EU's migration policy is an extremely sensitive and politicised area. From 2006 it found its way into practically every EU high level agenda, every formal and informal Council of Justice and Home affairs (JHA), General affairs and External Relation Council (GAERC) comprising Foreign and Development ministers, European Council of Head of States and Governments.

It was also the subject of two major ministerial conferences on migration and development held in Rabat and Tripoli, as well as high level Dialogue on Migration and Development, organised by the United Nation for the first time in September 2006 and repeated from then every year.

For the first time in 2009 a High-Level Parliamentary *Conference on Policy Coherence for Development and Migration* was organised jointly by the European Parliament, the European Commission and the OECD and was a success. Almost 300 participants from Europe, Africa, the Caribbean and the Asia-Pacific region stressed that the financial and economic crisis reinforces the urgent need for comprehensive migration policies with a global approach. There was concurrence that well-managed labour migration can be advantageous for destination countries and can also bring significant benefits to origin countries thus contributing to poverty reduction. The role and responsibility of parliamentarians to seek synergies between migration and development policies and their ability to influence governments to "speak with one voice" gained general support. Many key issues were debated, including: brain drain and brain waste; circular migration, illegal migration, remittances, migrant's rights and the media.

The visibility of the EU and the perception of the external dimension of the migration policy are influenced by the overall policy including EU internal migration aspects and the consistency with migration policies of the Member States. Hence all international treaties, official legislation, high level meetings, and instruments of public diplomacy of the EU and in each Member states are relevant for shaping the perception of the public and of the other targets selected for this evaluation, in particular third country governments.

Alongside this visibility produced by non deliberate visibility events, there is the specific communication plan and the messages that the Commission would like to convey to selected stakeholders which are purposely designed to visibility aim.

The policy guideline of the Commission, and the related communication messages, is to develop a comprehensive migration policy based on a genuine partnership with third countries and fully integrated into the Union External's policies. This reflects also the move from not only dealing with migration in itself, but also assessing the reasons behind migration and bringing the other policies areas, especially development, into the migration debate. A central issue for Europe is how to manage migration effectively to bring the maximum benefit for Europe, the migrants and their countries of origins, the so-called "*triple win situation*".

In relation to the migration theme we have good evidence from materials that show the communication activities, targeted messages and the work of the Commission, including the coordination with the relevant Directorate Generals, in this domain begun in 2008.

The former Commission (Barroso I, 2005-2010) each year decided a list of communication priorities that involve communication planning and activities of different Directorate Generals depending on the priority theme selected. The Directorate General of Communication (DG COMM) leads this process and usually the priorities are presented by a message of the President of the Commission Barroso.

In relation to the different subjects identified as priority an *inter-service group* called **Project Team (PT)** was created. The Project Team had the role of coordination of the communication plan and of the activities of the different Directorate Generals involved. The PT also had a specific budget to spend on the implementation of the planned activities.

Every year the Commission establishes the communication priorities and their related communication plans for the activities to be implemented during the year.

In **2008** among the Commission communication priorities was planned: **“Migration & Asylum”**. Below is presented the communication plan for the Migration & development priority. This example can be generalised to the other priorities and for this reason is presented in detail.

Box 1 - Migration & Asylum Communication plan 2008

Rationale of the communication campaign for Migration in 2008

The communication plan was based on a holistic approach to migration whereby the EU policy on immigration and asylum is presented as a comprehensive package of measures that take into consideration all the different aspects of immigration and asylum, notably legal and illegal migration, the needs of third countries, integration, and asylum as well as security aspects/border control. Each initiative can be easily criticised if taken in isolation and it is the comprehensiveness of the approach, involving initiatives from different DGs, that provides a powerful response to the range of challenges raised by immigration.

A plan aiming at communicating to key stakeholders and to the public at large the comprehensive package of measures relating to migration has been adopted. Ultimately, the Commission aimed to ensure public support for its proposed common and global approach on asylum and immigration. More specifically there were initiatives to be communicated as key part of a future comprehensive EU policy on migration. Among them

- the adoption of Communications (611-2008) on Global Approach;
- a "Green Paper on Migration and Education" and
- the opening of a "Migration management Centre in Mali" the CIGEM (DG DEV had the lead on the issue and coordinated its planned communication actions in the context of the "Migration" project team).

Coordination across the Commission

Inter-service coordination has essentially taken place in the dedicated project team (PT) on Migration which involves DG JLS, DG COMM, DG DEV, DG RELEX, and occasionally DG EMP. The PT on Migration has also aimed at developing coordinated actions with the FRONTEX Agency and with the Committee of the Regions. Last but not least, the PT aimed at coordinating closely with the Commission Representations (a dedicated network of contact of contact person has been developed) and the Europe Direct Relays.

Close coordination has also been developed with the French Presidency of the European Union through the French Permanent Representation in Brussels and through the Commission Representation in Paris.

A set of key messages has been developed in the context of the PT by DG JLS and served as a thread to the campaign.

The selection of the Target countries is made also on the basis of a specific Eurobarometer.

According to the Eurobarometer 68 published in December 2007: 63 % of European citizens think that decisions regarding immigration should be taken at EU level. 33% think they should be taken at national level and 4% don't have any opinion

In addition, immigration is not the main source of fear for European Citizens. For most of citizens, the most important issue facing their country at the moment is mainly crime. However, Crime and immigration can be associated in most of Member States Communication actions should therefore involve a specific focus on Member States particularly touched by illegal immigration (*Spain, Portugal, Italy, Malta*) and countries showing fears regarding the issue (*Denmark, Sweden, Austria, The Netherlands, UK*). In the context of the French Presidency, special communication actions should be set up in *France*.

Definition of the Target Groups

Despite the difficulty to target the public at large, it has been decided in the PT that, given the importance of and interest for Migration in public debates, the general public should remain the overall target of the communication campaign. While messages and communication's actions will as much as possible be tailored to specific audiences or Member States, the communication campaign will specifically target multipliers and most importantly the written press and the audiovisual media. This latter objective will notably translate into the organisation of journalist visits to cover FRONTEX operation at the Ukrainian border and in Senegal and the Canaries Islands together with interviews with Commissioners and participation to TV debates or radio broadcasts.

While the media will be a key target throughout the campaign, more specific target groups have been identified that

will be the object of tailored communication's actions. These are:

- NGO's active in the field of Migration,
- Local and Regional authorities,
- Employers and trade union federations,
- Relevant international public bodies such as the UN,
- Third countries through the Commission delegations.

Dissemination activities

A specific effort is also made to disseminate as widely as possible the communication material that is being developed for the purpose of the campaign. The PT has therefore aimed to develop synergies with other institutions and public or private bodies in order to channel the information through a range of networks (beyond the Commission networks). This has notably been the case with the Committee of the Regions and networks of EU regions. Communication tools will be adapted as much as possible to the audiences considered prior to dissemination.

Communication Tools to be used

A range of communication tools has been identified. Among the key communication tools to be used (beyond the traditional Press Releases, Memos and technical briefings provided on the dates of adoption) there are the following:

- Citizen's summaries
- Journalist visit to cover FRONTEX operations,
- Production of audiovisual material: video clips, audiovisual material to be broadcasted on EBS and/or EU Tube
- Contribution and financial support to Conferences relating to Migration,
- Use of the "Debate Europe" internet platform as a dedicated forum for discussion on the EU Migration policy,
- Use of Commissioners and Reps' "Blogs",
- A brochure on the EU Migration policy,
- Tailored information packs for specific stakeholders such as NGOs, Regions, Employers' organisations, trade unions, third countries,
- Identification of speaking opportunities for EU decision makers.
- A dedicated toolbox containing the communication material developed on Migration
- Seminars for Journalists through the European Journalism Centre

This methodology for organising communication/visibility activities around the creation of Projects Team for Communication priorities ended with the set-up of the new Commission Barroso II.

In the former Commission Barroso I there was also a process for creating *task forces* in relation to emergencies that could occur in the period of its mandate.

At present with the approval of the *Treaty of Lisbon* and the establishment of the new institutional organisation, in particular the set-up of EEAS (European External Action Service), the Commission is finding its way for coordinating official communication policy in the different sectors notably in response to crisis and emergency situation.

6.2 EC External Relations

The responsibility for visibility of the former External Relation DGs is related to the interventions in the migration areas financed by the geographical and thematic instruments.

The vast majority of these interventions is represented by projects or programmes to be implemented at country or regional level; hence the communication and visibility activity is focused to those levels. In term of budget it is not easy to understand the size of the financial contribution dedicated to visibility for each intervention. There are no common requirements in single contracts on a dedicated budget for visibility activities. There are on the other side mandatory visibility rules for projects financed included in a specific manual⁵.

All this considered evidence from the evaluation of the Thematic Programme on Migration & Asylum present interesting contradictory findings that should be taken into consideration in our study. In some third countries, the EU is perceived as being primarily concerned with security, border management, and the curbing of illegal immigration to Europe. The negative impression of the EU is influenced by the bilateral policies applied by EU Member States and the fact that the EU Member States have not signed the international agreement on the protection of the rights of migrant workers. It is difficult for the EC to play the role of a neutral provider of trustworthy policy advice in such situations. In other countries visited by the evaluators for this Migration & Asylum evaluation, though, including Moldova and Ukraine and Cape Verde, the realistic prospect of visa facilitation and the signing of re-admission agreements and Mobility Partnerships have given rise to a genuine partnership.

In border management and document security, the EC is regarded as a trusted source of advice because of the high quality of the technical procedures and standards applied. The same applies to the EU as a source of advice on conformity with international standards of protection, albeit the subject is not often a priority one.

On the project level, the evaluation documented that there is a high compliance to EC visibility rules by international organisations; somewhat less so by civil society organisations. In general, though, high quality communications strategies featuring websites, brochures, publicity events, and so on are the rule. However, the visibility of the Thematic Programme as a programme is low outside the circle of migration experts, despite attention to visibility rules at the project level. The visibility is limited for partner governments and local organisations at country level, in part due to the lack of involvement of the EC Delegations in monitoring and implementation. The relatively low level of integration of the Thematic Programme (and its predecessor AENEAS programme) into CSPs is an indication that, even within the EC system, visibility could be improved.

The study also highlighted that the dissemination of information regarding overall EU migration policies is quite poor. Projects are more concerned to disseminate information on their own activities rather than information of a more general nature. The EC in Brussels engages in only limited information dissemination

It should be noted that maximising visibility can be detrimental to overall project effectiveness in sensitive sectors including human rights protection, in post-conflict situations, or in implementing activities in crisis zones. EU-UN Joint Visibility guidelines and FAFA contain the possibility of derogation. However rules concerning other beneficiaries, such as human rights NGOs, are not clear on this point. Experts from some such organisations, interviewed, expressed the view that understating the role of the EC was more effective in achieving results than the reverse.

7 RATIONALE FOR THE CHOICE OF CASE STUDY AND COUNTRY

The selection of where to go and what to study for the Field Missions is closely linked to each of the themes included in the evaluation and has two levels. A first level is what 'cases' do the thematic studies look and second, the selection of the country themselves. Finally, the TOR for the Study stress that we must make clear what our hypotheses are to be tested during the field missions. These hypotheses should be related to the themes selected and also to some more general EQs already established depending on the specificity of each theme and cases selected. Each of these points is discussed in more detail below.

⁵ Communication and Visibility Manual for EU external Actions, 2009.

7.1 Case selection

In relation to the case to be chosen, there are 5 typologies of visibility actions that have been identified in the guidelines for the thematic work. The cases selected in relation to the different themes should cover the entire range of the visibility categories mentioned.

As far as *migration* is concerned the case suggested is the analysis of the EDF-funded project in MALI: ***Information and Management Center on Migration (CIGEM)*** a state of the art research and policy analysis organization dealing with practically all areas of migration.

There are a number of reasons backing this choice:

- This project is grounded in the policy framework of EU- ACP partnership on migration, on the dialogue under *article 13 of the Cotonou agreement* and on the the new global approach to migration launched after the high minister meetings of Rabat and Tripoli. After these events the European Commission, Mali, France and the ECOWAS signed at Bamako on February 2007 a *joint declaration on Migration and Development*. CIGEM represent the operational translation of this joint declaration and one of its main initiatives.
- The establishment of the Centre is a fully fledged programme in the migration sector strongly encouraged by the former Commissioner to Development Louis Michel and it is of direct responsibility of the former DG Development and of the EU Delegation in Mali.
- The opening of the CIGEM has been supported by a series of communication activities in the framework of the Migration inter service *Project Team* created for the 2008 Communication priorities plan of the Commission. DG DEV had the leadership of the communication plan, the organisation of activities and the monitoring & follow-up in Europe and Mali.
- The creation of the Centre is linked to a joint declaration involving the EU, a Member State, a regional organisation and a third countries allowing an assessment of the coordination and coherence in the migration sector in the country
- A broad range of Information exists to enable an assessment of how visible the EU was around the case and what profile or image it achieved; how much and what sort of effort and resources the EU put into raising or managing its visibility.
- Mali is at crossroad of the *Southern migratory route to Europe* (South/North migration), including flows originating from or transiting through the Sub-Saharan African countries and Northern Africa. It is also involved in the south/south migration in the region.

7.2 Country selection

In the Inception report the team identified eight (8) criteria for country selection which are related to a range of issues relevant to different extent to the six themes. The aim is to cover all the criteria in the 6 country selected for the mission.

They cover themes specific to EU External Action and priorities of the Visibility strategies. They are also related to the thematic scope of the study, the different geographic areas, but also to other issues such as levels of development, the geo-political or strategic importance of the country for the EU

Below a matrix which links the 8 criteria to the country identified for the field mission in the migration sector which is ***Mali***, the country where CIGEM (*the case*) has been established.

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Reasons for MALI</i>
1. Strategic priorities of External Action	Development cooperation
2. Strategic partnerships according to the EU Agreements with third countries and political priorities	The general framework is the EU-Africa Partnership Mali is part of the ACP political dialogue on migration guided by the <i>Article 13 of Cotonou Agreement</i> that provides the basis for a common and comprehensive approach.
3. EU Visibility/ Communication priorities	Global solidarity and poverty reduction The establishment of CIGEM is a concrete way to sustain Mali in its response to migration flow
4. 6 Themes given by the TOR as focus sectors of the evaluation	Migration but also Food crisis
5. Coverage of the European Union's regions of intervention	ACP (Mali at the crossroad of southern migratory route)
6. Scale of financial contribution of EC cooperation in the different countries	294 + 533 MEUR Top recipient of EU Aid (decile: 21 th to 30 th)
7. Importance of budget dedicated to Visibility and Communication in the different EU Delegations	Low public diplomacy & communication budget allocated for the EU Delegation in Mali
8. Indication of the level of income of the country selected following the classification of the World Bank ⁶ .	Low income country

7.3 Hypotheses to be tested during the field mission

The visibility assessment should focus on these points:

1. to understand how visibility actions have been perceived in terms of adequacy and effectiveness by different stakeholders in the country in building a coherent message for a common approach on migration.
2. to survey local stakeholders (e.g. government officials, civil society organisations, project beneficiaries etc.) and general public perceptions of the CIGEM role and activities and in general of EU policy & actions in the migration field.
3. to understand if EU is seen as a trusted partner and a source of advice on dealing with the challenges of migration with third countries

To this end, the proposed **hypotheses to be tested** and related **evaluation questions (EQs)** are the following:

- i. Local stakeholders and the general public were aware of EU funds disbursed through the CIGEM and of other programme and initiatives in the field of migration & Asylum and perceived this mechanism as adequate to tackle the challenges of the migratory phenomenon?
 - **EQ1:** “How well does the image of the external action of the EU perceived by the stakeholders correspond to the key issues outlined in the definition and objectives of this external action and to image the EU seeks to convey?”

Adapted questions for the migration study

- *Are you aware of the establishment and of the kind of objective and work of the CIGEM organisation?*
- *How do you consider the activities carried out by CIGEM in terms of services available and the procedures adopted and the effectiveness of them?*

⁶ Source: The World Bank http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups#Low_income

➤ *Is this experience a good practice for managing migration in the country to be replicated in other country of the region?*

- **EQ4:** “How well do stakeholders perceive the benefits of EU external action and not just its main features?”

Adapted questions for the migration study

➤ *In your opinion, is there any tangible evidence that CIGEM was effective in contributing to manage migration effectively in order to bring benefit to Europe, the migrants and to the country (triple win situation)?*

ii. EC is seen as a trusted source of advice in dealing with migration challenges.

- **EQ 6** “Are the EC’s messages coherent across different EU external action and internal policy areas?” and **EQ5** “To what extent is the EC’s visibility/communication work coordinated and complementary with that of the EU Member States, Council and Parliament?”

➤ *Are the messages conveyed and activities carried out by the EU in the country in the migration field contradictory with the internal EU migration policy and of those of its Member States?*

➤ *Is the migration policy in the country coherent with development and the EU external actions?*

iii. Actions and resources for the CIGEM have been perceived as adequate and effective by EU Delegations and Representations

- **EQ8:** “How far are the resources mobilized by the EC adequate (human resources, budget) to carry out its visibility/communication strategy?”

Adapted questions for the migration study

➤ *Were the resources (human resources, budget) mobilized for visibility of the CIGEM adequate to carry out the communication/visibility strategy?*

➤ *Was the media coverage given to any related event (e.g. signature of agreement, local government interviews and communiqués, etc.) effective in reaching the targeted audiences and intended objectives?*

iv. CIGEM contributed to enhance visibility on EU migration policy at the global level

- **EQ7:** “How far does the perception of the value added of the EU as a global actor emerge clearly from its presence as in the major international organisations/fora?”

Adapted questions for the migration study

➤ *Did EU visibility benefit from the establishment of CIGEM and those events where this initiative was announced/discussed (High Minister meetings, Bamako joint declaration on migration and development, etc.)?*

➤ *How did cooperation of the EU with stakeholder, MS and regional organisations on the implementation process impact on EU visibility?*

8 **METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

8.1 **Data collection during the field mission**

The case selected to focus the collect of material and the analysis of the migration theme is the EDF-funded project in MALI: *Information and Management Centre on Migration (CIGEM)*

The field mission had the double purpose of verifying hypotheses formulated during the desk phase (see Chapter above) and to collect additional and complementary information from multiple stakeholders and different tools in the selected partner country. Both levels of investigation are addressed in the present report as well as in the evaluation matrix.

During the field mission, information was collected and hypotheses tested through four main tools: (i) semi-structured interviews; ii) focus groups with journalists and civil society organisations ; (iii) local media coverage analysis; and (iv) visit to sites throughout the country where EU/CIGEM funded projects were realized.

8.2 Interviews with multiple stakeholders

A total of 12 vis-à-vis interviews were conducted during the field mission with a variety of stakeholders. The interviewees included:

- EU Delegation officials in Barbados;
- Representative Member States partner of the CIGEM project (Embassies of Spain and France)
- Representatives from governmental ministries (i.e MMEIA -Ministère Malien de l'Extérieur et de l'Intégration Africaine;
- Representatives of CIGEM (Director & media and communication advisor)
- Beneficiaries of trainings organised by CIGEM (visibility event: remise des diplomes)
- Representatives of the other component of the CIGEM: TOKTEN⁷ and CODEV⁸
- Members of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community based organisations (CBOs);
- Journalists

A detailed list of interviewed people and organisations is provided in Annex 8.

A challenge was related to the identification of relevant people to be met. To this end, the support provided first by the EU and by the local expert proved to be very important, the key stakeholders have been interviewed.

8.3 Media coverage analysis

CIGEM is a highly mediatised project at national level, thus the main challenge in conducting the media coverage analysis was represented by the big amount of articles available in local newspapers, even if the news culture in Mali appears to be skewed mainly towards radio rather than newspapers. Consequently a selection of most relevant article has been conducted by a local expert who is himself a director of one of the main newspaper in Bamako.

Media coverage survey was carried out on **63 media articles in French language** covering the period from **October 2008** (opening of CIGEM) till **July 2011** (date of the mission). Those 63 articles are split between:

- (02) two online newspapers;
- (02) international press agencies;

⁷ The Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals (TOKTEN) programme filled the urgent need for qualified teaching and research personnel in a number of key areas by bringing Malian academics living abroad back to their home country on short term contracts

⁸ The component CODEV of CIGEM carried on the Co-development Programme established between France and Mali in 2002 aims at facilitating the exchange of initiatives and resources related to migrant workers for the development of their country of origin. It includes: i) the co-financing of local development and enterprises projects; ii) technical counselling to conduct the feasibility study for the setting-up of enterprises; iii) social and cultural exchanges.

- (08) eight daily newspapers;
- (02) two weekly newspapers.

Particular emphasis was given to the articles that mentioned the perception of the different national stakeholders and migration actors. The time-span has been decided to show the evolving attitude & perception of the stakeholders on CIGEM and on the EU migration policy, and in order to take into consideration the resetting of CIGEM priorities and communication approaches as well.

The media coverage comprises several press releases reporting the official events and editorials addressing CIGEM objectives, activities & partnerships. Interviews of Malian personalities & European representatives have also been included to complete the variety of the stakeholder insights.

The collected articles are contained in a press book in the Annex 10.

8.4 Focus Groups

The first focus group was organised with journalists to investigate on the perception of the media towards CIGEM through discussion outside the framework of articles and reportages. The following 10 newspaper and radio were present (Les Échos, Essor, l'Indépendant, Info-Matin, Radio Kledu, Radio Guintan, le Combat, la nouvelle Patrie, Radio Bamakan, le Matin). The EUD and the responsible of communication at CIGEM attended as well. Interviews with journalists from *10 newspapers and radio* were useful to understand the type of image the EU gets through the media as well as the perception of EU external actions among the general public.

The second focus group was organised at the *Association Malienne des Expulsés*, which is one of the most active civil society organisation in the field of the right of migrants. People with different responsibilities participated.

The detailed list of the intervenes is included in Annex 8.

8.5 Sites visit

In order to assess how the full range of the CIGEM interventions is visible in Mali not only through the media but also through tangible examples, it has been decided to visit some CODEV⁹ small projects. The responsible of the “co-development” part, organized a visit to the different local sites where activities were realized by communities with the financial contribution of the diaspora in France. As part of this tour, the sites related to the following projects were visited: “*Amenagement de la base nautique de Bancoumana*” in the district of Kati; and “*Formation à la creation d'une entreprise de briques “geo-beton” a Siby*” in the region of Koulikoro.

Not surprisingly the CODEV component of the CIGEM project is considered the most successful for the link to the local community development, even if it has important limitation due to the insufficient funds that allow financing only very small projects.

9 FINDINGS FROM FIELD MISSION

9.1 Context for EU visibility

Mali is a landlocked country in the Sahel, with an estimated population of 12.7 million, which is growing at a rate of 3% per year, excluding large-scale migration. It is ranked 175th out of 177 countries according to the UNDP's 2006 Human Development Index but has experienced a slow but steady increase in its HDI over the past 15 years.

The ***EU is an important political actor*** in the country ***and a large donor*** being Mali the 2nd ACP recipient country with a bilateral programme for the period 2008-2013 of 533 million of Euro (10th

⁹ See previous note 7 on CODEV.

EDF). The European Community cooperation strategy is based on the poverty reduction where the EC has a comparative advantage, backing the government's efforts to promote growth by developing support for promising productive sectors around regional development. Special attention is given by the EU to the national reforms in the governance sector. Generally there is a very positive EU perception among national stakeholders for its development cooperation interventions.

Beyond the EU, France is the major international actor due to the long history of cooperation with Mali along with United States and China.

Media are not well developed to Western standards. There are a number of print media outlets, but the newspaper's circulation is limited and concentrated around the main cities, notably the capital Bamako. Radio and TV are the major popular way of getting information, especially at local level due to the news culture in the country and to the education gap, illiteracy is still a issue in Mali.

Migration was primarily of cultural rather than economic nature in Mali. For many people of Mali, "leaving for adventure" was part of the initiation rite. Nowadays, however, there is no work in many regions of the country, and many people only survive on the money sent by migrants. The issue of migration is therefore not simple. It is more sensitive than any other issue.

In this context, the EC decided to finance the ***CIGEM*** (Centre d'Informations et de Gestion des Migrations – *Centre for the information and the management of migrations*) with 10 million Euro for the period 2008-2010. This Centre was strongly wanted by the former Commissioner to the Development, Louis Michel.

At its creation, CIGEM was intended as an information and orientation centre serving all migrants' needs. It is a pilot project designed to enhance Mali's capacities to deal with migration issues. The centre was supposed to promote the mutual benefits of legal migration, to deter potential illegal migration, to highlight the financial contributions and transfer of knowledge of the diaspora, and to gather a better understanding of the migration phenomenon in order to be able to define an appropriate policy on the subject. The main project is completed by two components: CODEV and TOKTEN to strengthen the relation with diaspora and the migration and development link.

9.2 Evidence from Media Coverage

A thorough analysis of local press articles referring to the European Union and the CIGEM project was conducted in order to understand better the type of image media the EU received in relation to CIGEM during the implementation period. The Centre received strong attention by the media and this contributed to raise high expectations on its capacity to manage migration in the country, notably the labour component.

From the media coverage emerged clearly that at its creation CIGEM first came across as a structure intended to facilitate departures towards Europe. Although this Centre was once the focus of a lot of attention, it soon fell back into obscurity because of its lack of concrete results. To correct this trend, CIGEM has commissioned a survey from IBC-Mali (International Business Consulting Mali) in order to identify which services to offer to the public, and specifically to migrants, in view of the workforce needs observed in the national labour market and of the existing training offer; identify and assess the recruitment difficulties facing Malian companies, as well as the lack of skills and qualifications of the local workforce. This represented the first source of disappointment, because people perceived CIGEM as a structure "that helps to leave", rather than a structure "that helps to stay".

This perception is summarised well in an article reporting the interview of *Aminata Dramane Traoré* a well-known Malian anti-globalisation activist. We reproduce an extract here, since it best reflects the general feeling about CIGEM: "*In my opinion, this centre brings the wrong answers to existing problems. Mali is in difficult situation, characterised by unemployment and despair among young people. Building another centre in Mali will not solve anything. There is no shortage of information structures in this country. In my opinion, this centre is nothing else than the externalisation of Europe's borders*".

CIGEM changed its objectives and activities in late 2010 to (i) increase the National appropriation of the Centre by the MMEIA (Minister of Malians living abroad) and (ii) by focusing more on the support to dialogue and consultations element for the planning of National migration policy; (iii) training and capacity building for internal labour market with linkages with national agencies.

The press gave a lot of space to the training component of CIGEM, since the lack of specialised workforce is seen as a cause of unemployment in the country. Generally CIGEM is better perceived and appreciated for the support to national strategy and for the professional training activities which is however considered still too limited respect to the needs of potential and return migrants..

9.3 Responses to EQs

In this section, the findings obtained from different sources during the field mission are summarized under each of the selected evaluation questions (EQs) and those that was possible to add in relation to the information collected in the field – see also the EQs table in Annex 1.

- **EQ1:** Despite substantial fund spent for communication activities by CIGEM, at the beginning the objectives and activities of CIGEM have not been well understood by the local actors and general public. The national stakeholders were very unclear about the consistency of the objectives of the Centre and the tools and services provided to achieve them. In general, CIGEM was not successful in explaining its role and in reaching the relevant targets. The image perceived did not correspond to the one expected by EU and its partners, at list in the first years (2008-2010) of the project implementation..

CIGEM has been presented by the EU Commissioner, the President of Mali & the France Minister at its inauguration as an over ambitious project that could convey the information and management of migration at national level, making also the link with the regional and international dimension.

The national stakeholder expectations were from the start very high especially concerning the legal and labor migration element. Hence, firstly CIGEM has been perceived as mainly a job-centre to channel legal migration to Europe, especially to France and Spain (the two MS Partner of the project). Then, expectations turned into disappointment due to a lack of results, and the perception evolved towards considering the centre as a decentralized Office of FRONTEX to limit the Malian migration to Europe.

The theme of migration is very sensitive in Mali and the CIGEM projects generated negative image among national actors of the EU proper and EU Member States (France/Spain).

Stakeholders made strong complaints about the CIGEM as it started without a clear previous definition of what EU could realistically achieved. CIGEM revised its objectives and activities in late 2010 to: (i) increase the National appropriation of the Centre by the MMEIA (Minister of Malian living abroad); (ii) to focus on the support to dialogue and consultations element for the planning of National migration policy; (iii) to increase the training and capacity building for internal labour market in cooperation with national agencies (no more agency to migrate in EU).

This renewed strategy has been better perceived and appreciated for the support to the national policy, but still considered not effective in relation to (i) the professional training, considered too limited with criteria not appropriate for the participation of migrants expelled; and to (ii) the awareness raising campaign. CIGEM is still considered, notably by civil society, another national institution with no clear services for the people. Many NGOs representatives think that EU spends a huge budget for a project that is not beneficial to the group targeted (migrants).

- **EQ4:** All migration stakeholders (government and civil society) except the general public are quite exposed to visibility actions organized by CIGEM. The communications actions are

managed by CIGEM advisors supervised by the EUD, but the direct involvement of EUD is not foreseen.

The communication for CIGEM has been designed taking into consideration the target groups which are mainly the migrants and CSOs, but the strategy was not consistent with the reality of the CIGEM capacity and of the services provided. Hence, the expectations of the target groups were not met resulted in a **negative image** for the Centre and consequently for the EU. Public asked for more involvement of CIGEM in the support to expelled and stranded migrants and in the professional capacity building. The strategy has been recently changed and the reasons were explicitly presented to external stakeholder. This changed attitude had positive results for the EUD and for the CIGEM. However, the revised strategy which focuses on the support to the design of a National Migration Policy, CIGEM is still seen as distant from popular needs and closer to those of the elites.

Interviews and media coverage confirmed the point that it is **not the EC communication and visibility activities that alone generate stakeholder's view** of EU external action, but the image is mostly based on the **results of EU interventions** and their benefit for the people at national level.

The EU is seen as credible and reliable partner in development cooperation, especially in relation to decentralisation & local development programmes, agriculture, environment where EU's interventions have good track record. However, this picture is not confirmed in the migration field for the negative results obtained by CIGEM services.

- **EQ5:** Member States and EU policies & approaches in the migration field are not perceived as different by national stakeholders (mainly civil society and journalists). MS notably France & Spain influence the perception of the EU in the migration policy area where the heritage of MS is stronger than the one of EU. This clearly emerged by the media coverage and by the focus groups with journalists and civil society.

Although, European Union and Member States seem to develop their own messages in relation to migration without clear and visible reference to each other in the country, this is mainly due to different interests and political priorities. For instance the France's main concern is the signature of the readmission agreement with Mali. This resulted in the fact that MS did not follow closely the implementation of the CIGEM. Yet the CIGEM project included objectives and services which needed MS contributions to be implemented (i.e. legal labour migration).

European Delegation and Embassies of MS confirmed that there is not a formal joint Communication strategy with the EU MS at country level for migration. However the cooperation with MS is very well developed at technical level (development) and around specific political issues and themes.

EU put itself in this sensitive field in Mali without enough policy preparation at level of coherence & coordination with Member States and with the regional partner ECOWAS. There has been a common commitment that has not been followed-up.

The other components of CIGEM, where the cooperation between EU and the MS is functioning, worked very well as notably the *CODEV* that is financed with the support of French diaspora. It is much appreciated at the local level for the good link with communities and local authorities as confirmed by the site visits carried out during the field mission. However this component has a very limited budget and few small projects can be implemented, hence the impact is limited

- **EQ6:** The separate EU Institutions and their policy mandates are not known in the country. Generally stakeholders interviewed were not sophisticated enough for understanding details of EU internal and external policy areas and to pick up inconsistencies amongst them. In particular in the **Migration policy area the internal EU policy influence the external action** perception and contributes to convey a contradictory message.

It seems that media is not contributing to a nuanced or sophisticated understanding of these issues. For this reason from the start CIGEM has been perceived as a decentralized office of FRONTEX that wanted to limit migration to Europe.

EQ7: The EU relationship with International organisations, notably the United Nation, is based on collaboration with specific UN Agencies mainly at project level. The kind of partnership is based on the added value the single Agencies can bring to the EC in the different cooperation sectors. In the migration field EU financed two UNDP projects: (i) Tokten (transfer of knowledge by the diaspora) which is a component of the CIGEM; and (ii) two projects in the framework of the EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (JMDI). The result of this cooperation is mixed in relation to visibility; EU is not very visible in relation to the projects delivered through UN agency in the migration field, even if UNDP complied with the EU standard visibility rules. The projects were perceived by national stakeholders and even beneficiaries as mainly UN interventions. EU and UNDP have different objectives, approaches and ways of working in this sensitive area. The UN is generally considered by civil society in Mali to be more neutral as an international actor in the migration field.

- **EQ 8:** The EU capacity to allocate communication/visibility budgets and human resources differs from country to country and from region to regions (ACP countries get less than ENPI or other strategic partners such as China, USA or Russia).¹⁰

The annual allocations for the EUD general communication action in Mali is very limited, as in the most of ACP countries, and corresponds to **16.000 EUR per years**. The allocation for visibility at country level is available in the budget of each supported intervention; this is confirmed by the CIGEM case. The EU visibility in the field of migration has been delegated to CIGEM that influenced the public opinion and the media on this matter. The Centre has its own budget and develops its particular communication strategy in line with its objectives and actions; communication professionals worked for this specific project.

The EUD communication strategy in Mali is built around the cooperation sectors of the EDF programmes. The EU Communication is usually linked to specific projects since the limited financial amount for the general communication/visibility budget do not allow for a structured overall strategy at the Delegation level. The EUD could only organise ad-hoc visibility events included field visit to projects with journalists, maintain the web-site and produce an electronic Info-letter. The main visibility event for EUD is the Europe week which is organized every year and which is becoming well known at the level of the National partners.

The ongoing reform of EU external services has an influence on EUD communication and visibility strategies. Part of the EUD (political section) works under the EEAS, while the Cooperation section responds to DG-Devco which is more focused on building awareness on EU programmes and funding instruments. The EUD is confronted with having to deal with priorities more oriented towards political issues. However, an overall Communication strategy at Brussels level (EEAS & Devco) has not been defined yet and not transmitted to the EUD.

¹⁰ See inception report page 51, Table 5 - EU Delegations Communication budget (2010).

9.4 Conclusions

General

- The EU is most known and appreciated for its contribution and work in the development area. There is a very positive perception of the EU for cooperation, but less as a political actor in the migration sector. EC communication and visibility activities alone are not sufficient for generating stakeholders' views on EU external action, rather its image is mostly created and influenced by the positive or negative results of EU interventions and of their benefit or otherwise for the people or for the specific target groups at national level.
- In non-member states, a high level of visibility in a sensitive policy field such as migration can be perceived as the EU wanting to impose its policy and priorities. The policy context can influence and limit the EU communication effort
- At the country level it is difficult to differentiate between the EU level and the MS, with the entire EU "suffering" more than benefitting from the perception of the MS and their actions in the migration field. Differentiation tends to only really occur at the level of government and of elites

Specific to CIGEM

- The strong pressure from the European partner to complete the CIGEM project as soon as possible has resulted in some neglect of the minimum requirements of good preparation of an innovative and politically sensitive intervention of this scope.
- In giving this intervention the form of a centre meant to "manage" migration issues, the project created disproportionate expectations about the services it could actually provide, included a suitable communication activity. CIGEM is still struggling with this initial form, which does not enable it to reach its audiences in an optimal manner.
- CIGEM has so far been dependent on the users who come to the Centre. It has not reached out to its target audiences though an appropriate communication strategy and has essentially reproduced the logic of a central institution waiting for potential users to come forward. Although it listens to their needs, the services offered are considered limited and without much effect on beneficiaries.
- Since CIGEM began to take better account of the specific problems of migrants expelled and deported back to Mali, it has been able to address significant issues such as emergency shelter and support to the first successful reintegration, and has contributed effectively to the piloting of a task force on this topic. Unfortunately, the proposals made by this group have not yet been implemented.
- CIGEM revised its objectives and activities in late 2010. The changed attitude had positive results but it is perceived as distant from people needs and closer to those of the elites. This shows how it is difficult to communicate effectively when the delivery is too modest or perceived negatively by the stakeholders.

9.5 Recommendations

General

- The EC should learn the visibility lessons from the experience of designing a project such as CIGEM, negatively marked by the fact that a new policy approach was turned too rapidly into a support intervention to a particularly sensitive area.
- At times there may be good reasons for achieving outcomes to have less visibility. Keeping a lower profile is sometimes preferable in order to avoid raising unrealistic expectations of what the EU can do.
- EU and MS should have a more coherent approach on how to communicate in policy areas of shared competence in a non-member country, especially where MS have an important mandate such as on migration.

Specific to CIGEM

- Migration is an important issue that is very much in the public eye in Mali. There are visibility benefits therefore to be had from the EU extending and amplifying the support provided to civil society in this area, either to meet the needs of specific categories of individuals and groups affected by migration through CIGEM or independently.
- In visibility terms it would be valuable for the EU to combine better migration with development strategies where it has excellent records, allowing for migration issues to be fully integrated into local development interventions driven by the on-going decentralization process in the country.

ANNEX 1: STANDARD FORMAT FOR EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO EQS (MALI)

EQ 1	“How well does the image of the external action of the EU perceived by the stakeholders correspond to the key issues outlined in the definition and objectives of this external action and to the image the EU seeks to convey?”	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...	
JC.1.1. The EU has managed to disseminate the message to the relevant stakeholders in terms of content and reasons for its external action	Government officials and migration actors (CSOs) in Bamako are aware of the CIGEM project and that it is financed by the EU. Among the general public in the country at regional and local level CIGEM is generally not well known.	
<p><u>Indicator 1.1.1</u> The stakeholders know the definition of the external action of the EU</p> <p><u>Indicator 1.1.2</u> The stakeholders know the content of the definition of the external action of the EU</p>	<p>Despite substantial fund spent for communication activities, in general the national stakeholders are very unclear about the consistency of the objectives of CIGEM and the tools and services provided to achieve them.</p> <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews and focus groups</i></p>	
JC.1.2. The EU has managed to transmit an image to stakeholders that correspond to the image that was sought to be conveyed	In general, CIGEM was not successful in explaining its objectives and the image perceived did not correspond to the one expected by EU at list in the first years (2008-2010) of the project implementation	
<p><u>Indicator 1.2.1</u> The images that are widely perceived by the stakeholders correspond to the communication objectives of the EU on its external action</p>	<p>CIGEM has been presented by the EU Commissioner, the President of Mali, France Minister & the press as an over ambitious project that could convey the information and management of migration at national level, making also the link with the regional and international dimension.</p> <p>The national stakeholder expectations were from the start very high especially concerning the legal and labor migration element. At the beginning the objectives and activities of CIGEM has not been well understood by the local actors and general public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Firstly, it has been perceived as mainly a <u>job-centre</u> to channel legal migration to Europe, especially in France and Spain (two MS Partner of the project). ➤ Then this perception evolved towards considering the centre as a kind of decentralized <u>Office of Frontex</u> to limit the migration to Europe and this contributed to the negative perception toward EU in the migration area. <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews and focus groups, media coverage</i></p>	
<p>Preliminary Findings</p> <p>In general, CIGEM was not successful in explaining its role and in reaching the relevant targets. The image perceived did not correspond to the one expected by EU.</p> <p>CIGEM has been presented as an over ambitious project for information and management of migration at national level, making also the link with the regional and international dimension. The expectations at national level were from the start very high especially concerning the legal and labor migration element and the connection with Europe, notably France and Spain.</p> <p>Despite substantial fund spent for communication activities by CIGEM, the objectives and activities of CIGEM have not been well understood by the local actors. The national stakeholders did not see the consistency of the objectives of the Centre and the tools and services provided to achieve them.</p>		

EQ 2	“How well do the Visibility communication priorities (Key Communication Messages from Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner, i.e.: why, what, how) ¹¹ achieve their objectives?”	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...	
JC 2.1: The priorities (why, what, how) have been well perceived and understood by the stakeholders	The implementation of the visibility strategy of CIGEM provides stakeholders with some information on the policy framework of the global migration policy (why); more on the specific initiative (CIGEM) (what) and not clearly on the opportunities that may arise from it (how). This Communication strategy has not been effective	
<p><u>Indicator 2.1.1</u> The stakeholders perceive well why the EU does have an external action</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.1.2</u> The stakeholders perceive well what defines EU as an actor on the world stage</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.1.3</u> The stakeholders perceive well how the EU deploys its instruments around the world</p>	<p>There is limited conveyance of what defines EU as an actor on the world stage at policy level. The national stakeholders are aware of the EC objective as development actor, but it is difficult for them to differentiate the EU proper external policy from the one of its Member States, notably in the migration sector.</p> <p>There is a widespread awareness on the development activities and on the financial amount of the EC contribution (EDF programme), unclear or negative on what the EU + MS want to achieve in the migration field.</p> <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews and focus groups</i></p>	
JC 2.2.: The formulation of the priorities would have to be changed in order to gain an increased impact	<p>Yes. The theme of migration is very sensitive in Mali and the CIGEM projects generated negative perception among national actors toward the EU proper and EU MS (France/Spain) during the first stage of its implementation</p> <p>CIGEM changed its objectives and activities in 2011 to (i) increase the National appropriation of the Centre by the MMEIA (Minister of Malian living abroad) and (ii) by focusing more on the support to dialogue and consultations element for the planning of National migration policy; (iii) training and capacity building for internal labour market with linkages with national agencies (no more agency to migrate in EU).</p> <p>Better perceived and appreciated for the support to national strategy, but still considered not effective (i) in the professional training, too limited, criteria not appropriate for the participation of migrant expelled ; (ii) awareness raising campaign, <u>it is considered another national institution with no clear services for the people</u>. Many NGOs consider that EU spends a huge budget for a project that is not beneficial to the group targeted (migrants)</p>	
<u>Indicator 2.2.1</u> The stakeholders express the need for another formulation about the external action of the EU in order to make it more visible	<p>Stakeholders made strong complaints about the CIGEM project as it was badly communicated when it started without a clear previous definition of the objectives that EU could realistically achieved.</p> <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews and focus groups</i></p>	
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u></p> <p>The communication for CIGEM has been designed taking into consideration the target groups which are mainly the migrants and CSOs active in the migration area, but the strategy was not consistent with the reality of the CIGEM capacity and of the services provided. The expectations of the target groups were not met and resulted in a negative image for the Centre and consequently for the EU.</p> <p>The strategy has been recently revised into more realistic objectives and well targeted communication. From the analysis of the media and interviews of the relevant actors there are signs of a more positive consideration among of the project and of the EUD action in this field.</p>		

¹¹ Section 2.2 of Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner’s Draft Communication to the Commission: 2 Feb 2006, “The EU in the World: Towards a Communication Strategy for the EU’s External Policy 2006-2009”

EQ 3	To what extent does the EC view itself as implementing a single, clearly defined Visibility strategy to achieve an agreed public image for its external action?	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...	
JC 3.1 – The external actions services have one common visibility strategy	<p>An <i>overall Communication strategy at Brussels level (EEAS & Devco) has not been defined yet and not transmitted to the EUD.</i></p> <p>The EUD communication strategy in Mali is built around the cooperation sectors of the EDF programmes. The EU Communication is usually linked to specific projects, not an overall approach</p>	
<p><u>Indicator 3.1.1</u> The number of communication / visibility strategies in the EC external action services and the variations between them</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.1.2</u> The existence of functioning and respected coordination mechanisms between the responsible services</p>	<p>CIGEM has developed its particular communication strategy for its objectives and actions; communication professionals worked to for this specific project, not for the EU global objectives.</p> <p>Visibility has followed standard EU protocols, but after the negative perception EUD was much more involved in the revision of the communication strategy followed closely all the CIGEM activities, public events, relation with the press and requiring evaluations.</p> <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews CIGEM documentation, media coverage</i></p>	
JC 3.2 – Variations between the existing strategies are explained with valid reasons and an effort has been made to ensure overall coherence	Yes, strategy has been revised so the objective of the project and reasons were explicitly presented to external stakeholder. This changed attitude had positive results for the EUD and for the CIGEM.	
<p><u>Indicator 3.2.1</u> The existence of valid reasons to explain any differences detected between the strategies</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2.2</u> The overall coherence of the existing strategies is explained either in the documents or verbally in a consistent way by the officials responsible for them</p>	SEE JC 2.2	
JC 3.3 – The overall strategy or strategies outline a clear and logical path to achieve the visibility goals of EU external action	The ongoing reform of EU external services has influence on EUD communication and visibility strategy. Part of the EUD (political section) works under EEAS, while the Cooperation section responds to DG-Devco which is more focused on building awareness on EU programmes and funding instruments. The EUD is confronted to deal with priorities more oriented towards political issues.	
<p><u>Indicator 3.3.1</u> The strategy or strategies are easy to follow, specify a clear goal and outline a logical chain of actions.</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3.2</u> The logic of the chain of actions in the strategy(ies) is robust</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.3.3</u> The communication strategies are sound-proofed by communication professionals</p>	<p>At the start CIGEM communication strategy had not clear goals and consistent services & activities.</p> <p>Communication strategy has been carried out by professionals. The problem was the unclear and contradictory message.</p> <p>Full media coverage through different tools from the opening ceremony: <u>beginning</u> more focused on newspaper articles & TV, <u>then</u> evolution towards more radio (the most followed at local level) reportages, and newsletters, awareness events, training for journalists on migration issues.</p> <p><i>Sources Field mission interviews CIGEM documentation, press articles</i></p>	
JC 3.4 – Variations between the existing strategies do not cause problems in creating the right visibility	The revision of the CIGEM communication strategy toward an increased appropriation by the national bodies made the EU image more positive in the country. See JC 2.2	
<p><u>Indicator 3.4.1</u> Evidence of difficulties of achieving the visibility objectives</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.4.2</u> Evidence of difficulties being ascribed to confusion on objectives or differences of points of view between the</p>	There has been a lot of visibility around the CIGEM project. The point is that was a negative one for the EU due to the reasons explained above.	

responsible services	<i>Sources: Field interviews, media coverage</i>
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u></p> <p>Before the institutional changes of the EU External Service following the enter into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EUD communication strategy in Mali was built around the cooperation sectors of the EDF programme and followed guidelines from therelevant Commission services, notably EuropeAid. Now EUD is confronted to deal with priorities more oriented towards political issues, but there is still not a shared single communication strategy at HQ level between EEAS and the Commission. This resulted in a more problematic management of the communication at EUD level.</p>	

EQ 4 “How well do stakeholders perceive the benefits of EU external action and not just its main features?”	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...
JC 4.1. The stakeholders are sufficiently exposed to a communication from the EU on Visibility of its external action that is organised to improve impact, retention, credibility and buying intention	All migration stakeholders (government and civil society), except the general public are quite exposed to visibility actions organized by CIGEM Communications actions directly managed by the EUD are not foreseen under the CIGEM framework
<p><u>Indicator 4.1.1</u> The communication strategies are designed to improve impact, retention, credibility and “adherence/agreement” at the level of targeted stakeholders</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.1.2</u> The communication strategies are implemented to improve impact, retention, credibility and buying intention at the level of targeted stakeholders</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.1.3</u> The communication strategies are monitored and evaluated on impact, retention, credibility and buying intention at the level of targeted stakeholders</p>	<p>The communication strategy has been designed taking into consideration the target groups, but the strategy was not consistent with the reality of the CIGEM capacity and of the services provided. The fact to deceive expectations of the target group resulted in a negative image for the Centre and for the EU.</p> <p><i>Sources: Field interviews, media coverage ,CIGEM evaluation</i></p>
JC 4.2. The stakeholders perceive and value the differences between the benefits of the EU external action and the results or the features/instruments	<p>It is not EC visibility activities that alone generate stakeholders view of EU external action. But is more based on the results of EU interventions and their benefit for the people at national level.</p> <p>The EU is seen as credible and reliable partner in development cooperation, especially in relation to decentralisation & local development programmes, agriculture, environment where EU’s interventions have good track record. This picture is not confirmed in the migration field.</p> <p>At the beginning CIGEM (2008/2009) contributed to create a negative image of EU as concerned migration, since suddenly the expectations focused mainly on the labour migration component have been disappointed.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 4.2.1</u> The communication strategies are designed to improve the perception of benefits at the level of targeted stakeholders</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.2.2</u> The communication strategies are implemented to improve the perception of benefits at the level of targeted stakeholders</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.1.3</u> The communication strategies are monitored and evaluated on the perception of benefits of targeted stakeholders</p>	<p>CIGEM objectives & service are generally defined and overambitious, the related activities are considered not appropriate to answer to the need of potential and return migrants. Public asks for more involvement of CIGEM in the support to expelled & stranded migrants and in the professional capacity building.</p> <p>Within the revised strategy CIGEM support to the design of a National Migration Policy is seen far from people needs (money for another public Institution – to the Elites of the country 10 million EUR 2008-2010 + 7 million 2011-2013).</p> <p><i>Sources: Field interviews, focus group, EC documents, CIGEM evaluation</i></p>
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u></p> <p>The EU is seen as credible and reliable partner in development cooperation sector where EC’s interventions have</p>	

good track record. However, this picture is not confirmed in the migration field for the negative results obtained by CIGEM services in the country.

In general terms it has been noted that it is *not the EC communication and visibility activities that alone generate stakeholder's view* of EU external action, but the image is mostly based on the *results of EU interventions* and their benefit for the people at national level.

EQ 5	To what extent is the EC's visibility/communication work coordinated and complementary with that of the EU Member States, Council and Parliament?
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...
JC5.1 – The EC, MS and Council have a established coordination mechanism to discuss visibility issues	<p>EU and Member States seem to develop their own messages in relation to migration (difference among interests) without clear and visible reference to each other in the country.</p> <p>However Member States and EU policies & approaches are not perceived as different.</p> <p>MS influence the perception of the EU in the migration policy area, especially <i>France & Spain</i>. MS image and heritage is stronger than EU. This is the case for Migration</p>
<p><u>Indicator 5.1.1</u> Evidence of such a coordination mechanism (minutes of meetings held at regular intervals, agenda items on existing Council working groups, etc) being used regularly.</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.1.2</u> Evidence that points agreed on coordination and complementarity of visibility work are then followed up by actions by each of the three parties</p>	<p>There is not a formal Communication strategy with the EU MS at country level. However the cooperation with MS is very well developed at technical level (development) and around specific political issues and themes. Not yet in the migration sector where interests and priorities are different.</p> <p>MS did not follow closely the implementation of the CIGEM,</p> <p><i>Sources: Field mission interviews</i></p>
JC5.2 – Council, EP and MS representatives are aware that their actions have an impact on the visibility of the EU as a whole	<p>CIGEM included objectives & services which needed MS contribution to be implemented (i.e. legal labour migration).</p> <p>Problems are related to the signature of <u>readmission agreement France-Mali</u>, hence impossible to carry out and respect CIGEM engagements in relation to labor migration.</p> <p>MS issues resulted in a negative image for EU.</p> <p>Other components of CIGEM worked very well (<i>co-development</i>, with the support of France and diaspora, however very limited budget and few small projects implemented). Much appreciated at local level, good link with communities)</p>
<p><u>Indicator 5.2.1</u> Evidence of discussions on the need to coordinate with the Commission on visibility</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.2.2</u> Evidence that these discussions on the need to coordinate with the Commission on visibility are then followed up by action</p>	<p>EU put itself in this sensitive field in Mali without enough policy preparation at level of coherence & coordination with MS. There has been a common commitment (EU, MS, ECOWAS) that has not been followed-up.</p> <p><i>Sources: Field mission interviews, EC documents</i></p>
JC5.3 – EC representatives take regular steps to liaise with MS, Council and EP on visibility issues in EU external action	Yes at the development level
<p><u>Indicator 5.3.1</u> Evidence of discussions on the need to coordinate with the Member States, Council and EP on visibility</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.3.2</u> Evidence that these discussions on the need to coordinate with the Member States, Council and EP on visibility are then followed up by action</p>	N/A
JC5.4 – Outside observers in a particular context (eg. In a partner country) see the EU (eg. MS	See JC5.2

embassies and EU Delegation) acting as a single entity rather than as a group of discordant actors	
<u>Indicator 5.4.1</u> No evidence emerges from interviewees or reports of examples of uncoordinated action on visibility or of MS actions conveying contradictory messages to the Commission	
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u></p> <p>Member States and EC/EU policies & approaches in the migration field are not perceived as different by national stakeholders (mainly civil society and journalists). MSs migration policies notably those of <u>France & Spain</u> influence the perception of EU in Mali.</p> <p>In relation to communication the European Delegation and Embassies of MS confirmed that there is not a formal joint communication strategy with the EU & MSs at country level for migration</p> <p>CIGEM develops an independent communication strategy> The EUD followed more closely the work of CIGEM in all aspects, the MSs partner of the project were not much involved.</p>	

EQ 6 Are the EC's messages coherent across different EU external action and internal policy areas?	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...
JC6.1 – EU policy in other areas do not contradict EU external action	Generally stakeholders interviewed were not sophisticated enough for understanding details of EU internal and external policy areas and to pick up inconsistencies amongst them. In particular in the Migration policy area the internal EU policy influence the external action perception (It seems that media is not contributing to a nuanced or sophisticated understanding of these issues. <i>EU is not known in its Institutional Organisation</i> and policy mandate.
<p><u>Indicator 6.1.1</u> Evidence of incoherence between formal policies</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.1.2</u> Awareness among outside observers of incoherence in the EU's policy</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.1.3</u> Evidence from officials working in one EC policy sector that they have taken steps to improve policy coherence between their area of policy and other areas</p>	<p>At the beginning CIGEM has been perceived as a decentralized office of FRONTEX that wanted to limit migration to Europe. No difference in perception among general public and press.</p> <p>Generally actions in the migration area are perceived as contradictory by the national actors in Mali.</p> <p><i>Sources: Field mission interviews, focus groups, media coverage</i></p>
JC6.2 – Existence of contradictory messages being conveyed by different policy sectors	The internal EU migration policy influenced substantially its external action. It contributes to convey a contradictory message
<p><u>Indicator 6.2.1</u> Evidence of contradictions between the visibility and communication strategies of different EC departments responsible for different policy sectors</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.2.2</u> Evidence that EC officials have taken steps to coordinate the messages to be conveyed on different policies so as to iron out possible contradictions</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.2.3</u> Awareness among outside observers of apparent contradictions (lack of coherence) between the messages conveyed by EU officials</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.2.4</u> Existence of press enquiries and requests for explanations about seeming contradictions in messages conveyed by EU</p>	N/A
<u>Preliminary findings</u>	

In the **Migration area the internal EU policy and those of MSs influence the EU external action** perception and contributes to convey a contradictory message.
 EC is appreciated for its development cooperation work, less for this project supporting the management of migration.
 At country level it is difficult for the general public to differentiate among EU institutions and even the EU proper and the MSs are not well distinguished

EQ 7	“How far does the perception of the value added of the EU as a global actor emerge clearly from its presence as in the major international organisations/fora? “	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...	
JC 7.1 The Commission has displayed political leadership in the implementation of its overall communication strategy and visibility activities, both internally and towards Council, MS ,EP and International Organisations	This subject is politically sensitive. EU relationship with International organisations, notably the UN is based on agreements with UN Agencies on specific projects. (UN as channel for EU aid).	
<u>Indicator 7.1.1</u> The degree of leadership (political and managerial) exercised internally to produce policy documents and take decisions (HQ and DEL) <u>Indicator 7.1.2</u> The degree of leadership (political) related to key events with Council, MS and EP <u>Indicator 7.1.3</u> Policy document with clear communication and visibility objective + implementation strategy produced with contribution of all external family DGs <u>Indicator 7.1.4</u> Communication/visibility tools provide improved access to information on EU policies	N/A	
JC 7.2 The Commission has actively supported the further consolidation of the overall EU institutional architecture enabling a more coherent and effective communication and visibility	The new political and institutional configuration established by the <i>Lisbon Treaty</i> (and the related creation of EEAS) has sparked expectations of more coherent and effective visibility strategy the EU policy, however at organisational level the work is just at its initial stage, EUD is facing challenges dealing with priorities more oriented towards political issues such as migration	
<u>Indicator 7.2.1</u> To what extent is the EU Institutional architecture conducive to ensuring responsive and coherent decisions have a strong visibility impact <u>Indicator 7.2.2</u> To what extent EC has expressly push for reforms having a visibility impact	See above	
JC.7.3 The EU Delegation contributed to strengthen the image of the EC in the third countries and the knowledge on the EU policies and activities	EUD worked very well to strenghten the image of EU as development actor and it was effective and very well perceived. The image in the field of migration has been delegated to the CIGEM projects that influence the public opinion and the media on this matter.	
<u>Indicator 7.3.1</u> How the presence of Delegation in third countries is perceived by local stakeholders, including MS and International organizations <u>Indicators 7.3.2</u> To what extent the stakeholder in the country knows the EC policy and actions	EUD is very well perceived as means to implement bilateral EDF programme in the different relevant field. EDF programme is very well known at all level, civil society, press national and decentralised institutions. <i>Sources: Field mission interviews, focus groups, media coverage</i>	
JC 7. 4 If and how the EU has been able to demonstrate its specific added value in relation to the Presidency and MS and to influence the international organizations/bodies while making it visible externally	EU not very visible in relation to <u>projects delivered</u> through UN agency in the migration field. The projects were perceived by national stakeholders and even beneficiaries as mainly UN interventions.	
<u>Indicator 7.4.1</u> Constant key role of the EC in reaching	EUD in Mali cooperates manly with UNICEF and	

<p>EU common positions to be presented in the ECOSOC, selected Trust Funds, UN HR Council.</p> <p><u>Indicator 7.4.2</u> How the EC role is perceived by selected International Organisations (HQ and field)</p> <p><u>Indicators 7.4.3</u> How the role of the EC in international fora is perceived by governments of third parties and OECD countries</p>	<p>UNDP. The kind of partnership is based on the added value the Agencies can bring to EU. Very good relationship with UNICEF for nutrition programme, UNICEF has the experience and expertise</p> <p>In the migration field EU financed the following UNDP projects: 1) <u>Tokten</u> (transfer of knowledge by the diaspora) which is a component of the CIGEM and 2) two projects in the framework of the <u>EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative</u></p> <p>EU and UNDP have different objectives, approaches and way of working in this area. Cooperation for the Tokten project between UNDP and EU will end in 2012</p> <p>JMDI: Good initiative but it did not add a lot to the EU work, since actors & beneficiaries were well known by the EUD.</p> <p>Tokten and JMDI respected the compliance to EU-UN visibility rules, however by national stakeholders they are perceived as UNDP Programmes.</p> <p><i>Sources: Field mission interviews, focus groups</i></p>
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u></p> <p>The relation between the EUD and the UN agencies is not much strategic but more based on collaboration at the level of projects to be funded. EU agencies act mainly as a channel for delivering EC aid.</p> <p>EU work with different UN bodies on the base of their expertise, in the migration field EU financed 2 main projects: the TOKTEN (one component of CIGEM) and projects under the Joint EU-UN initiatives. EUD did not see a big added value of UN in those supported initiative, even if they were successful.</p>	

EQ 8	“How far are the resources mobilized by the EC adequate (human resources, budget) to carry out its visibility/communication strategy?”	
Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators	Evidence identified from ...	
<p>JC 8.1 The Commission has sufficient levels of capacity (at HQ and in Delegations) to manage the various dimensions of communication/visibility actions (strategy programming, support to implementation, M and E)</p>	<p>It seems that the capacity to allocate visibility and communication budgets and human resources differs from country to country and from region to regions (ACP countries get less than ENPI or other strategic partners such as China, USA or Russia. See inception report page 51, Table 5 - <i>EU Delegations Communication budget (2010)</i>)</p>	
<p><u>Indicator 8.1.1</u> Qualification and tasks of staff dealing with communication/visibility in dedicated Unit and at DEL</p> <p><u>Indicator 8.1.2</u> Number of staff in HQ and Delegation compared with similar organisations (UN Agency and/or MS)</p>	<p>Only one Policy Officer is working on visibility at EUD level for the overall topics dealt by the Delegation, included policy issues (not project related).</p> <p><i>Sources: Field mission interviews EUD</i></p>	
<p>JC.8.2 Financial amount of communication visibility budget and % of dedicated budget from projects, programmes, budget support and dialogues</p>	<p>The annual allocations for the EUD <u>general communication action is very limited (16.000 EUR per years)</u> as in the most of ACP countries.</p> <p>The allocation for visibility is mainly available in the <u>budget of each intervention.</u></p>	
<p><u>Indicator 8.2.1</u> Financial amount for staff and management services at HQ</p> <p><u>Indicator: 8.2.2</u> Financial amount for staff and management services at Delegation</p> <p><u>Indicator: 8. 2.3</u> % or amount dedicated to visibility in financed projects/programme to CSOs, UN Agencies, Foundations, and Universities.</p>	<p><i>The EUD communication strategy in MALI is built around the cooperation sectors of the CSP programmes,</i> linked to specific interventions.</p> <p>EUD is invited and participated in the main events organised by the beneficiaries of EU Funds especially at National level (At general level <u>EUD is visible for their participation at visibility events and for the results of the</u></p>	

<p><u>Indicator 8.2.4</u> Availability of budget lines specifically related to visibility or other means to M &E visibility <u>Indicator: 8.2.5</u> EC Resources used to check visibility compliance for projects/programme <u>Indicator 8.2.6</u> Resources used for policy dialogue and new delivery methods</p>	<p><u>interventions in the Country</u>). Neither could figures be obtained for the resources that are used for policy dialogue which is quite actively dealt by the EUD. <i>Sources: Field mission interviews, media coverage</i></p>
<p>JC.8.3 The financial amount available for implement the communication visibility strategy is known by the Commission and the strategy is designed accordingly</p>	<p>The financial amount for the general communication/visibility budget is known, but there is no possibility to have a structured strategy due to budget limited amount. There are only ad-hoc events organised by the EUD each year.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 8.3.1</u> To what extent the strategy is designed taking in consideration the available resources (staff/budget) <u>Indicator: 8.3.2</u> Involvement and training of external DGS and DEL personnel on visibility /communication not working in Communication Units</p>	<p>The main visibility event for EU is the <u>Europe week</u> which is organized every year and which is becoming well known at the level of the National partners. At a general level the EUD produce an <u>electronic Info letter and the EUD the web-site</u>. In addition EUD organize visits on the field with journalists. <i>Sources: Field mission interviews, focus groups</i></p>
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u> The allocation for visibility at country level is available in the budget of each supported intervention; this is confirmed by the CIGEM case. The communication strategy of the EUD is built around the cooperation programme with the country. For migration it has been delegated to CIGEM. The annual allocations for the EUD general communication action in Mali is very limited, as in the most of ACP countries, and corresponds to 16.000 EUR per years. This amount did not allow to implement a comprehensive information and communication strategy. The dedicated resources are also limited (mainly the political officer). Most of staff is involved in the single project implementation and followed the visibility actions included into the intervention.</p>	

<p>EQ 10</p>	<p>How effectively do EC external action staff from different services translate the visibility strategy they are expected to implement into action plans that are consistent amongst each other?</p>	
<p>Expected Judgement Criteria & Indicators</p>		<p>Evidence identified from ...</p>
<p>JC10.1 – Commission staff coordinate with their colleagues in other departments on their visibility work</p>		<p>An overall Communication strategy at Brussels level (EEAS & Devco) has not been defined yet and not transmitted to the EUD.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 10.1.1</u> Evidence of coordination mechanisms (eg. minutes of meetings, correspondence on coordination, etc) <u>Indicator 10.1.2</u> Evidence of changes in draft visibility action plans of different services as a result of having coordinated with colleagues in other services</p>		<p>In relation to <u>the EDF programmes</u> there are many coordination meetings with the different sections at EUD and exchange with the HQs (former Relex and EuropeAid) <i>The visibility plans are related to single interventions.</i> <u>For CIGEM:</u> Many meetings internal at EUD and with responsible people at CIGEM (Director, Communication advisor) but also with journalists, government, civil society. A lot of thinking among EUD and CIGEM responsible people to revised the communication strategy in relation to the revised objectives. EU will not be at the driving seat, migration more as internal policy and process lead by relevant Ministries at the government level and a lot of consultations with all the national actors included the civil society Need to erase negative EU image</p>

	<p>Very mediated intervention. <i>Sources: Field mission interviews, focus groups, media coverage, documents</i></p>
JC10.2 – Commission staff formulate action plans that are clearly based on their visibility strategy	See JC10.1
<p><u>Indicator 10.2.1</u> The links between the action plans and the visibility strategy they are based on are clear and logical</p>	<p>CIGEM has enough financial resources and staff to carry out a comprehensive communication strategy. CIGEM has a very precise communication plan and related actions <i>Sources: Field mission interviews, CIGEM documentation</i></p>
JC10.3 – The visibility action plans produce expected results	<p>CIGEM at the starting has not been effective in reaching the relevant targets. The Strategy at the beginning more focus on convey message to elites in Bamako than in reaching the migrants at local level . Now strategy more focused on the communities at regional level and on different media (more radio, less national paper), based on good practice of past experience.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 10.3.1</u> Evidence of results official expect and linked back to their own action plans <u>Indicator 10.3.2</u> The logical chain of the action plans to the results is solid</p>	N/A
<p><u>Preliminary findings</u> The strategy at country level was more oriented to cooperation areas, not much oriented to other policy areas if not included in the CSP. The new political and institutional configuration established by the <i>Lisbon Treaty</i> (and the related creation of EEAS) has sparked expectations of more coherent and effective visibility strategy of the EU policies, however at organisational level the work is just at its initial stage and no joint guidance and instruction have been prepared. The EUD is facing challenges in Mali dealing with priorities more oriented towards political issues such as migration</p>	

ANNEX 2: THE WORKING METHODS OF THE COMMISSION 2010-2014 – A COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT ISSUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 17 (6) TEU

A communication from the President issued in accordance with Article 17 (6) TEU

Introduction

The three seminars held for the incoming Commission, and the informal meeting of the incoming Commission after the vote of consent by the European Parliament, have been an excellent opportunity to reflect on how we can ensure that the Commission for the next five years can deliver on the tasks it is given under the Treaties. Part of this has been to shape the vision for the future, discussing the key challenges Europe faces and the steps we will take. And the success of a Commission also depends on how it works.

These discussions have helped me to crystallise my intentions about how to fulfil my responsibilities under Article 17 TEU and Article 248 TFEU, most particularly the "internal organisation of the Commission". This note sets out how I intend to organise the College to further our objectives most effectively.

Our workload is such that I had no difficulty in isolating 26 important portfolios, and I may of course revisit the shape of the portfolios in the course of the mandate. But our mission is not the sum of different portfolios, but a collective effort requiring the commitment of all the College to work together effectively. As President, my task is to ensure that collegiality works well: I intend to take a step further in organising the College so that our energies are focused on our collective work as a College.

This note develops three themes concerning the functioning of the Commission which we discussed in our recent seminars:

- The need for prioritisation, so that we can concentrate to best effect;*
- The importance of working together to develop policies in a collegiate, cross-cutting way*
- The requirement for high quality in the Commission's work.*

Its annexes lay out the principles governing the relationship between the members of the Commission, their cabinets, and the services on the one hand, and the coordination of communication on the other.

We are of course a political body and the day to day exercise of these rules needs some flexibility. If necessary, these rules can be adapted in the course of the mandate in the light of experience. But the approach I explain in this note constitute the ground rules which will allow all of us in the Commission and its services to harness our efforts to achieve our common objectives.

José Manuel Barroso

WORKING AS A COLLEGE TO DEVELOP POLICIES IN A CROSS-CUTTING WORLD

Since all decisions are collegiate, all Commissioners have a stake in every decision taken. The opportunities to influence come before a decision is taken, and once it is taken it is for all in the College, and all in the Commission as a whole, to promote and defend it. A collegiate decision is needed to amend a collegiate decision.

My role under the Treaty is to "ensure that the Commission acts consistently, efficiently and as a collegiate body". This is the core objective of organising the Commission to best effect. But achieving this goal also needs the wholehearted commitment of the members of the Commission, their Cabinets and services to cooperate in a spirit of loyalty, confidence and transparency.

An important aspect of this is that all members of College fulfil their responsibilities in terms of attendance in the European Parliament and the Council, and indeed obligations to other bodies such as the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Working as a College also requires ongoing contacts with myself as President and with other Commissioners, so the norm should be that Commissioners are present in Brussels for the full working week.

This section sets out how we should act to give meaning to collegiality and make it work. I regard this as one of the President's main responsibilities, with the support of my Cabinet and the Secretariat-General in particular. More detailed arrangements for decision-making will be set out in revised rules of procedure.

College meetings

The weekly meetings of the College are the primary means for the members of the College to come together and take collective decisions. These meetings require careful preparation: this is the purpose of the weekly "Hebdo" meeting of Heads of Cabinet, and the special meetings of Heads of Cabinet which precede them. Cabinet members speak in these meetings on behalf of their Commissioner, and the purpose of the sequence is to reduce the number of outstanding questions at each stage, so that College meetings are devoted debating the key political issues. Every effort should also be made to avoid new issues being raised at the later stages.

- Absence from the meetings of the College should be restricted to exceptional and justified circumstances such as inter-institutional obligations and the formal requirements of the external representation of the EU.
- The positions taken by the Commission in inter-institutional discussions are prepared by the Group on Inter-institutional Relations (GRI). Established positions can only be changed by referring an issue back to the College through GRI.
- Issues closed at one stage of preparation for meetings of the College should not be reopened at the next stage.
- Proper discussion requires that documents are available in good time and respect established deadlines. Clear, concise documents also help to ensure a focused debate.
- Special arrangements will be required inside the Commission to assist the High Representative/Vice-President in her coordination functions and to help prepare Commission positions.

Orientation debates

The political work of the Commission is not confined to discussions on specific documents and proposals. Orientation debates are used to frame the political parameters within which services should develop a proposal, to discuss sensitive political or moral issues requiring the direct input of the College, or to develop a common approach to general political developments.

- Orientation debates should take place on the basis of a short preparatory note outlining the problem and the main policy options.
- Orientation debates can be held both as part of formal meetings of the College, and as informal meetings.
- The Secretariat-General should record the conclusions of orientation debates, to be distributed afterwards or presented directly to Hebdo.

Groups of Commissioners

Commissioner groups can be one of our most important tools for developing the complex, crosscutting policy initiatives which are the flagship initiatives of the Commission.

The basic model of Commissioner groups should be a group of the most relevant Commissioners meeting with a view to developing a specific policy initiative, often a key policy document or legislative proposal with a specific target date. In principle, groups should not be permanent, but should focus on addressing a specific issues and delivering a defined output on a specified timetable.

They would dissolve once their mission is complete. They will normally be chaired by the chef de file Commissioner, with the support of my Cabinet and the Secretariat-General as well as the Commissioner's own Cabinet and the relevant services. They should report regularly to College on progress or on issues which merit the consideration of the College a whole. Another model would be a group of Commissioners asked to prepare an orientation debate for the College.

- Each Commissioner group will have its own mandate, Chair, members and where appropriate target date fixed by decision of the President.
- Meetings of Commissioner groups should be prepared by meetings of the Director-Generals of the services concerned.
- The President's Cabinet and the Secretariat-General will attend all meetings. In addition, the Secretariat-General will provide the secretariat of all groups.

Commissioners and the services under their authority

Key to the success of the Commission is a recognition that collegiality does not happen in the Commission room alone. It must be the guiding principle of all the work of the Commission.

Responsibility for the coherence and quality of Commission proposals is shared by all who work in the Commission. This must be reflected in the way of working from the earliest point in the development of policy initiatives.

To make the most of the Commission, the resources at our disposal need to be used to best effect. These resources of expertise and knowledge can best be deployed when the different parts of the Commission work in cooperation under clear ground rules, designed to ensure that the political orientations of Commissioners are effectively translated into action by the services. Each actor inside the Commission has a role, and the Commission is most effective when these roles are well understood and respected. The principles governing the relations between members of the Commission and the services under their authority are set out in an annex to this note (Annex 2).

Communication

Successful communication is an important tool to achieve our objectives. It relies heavily on the consistency and focus of our message, which in turn implies maintaining a degree of discipline and respecting principles put in place by the Spokesperson's Service, under my authority. These principles are set out in Annex 3.

PRIORITISATION

Setting political priorities

The Treaty establishes the framework for action by the Union, and the responsibilities of the Commission. In many instances, it gives a specific role to the Commission as regulator, as executive, or as the representative of the EU. Its overall role is clearly set out:

Article 17

1. The Commission shall promote the general interest of the Union and take appropriate initiatives to that end. It shall ensure the application of the Treaties, and of measures adopted by the institutions pursuant to them. It shall oversee the application of Union law under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union. It shall execute the budget and manage programmes. It shall exercise coordinating, executive and management functions, as laid down in the Treaties. With the exception of the common foreign and security policy, and other cases provided for in the Treaties, it shall ensure the Union's external representation. It shall initiate the Union's annual and multiannual programming with a view to achieving interinstitutional agreements.

The Commission has considerable discretion to determine its priorities, within the guidelines laid down by the President under article 17(6)(a). This allows it to respond to key challenges facing the general interest of the Union, and to react to changing circumstances where required. Its exclusive right of initiative, as set out in article 17(2), is our primary tool to further these priorities.

Reflecting the new arrangements for the appointment of the President and members of the Commission under the Treaty of Lisbon, I put forward the Political Guidelines for the next Commission in September 2009, ahead of my election by the European Parliament.

The guidelines will form the basis for the development of the political priorities of the College for its five-year mandate, to be expressed through a Work Programme to be adopted each year reflecting the multi-annual nature of our work.

Work Programme

The Work Programme performs several functions. Externally, it is an important statement of intent for the Commission's exercise of its right of initiative: it signals to the other institutions and to the EU as a whole the Commission's intentions with regard to where it will concentrate its attentions, and when a formal proposal or policy document can be expected. Internally, it is the fruit of collective reflection about collective priorities, even if different initiatives will be spearheaded by different chef de file Commissioners and services. It therefore signals priorities which will be taken into account in the organisation of the Commission's business, the allocation of resources, and its communication work. It helps us to plan the organisation of business, so that we can efficiently organise stages in the process like impact assessments, orientation debates and translation and so that we can organise our communication strategy most effectively. It also helps to identify dossiers requiring upstream coordination between different Commissioners/services.

The Work Programme should also reflect how the Commission will take forward a broader consensus about the EU's priorities. This is reflected in the Treaty of Lisbon, which refers to the Commission's role in initiating programming with a view to interinstitutional agreements. All the institutions offer important input into the process of building Europe's policy agenda for the future. That is why the new Framework Agreement with the Parliament will set out that the European

Parliament Conference of Presidents and the Conference of Committee Chairs will meet the Commission every year, before the adoption of the Work Programme – a meeting to be preceded by an invitation to the President of the European Parliament to visit the College. The conclusions of the European Council and the 18-month forward programmes of the trio of Council Presidencies also be taken into consideration in the Commission's approach.

The Work Programme should reflect the reality of policy making in Europe today. On the one hand, it needs to recognise that complex policies with direct consequences for millions of Europeans across

Member States need to be developed with rigour, if they are to deliver the quality required. It should recognise the need for a longer time horizon. On the other, the Commission needs to remain responsive to changing circumstances.

- The Work Programme will focus on the major political themes which require a multi-annual perspective. Such initiatives may require a series of documents to be adopted by the College over several years.
- All initiatives defining new policy or having significant impacts will require an impact assessment and a positive opinion from the Impact Assessment Board. The planning of adoptions should take full account of the need to complete the impact assessment process in good time.
- At the same time as the Work Programme is agreed, the full list of other items for adoption in the coming year should be submitted. Significant additions in the course of the following year require the agreement of the Cabinet of the President through the Secretariat-General.
- It is the responsibility of chef de file Cabinets and services to draw colleagues' attention to potentially sensitive issues in all initiatives not covered by the formal planning system, including proposals under comitology. This would allow such proposals to be discussed by the College where appropriate.
- Inter-service cooperation from an early stage in the policy-making process is the bedrock of the Commission's work. Inter-service groups should assist the policy making process, including for all initiatives in the Work Programme, with the formal stage of inter-service consultation acting as a final round to involve all relevant services.

Subsidiarity and proportionality

The legislative work of the Commission is governed by the need to respect subsidiarity and proportionality. Article 5 of the Treaty makes it clear that "the use of Union competences is governed by the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality", and the protocol on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality is one of the most important innovations of the Lisbon Treaty, putting in place the new scrutiny mechanism for national parliaments to oversee subsidiarity.

The Commission naturally looks at the key trends which can help European society to develop in a healthy, prosperous, socially stable way. But it is not always for the EU, or the Commission, to act. The Treaty is clear: The Commission acts only within its competence, and only when action at EU level can deliver better than action at national level.

In addition, even when the EU has the power to legislate, this is not always necessary, or even the best way to secure its goals. The use of different delivery tools can sometimes permit a more comprehensive and swift result.

In both cases, we must be prepared to hold off or halt action if respect for subsidiarity and proportionality cannot be established, even if there is a strong constituency of interest asking the Commission to act.

- The implications of all initiatives in terms of subsidiarity and proportionality should be examined when the Work programme is first agreed.

- All impact assessments must include an examination of initiatives in terms of subsidiarity and proportionality, and the justification must be given in the explanatory memorandum accompanying each proposal. Reports of the Impact Assessment Board will specifically identify subsidiarity issues.
- Subsidiarity and proportionality considerations also apply to initiatives received by the Commission under the European Citizens' Initiative, as well as proposals flowing from the exercise of Articles 225 and 241 of the Treaty.

QUALITY AND COHERENCE

Central Services

Collegiality makes the quality and consistency of the Commission's acts and proposals particularly important. Since the College as a whole is responsible for all acts and proposals, the results reflect on all the College.

The Central services of the Commission have a particularly important role to play. The Secretariat-General and the Legal Service support the College through their respective functions of checking coherence, ensuring consistency with the priorities agreed by the Commission, its institutional role and the principles and rules of the Treaties, and ensuring the quality of the Commission's acts and proposals. These services also oversee the system to make sure that all members of the College have had an opportunity to participate in all decisions, and the Secretary-General has a broader role to coordinate the services on behalf of the President.

An important part of this work is the need to organise the flow of business through the College in line with external requirements, inter-institutional considerations, and the Commission's communications strategy. Even if documents are well prepared and meet quality requirements, their precise planning must be seen in this wider context.

The Secretariat-General also acts as quality control and to ensure that rules such as the linguistic regime are respected. It has a particular responsibility for policy coherence, ensuring that the agreed priorities are respected, and that collective work on cross-cutting dossiers starts at an early stage of policy development.

- The College agendas are determined by the President through the work of the Secretariat-General, with the support of the Spokesman's Service.
- The "lines to take" from the Spokesman's Service should be respected in full.
- Central services are also charged with ensuring that the budgetary and resource implications of proposals are consistent with the Commission's decisions and priorities.
- The President provides the final say on all issues of coordination.

Smart Regulation

Smart regulation has two core objectives. The first is to maximise the quality and effectiveness of Commission proposals. The second is to illustrate how the Commission is working in a responsible and professional way. It is therefore the responsibility of the College as a collective exercise; and also the specific responsibility of each Commissioner in respect of each portfolio.

Particularly important to securing these two objectives are ex post evaluation and impact assessment. Ex post evaluation of the effectiveness of existing policies is a fundamental step in developing new initiatives. A real understanding of how far existing policies are producing their intended results allows us to correct shortcomings and to design new initiatives to have a real impact. All significant proposal for a revision or new measure should be based on an evaluation of the policy framework already in place: this will be the basis for the impact assessment.

Impact assessments are increasingly being used as a tool to introduce the European Parliament and Council to the issues at stake behind a proposal. The Impact Assessment Board, established under the authority of the President, provides an impartial analysis of the content and conclusions of impact assessments.

Other issues which need to be assessed for every policy area and every new proposal are administrative burden and simplification. We need to deepen our work and deliver our commitments to reduce administrative burden (with the target of a 25% reduction by 2012), to make compliance with EU rules easier, and to constantly review and update the *acquis communautaire*, working with the other institutions.

The rigour implied by smart regulation requires planning and forethought. Impact assessments require an extra investment in terms of time. Political goals which may bear fruit as an initiative in 2-3 years should soon be starting their impact assessments – and looking at what can be learnt from a careful evaluation of experience to date. An input from across the Commission and from consulting stakeholders is also important, to ensure that the final assessment takes fully into account the economic, social and environmental consequences, as well as issues such as fundamental rights and the impact on SMEs. It is particularly important that the social aspect of the assessment is given proper attention and is clearly identified.

- In addition to new initiatives in the Work Programme, all major proposals should be accompanied by an impact assessment. The Secretariat-General will establish a list of proposals for impact assessment.
- In principle, the positive assessment of the Impact Assessment Board is required before an interservice consultation can be launched.
- All services will account each year for progress in reducing administrative burdens and simplifying compliance with EU rules.
- An evaluation of the existing policy framework should be available before significant new initiatives are put on the Work Programme.

Public Consultation

Consultation makes a major contribution to smart regulation. It is the main tool to collect the evidence and opinions needed to shape proposals suited to a varied EU of 27 Member States; to test out ideas; and to build consensus. Consultations should be open and transparent, and respect in full the minimum standards for consultation. Consultation is also an obligation for every impact assessment: stakeholders should be able to comment on a clear problem definition, an analysis of subsidiarity, and a clear description of the possible options.

Consultation does not however impose any obligation on the Commission to follow the opinion of a particular stakeholder. The Commission retains full responsibility for its proposals, and all the political conclusions it reaches must be the result of the Commission's own deliberation.

ANNEX 1 - EXTRACTS FROM THE TREATY OF LISBON

Article 17

1. The Commission shall promote the general interest of the Union and take appropriate initiatives to that end. It shall ensure the application of the Treaties, and of measures adopted by the institutions pursuant to them. It shall oversee the application of Union law under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union. It shall execute the budget and manage programmes. It shall exercise coordinating, executive and management functions, as laid down in the Treaties. With the exception of the common foreign and security policy, and other cases provided for in the Treaties, it shall

ensure the Union's external representation. It shall initiate the Union's annual and multiannual programming with a view to achieving interinstitutional agreements.

.....

6. The President of the Commission shall:

- (a) lay down guidelines within which the Commission is to work;
- (b) decide on the internal organisation of the Commission, ensuring that it acts consistently, efficiently and as a collegiate body;
- (c) appoint Vice-Presidents, other than the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, from among the members of the Commission.

A member of the Commission shall resign if the President so requests. The High Representative of the

Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy shall resign, in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 18(1), if the President so requests.

Article 248

Without prejudice to Article 18(4) of the Treaty on European Union, the responsibilities incumbent upon the Commission shall be structured and allocated among its members by its President, in accordance with Article 17(6) of that Treaty. The President may reshuffle the allocation of those responsibilities during the Commission's term of office. The Members of the Commission shall carry out the duties devolved upon them by the President under his authority.

ANNEX 2 - PRINCIPLES GOVERNING WORKING RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, THEIR CABINETS AND THE SERVICES OF THE COMMISSION

Article 17 of the Treaty on the European Union states that 'the President of the Commission shall decide on the internal organisation of the Commission, ensuring that it acts consistently, efficiently and as a collegiate body'. This document, which is attached to the Communication from the President to the College [reference], sets out the basic, compulsory principles for sound cooperation between the Members of the Commission, the cabinets, the Directorates-General and the Commission services¹. It applies to relations within the same portfolio and covers other relations that are necessary for general coordination within the institution.

The principles set out below can be supplemented by practical arrangements indicated on the attached form. This annex must be filled in by common consent between the Member of the Commission and the Director-General² and sent to the President's cabinet and the Secretary-General.

1. PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION AND RESPECTIVE ROLES

1.1. Principles of cooperation

Cooperation is established primarily between the Member of the Commission and the Director-General and must be supplemented by a close relationship between the cabinet and the services. The Members of the Commission, the cabinets and the services are collectively responsible for working together closely in order to ensure effective implementation of the President's policy guidelines and the College's priorities. They establish working relations based on loyalty, trust, transparency and the mutual provision of information, in keeping with the principles set out in this document.

Any differences in the implementation of these principles are dealt with by the President through his/her cabinet and the Secretariat-General.

1.2. Member of the Commission and Director-General

A close personal relationship based on trust and the mutual provision of information must be established between each Member of the Commission and the Director-General concerned. The Member of the Commission issues general guidelines or gives instructions to the Director-General, in accordance with the College's priorities. The Director-General, for his/her part, advises the Member of the Commission on the files relating to his/her portfolio and informs him/her of any subjects of relevance to the implementation of the priorities or the management of his/her services. He/she is accountable to the Member of the Commission and the College for proper implementation. The Member of the Commission sees to it that contacts are maintained with the staff of the services under his/her authority and organises at least one annual meeting with them.

1.3. Cooperation between cabinet and services

In addition to the direct relationship between a Member of the Commission and the Director-General concerned, there is daily cooperation between the cabinet and the services. They work together in a

spirit of loyalty and mutual assistance, in keeping with their respective powers.

1 This designation also covers the offices of the Commission.

2 This designation also covers the directors of the offices of the Commission.

As a matter of principle, the cabinet is represented by the Head of Cabinet or the Deputy Head of Cabinet, and the Commission services are represented by the Director-General, a member of the hierarchy or his/her assistant. The assistant to the Director-General acts on behalf of the Director-General as the main interface between the cabinet and the Commission services. The cabinet and the Commission services establish by common accord (in the attached document) their respective points of contact and describe how any specific existing or new coordination or liaison structures function.

1.4. Responsibilities of cabinets

A cabinet is at the direct service of the corresponding Member of the Commission and works in the general interest of the institution. It plays an essential role in the proper functioning of the collegiate system. The cabinet is actively involved in preparing the meetings of the College, at which it expresses the points of view of the Member of the Commission on the various points on which decisions are to be taken.

As regards sound cooperation between cabinets and services, it is important to stress that:

- the cabinet draws as much as necessary on the assistance of the services under the authority of the Member of the Commission;
- the cabinet informs the Commission services of the College's work, especially when it has a direct impact on their activities, and of the decisions taken by the Member of the Commission;
- the cabinet represents the Member of the Commission to the outside world, in line with his/her instructions, with the exception of the Member's formal institutional responsibilities. Questions of a technical nature relating to the portfolio are passed on to the services. Whenever the Member of the Commission is unable to attend an event which is one of the tasks of his/her service and he/she cannot be represented by a Member of his/her cabinet, he/she asks the Director-General or another senior Member of the service to represent him/her;
- the cabinet does not involve itself in the direct management of the services, which is the exclusive responsibility of the Director-General.

Where appropriate, the Member of the Commission or his/her cabinet may ask the Secretariat-General (SG), the Legal Service (SJ) or the Spokesman's Service (SPP) to attend strategy or information meetings, especially when they consider topics relating to major and/or general policy, legal or communication issues.

1.5. Responsibilities of services

The services of the Commission work under the responsibility of the College, and are placed by the President under the authority of the Member of the Commission in charge of the portfolio concerned.

The services are responsible for implementing the President's policy guidelines and the priorities decided by the College and developed by the Member of the Commission and – to this end – are actively involved in drawing up the institution's policies and initiatives. The services have a responsibility to work together in good faith and are coordinated by the Secretariat-General on behalf of the President. To this end, the services apply the guidelines and instructions issued by the President, via his/her cabinet or the Secretariat-General.

In this context, it is important to emphasize that:

- the Director-General is fully responsible for the management of the services under his/her authority, and for the effective implementation of the guidelines and decisions adopted by the Member of the Commission. He/she is accountable to the Member of the Commission and the College for his/her management;
- the services keep the cabinet regularly informed of progress in the files and activities of its services;
- the services also inform the Member of the Commission of relevant documents, especially key reports drawn up by the various monitoring authorities (see point 5.2);
- in principle, the positions of the services are passed on to the cabinet by the Director-General or his/her representative indicated in the annex. The services inform their cabinet of any direct contact with other cabinets.

1.6. Exchanges of information/communication

There must be a continuous, transparent and smooth exchange of information between the Member of the Commission and the services, on the basis of the following principles:

- exchanges and meetings on policy priorities, their implementation and the methods of cooperation between the cabinet and the services are regularly organised between the Member of the Commission and the Director-General. Good coordination between cabinets and services is ensured by a weekly strategy meeting between the Head of Cabinet and the Director-General and/or their representatives indicated in the annex;
- in principle, instructions from the cabinet to the services are sent directly by the Head of Cabinet or his/her deputy to the Director-General and his/her assistant. Instructions or positions sent by members of the cabinet must be sent on behalf of the Member of the Commission. If, in exceptional cases, the cabinet has to communicate directly with the services, it informs the Director-General thereof via his/her assistant;
- where a cabinet sends a service requests for which it does not have the authority, they must be sent through the responsible cabinet, which informs the assistant of the Director-General of the service concerned;
- in principle, the positions of the services are sent to the cabinet by the Director-General, or by a representative of the hierarchy or his/her assistant. Services ensure that any position sent to the cabinet reflects the position of the Director-General or the service. Any information notified to the cabinet by the services is deemed to have been provided to the Member of the Commission. In order to simplify matters and to give people more responsibility, routine

replies on a known and established position of the service may be provided directly by a head of unit or a director to the Member of the cabinet responsible for the file, with a copy being sent to the Director-General's assistant for information purposes;

- replies that require the adoption of a new position or a change in position, and replies on sensitive topics, are sent by the Director-General to the Member of the Commission or, where appropriate, to his/her Head of Cabinet.
- cabinets and services give priority to electronic communication tools for sending documents and messages. They may use written instructions, where appropriate, depending on the nature of the information.

The specific principles governing cooperation agreed by common accord between the services and the cabinets are to be set out in the document attached to this document.

2. FORMULATION OF POLICY

2.1. Strategic planning cycle

Cabinets and services are jointly involved in drafting policy guidelines by advising the Member of the Commission and providing him/her with any necessary relevant information. The services are responsible for implementing the priorities adopted.

The Director-General organises and coordinates the work of the services concerning the priorities set by the Member of the Commission. He/she must obtain the prior agreement of the Member of the Commission before launching any new initiative, except those relating to routine management.

Strategy meetings between the Director-General and the Member of the Commission on the coordination of action with a view to implementing the policy priorities established by the College must be held at regular intervals, at least once per month.

2.2. Coordination and interservice consultations (CIS)

Implementation of the President's policy guidelines and the College's priorities implies close cooperation between the cabinet and the services with the same portfolio. It also requires a high degree of coordination with the other cabinets and services in order to ensure that the Commission functions on a collegiate basis and that its proposals are of high quality. In this area, cabinets and lead services respectively are responsible for informing the other cabinets and services concerned at their level in order to ensure that major initiatives are prepared as far upstream as possible. The Secretariat-General ensures that this principle is properly applied, under the authority of the President, and – if necessary – carries out this coordination work directly.

In accordance with the rules in force on interservice consultations, it should be remembered that:

- the cabinet is consulted before the launch of any interservice consultation that concerns its portfolio and involves a new policy initiative or a politically sensitive policy initiative. Services inform the cabinet of the interservice consultations that come under routine management (especially those of a financial nature) of the portfolio of the Member of the Commission. The attached document must set out the practical arrangements for consultation;
- in addition, the services inform the cabinet of the particularly important interservice consultations launched at the initiative of other services. Where the services issue a negative opinion, they send the cabinet a copy of the reply with a view to future discussion in the College;
- in any event, the cabinet informs the services of the major changes introduced during discussion between cabinets or in the College.

3. RELATIONS WITH THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS

In order to ensure that the Commission's positions are consistent vis-à-vis the other institutions, the cabinets of the President and of the Member of the Commission responsible for interinstitutional relations, the Secretariat-General and all the cabinets and services duly exchange information regarding meetings and other forms of contact with the various institutions. The Interinstitutional Relations Group (IRG) and the Interinstitutional Relations Pre-Group (IRPG) provide coordination on behalf of the President and the College.

The Secretariat-General acts as an interface between the Commission and the other European Union institutions, the Member States' parliaments and non-governmental bodies and organisations. The SG is responsible for the smooth coordination of the Commission's activity and positions vis-à-vis the other institutions.

In this connection:

- Cabinets and the various services must exchange information concerning any formal or informal contact which they have with the other institutions and which has an impact on their own activities or on joint activities. The services must alert the cabinets to important points of view expressed by MEPs on matters relating to their portfolio, in particular sensitive oral or written questions.
- Cabinets and services must liaise in preparation for IRG meetings in order to ensure that the positions expressed within a given portfolio are consistent. The services must inform the cabinets of the outcome of IRPG meetings.
- Correspondence sent by a Member of the Commission to the other institutions (or to their representatives) must be drafted the services, and the IRG and the Secretariat-General must be notified thereof.
- The services must also provide representation at the appropriate level (in principle, a service's senior management) in meetings with the other institutions (in particular the European Parliament, the Council and the Committees), without prejudice to the specific role played by the Secretariat-General on behalf of the President and the Vice-President responsible for interinstitutional relations.
- The services must prepare answers to MEPs' oral and written questions, draw the cabinets' attention to questions on sensitive topics and prepare background documents for the EP's part sessions and meetings of the Council.
- The services must prepare the Commission's position on European Parliament amendments or in advance of meetings of the conciliation committees under the standard legislative procedure, and also Commission communications concerning the Council's common positions (legislative procedures).
- Whilst Commission proposals or other initiatives are being negotiated, cabinets must be systematically informed by the services regarding the course of the discussions within the European Parliament's committees and Council working parties, and regarding the work of COREPER. Any change in position by comparison with the established remit must be discussed with the cabinet and drawn to the IRGs attention.

4. SPEECHES, BRIEFINGS AND CORRESPONDENCE

4.1. Speeches and briefings

A cabinet may ask the services to provide briefings and speeches for a Member of the Commission or his/her representative. High-quality documents delivered on time will ensure that the Member of the Commission is supported effectively by his/her cabinet and services as he/she carries out his/her duties.

The cabinet's responsibilities

The cabinet asks the service to ensure that contributions for the briefings and speeches to be prepared for the Member of the Commission or his/her representative are made available within a

reasonable deadline (if possible, at least 10 working days before the event). A briefing request includes the essential information needed to ensure that the services properly understand the content and the salient points of the meeting, in particular any previous positions adopted by the Member of the Commission on the subject in question. It is sent to the Director-General via his/her assistant. Any specific arrangements are to be detailed in an annex.

Where possible, a member of the services will be asked to attend the meeting or the event. The cabinet gives the service feedback concerning the quality and the usefulness of the briefings provided (level of detail, length, etc.) and provides a report on the event. The member of the cabinet responsible forwards the final version of the briefing or speech to the Member of the Commission (with a copy to the service) and to the spokesman.

Where the Member of the Commission or his/her representative goes away on mission, the briefing or a file containing the schedule and the main messages must be shared in advance with the Commission representation in the Member State or the EU delegation.

The service's responsibilities

The briefing/speech is produced by the services within the specified deadline, in accordance with the good practices and the examples given on the Commission's Intranet site for the President's briefings.

The draft briefing/speech is forwarded electronically to the member of the cabinet responsible. The rules governing prior approval within the service are to be laid down in an annex. The services forward requests for speeches/briefings issued by other Members of the Commission and received directly by the cabinet. The draft prepared by the service is sent to the Head of Cabinet, who forwards it to the requesting cabinet.

Specific working arrangements may be devised in the case of cross-sector portfolios requiring the involvement of several services.

4.2. Dealing with correspondence

Pursuant to the Code of Good Administrative Practice, any correspondence received by a cabinet must be answered at an appropriate level within 15 working days. The deadline set for the draft reply to be prepared by the service and forwarded to the Member of the Commission takes this requirement into account.

The relevant cabinet is responsible for correspondence addressed to a Member of the Commission. Where the service's expertise is required for the draft reply, the cabinet sends the correspondence to the Director-General's assistant.

If the correspondence is written in a language other than French, English or German and requires an urgent reply, the cabinet has it translated into one of those languages before it is sent to the service for a reply to be drafted, and also has the draft reply translated.

Correspondence addressed to the Commission President is covered by a special procedure under the responsibility of the Secretariat-General. Draft replies prepared by the services are validated by the Director-General and the corresponding cabinet must be notified of the fact. The specific arrangements are to be detailed in an annex.

Multi-Commissioner correspondence

Correspondence addressed to more than one cabinet is covered by a special procedure administered by the Secretariat-General and intended to ensure that correspondents receive a single, internally consistent reply from the Commission. The Secretariat-General consults the cabinets in order to find out which of them have been contacted. It registers the correspondence and allocates it to the service(s) concerned, so that a reply on behalf of the relevant Members of the Commission can be prepared. Any associated services are consulted regarding the draft reply. The letter is signed and sent by the Director-General/the head of service or a member of the appropriate service. It explicitly states that the reply has been drawn up on behalf of all those to whom the correspondence is addressed. A copy of the reply is forwarded to the cabinets concerned by the Secretariat-General.

5. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND THE HANDLING OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION

The Commission has introduced various mechanisms for planning its work, for optimum management of its resources and for ensuring that the relevant information reaches the people responsible in goodtime. Those mechanisms are operated by the service under the supervision of the appropriate general departments⁸. Both the services and the cabinets must be familiar with those mechanisms and comply with the rules relating to them.

5.1. Human-resource management

Staff are recruited in accordance with the Staff Regulations applicable to officials and other servants of the European Communities and the specific procedures adopted by the Commission, in particular the Decision on the exercise of the powers conferred on the Appointing Authority (AA)⁹ and – for the cabinets in particular – the Communication concerning the composition of the cabinets of Members of the Commission and of spokesmen.

The Appointing Authority for middle managers within the services is the Director-General/head of service. In the case of grades AD13 and AD14, the procedure calls for the prior agreement of the Commission President, of the Member of the Commission concerned and of the Member of the Commission responsible for personnel¹¹. In the case of grades AD9 to AD12, the Member of the Commission must be consulted.

5.2. Management of financial resources

It may be recalled that a Director-General is responsible for the smooth running of his/her service in accordance with the rules and standards laid down by the College. He/she accounts for his/her responsibility by means of his/her annual report to the Member of the Commission and to the College. Detailed information is called for in order to enable (in particular) the Member of the Commission to exercise his political authority over the service concerned and, where appropriate, to carry out monitoring as part of the budgetary-discharge procedure.

Accordingly:

- The Director-General and his/her services endeavour to identify and reduce management related risks.
- Once the Member of the Commission has taken up office, the services provide him/her regularly with appropriate information concerning budgetary and financial matters. They draw his/her attention to any major problem in this area, relating to a previous, current or foreseeable state of affairs.
- In this connection and on the basis of the principle of sound cooperation, the services supply the Member of the Commission with the relevant documents which will enable him/her to assess the service's financial situation¹². The Member of the Commission is also informed of any substantial change concerning the Directorate-General's financial systems and the checking procedures.
- Prior to finalisation of the annual activity report, the Director-General notifies the Member of the Commission concerning the caveats which could be added to the declaration of assurance. The action plan proposed by the Director-General for the purpose of remedying the weaknesses identified by means of the caveats is set out in a written document and is covered by a specific follow-up procedure. The Member of the Commission and the Director-General meet at least twice a year in order to discuss the internal-control weaknesses highlighted or the caveats expressed in the services' annual activity report and the action plans devised in order to remedy them.
- With regard to the management of the administrative appropriation for which the cabinets have a specific budget, the Directorate-General and the cabinet are kept entirely separate, particularly where mission and entertainment expenses are concerned.

5.3. The handling of sensitive information

If the cabinets and the services communicate to the outside world any information of an internal, confidential or classified nature, they will be liable to the disciplinary measures laid down in the Code of Good Administrative Practice and the legal provisions in force.

The Director-General immediately forwards to the Member of the Commission any sensitive information which may engage his/her responsibility and/or that of the College. Such notification is carried out by means of the following formal referral procedure:

- Written notification giving rise to a swift formal response on the part of the Member of the Commission in whatever form he/she judges most appropriate (personal interview, request for additional information, etc.).
- Drawing up of a documented action plan, the implementation of which is covered by specific monitoring arrangements agreed between the services and the Member of the Commission. The Member of the Commission is also informed – as soon as he/she takes office – of serious situations which have come to light in the past and which have not been fully remedied, and also of any fraud or irregularity brought to the attention of the Director-General and likely to have a significant impact on the European Union's reputation and/or budget. The services convey to the Member of the Commission the reports or documents relating to the investigations carried out by OLAF which require special follow-up.

Annex Form detailing the working arrangement agreed by the Members of the Commission, the cabinets and the services.

PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS GOVERNING WORKING RELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, CABINETS AND SERVICES

Member of the Commission:

.....

DG/service:

_____ Specific working arrangements have to be laid down by the cabinets and services in this document.

The aim of this Annex is to define in more detail the implementation of the principles laid down by the President of the Commission on the working relations between Members of the Commission. In any event, it cannot derogate from these principles.

1. PRINCIPLES OF CO-OPERATION AND RESPECTIVE ROLES

Compulsory:

Points of contact for relations between the Cabinet and the services of the DG (name, hierarchical position and function)

.....

Persons authorised to represent the Member of the Commission (name, grade, area (if the representation is limited)):

.....

Optional:

Specific coordination or liaison structures between the Cabinets and services:

.....

Compulsory:

Strategy meetings on policy priorities (Member of the Commission/Director-General):

Planned frequency (at least 1 per month except for the offices):

.....

Planned day and time:

Optional:

Agenda and minutes:

Other participants:

Miscellaneous:

.....

19

Meetings between Head of Cabinet and Director-General

Participants (name, hierarchical level and function):.....

.....

...

Optional:

Drafting and dissemination of the agenda and documents for the meeting (persons responsible, deadlines)

.....

Drafting and dissemination of minutes (persons responsible, deadlines) :

.....

Miscellaneous:

.....

.....

2. FORMULATION OF POLICY

Compulsory:

Specific arrangements for consultation of Cabinet by the services before the launch of an interservice

consultation in the portfolio relating to a new policy initiative or a politically sensitive initiative:

.....

.....

3. RELATIONS WITH THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Optional:

Specific arrangements for management of relations with the other institutions:

.....

.....

4. SPEECHES, BRIEFINGS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Compulsory:

Arrangements for briefing requests from Cabinets:
.....
.....

Arrangements for the drafting and transmission of briefings by services (contact persons, approval, etc.):
.....
.....

Optional:

Specific arrangements for briefings requiring the involvement of several services (horizontal portfolios).....
.....
.....

Compulsory:

Specific arrangements for dealing with mail:
20

5. MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES AND PROCESSING OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Optional:

Specific arrangements laid down by the services and Cabinets by mutual agreement:
.....
.....

6. OTHER WORKING ARRANGEMENTS LAID DOWN BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CABINETS AND SERVICES (OPTIONAL)

Additional arrangements may be agreed. They must abide by the principles set out in the main document and the rules laid down in the area concerned.

.....
.....

Date:

Approved by:

**Member of the Commission
General**

Director-

ANNEX 3 EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Introduction

The external communication of the Commission is dependent on the political impetus of the College of commissioners and its success is firmly anchored in the principle of collegiality. The guidelines below relate to the interaction between the following factors:

- the political level (the President, the commissioners and their cabinets)
- the work of the Spokespersons' Service
- the activities of DG COMM (including the representations in the Member States)
- the communication activities of the Directorates-General (DGs)

The implementation of these guidelines aims to improve the quality and coherence of the Commission's communication. The Commission will also aim to strengthen its strategic communication through enhanced planning and coordination.

1. Relations between cabinets and the Spokespersons' Service (SPP)

The Spokespersons' service is placed under the authority of the President and is administratively linked to DG Communication. The SPP is the official voice of the Commission vis-à-vis the written, audiovisual and internet press. It provides information about the policies and decisions of the Commission to the media. It ensures media coverage of the Commission through a pro-active strategy.

The spokespersons serve the common interest of the Commission. In this collegiate context, each spokesperson is in charge of media communication for the member of the Commission whose portfolio he/she represents.

The SPP is in charge of organising press conferences, technical briefings and VIP corners in Brussels as well as, in cooperation with the representations of the Commission, in the countries visited by Members of the Commission. It deals with political issues in the press and organises daily midday briefings for the accredited press. It prepares and issues all press releases and press memos as well as the speeches of the commissioners. It provides internal and external strategic press planning tools (News Ahead and Top News respectively), as well as a weekly calendar of visits and meetings by the Members of the Commission.

In order to allow the Spokespersons' Service and the relevant spokesperson to manage their relations with the media in an efficient and pro-active manner, the spokesperson should be involved closely in the work of the cabinet:

- (i) The spokesperson must have access to information in order to communicate effectively. Planning and managing the media impact of dossiers is an integral part of the political decision-making process.
- (ii) The spokesperson should take part in the daily work of the cabinet and participate in all relevant meetings.
- (iii) He/she must work in close cooperation with the member of cabinet in charge of communication as well as with the members in charge of files with a media interest.
- (iv) Lines to Take should be submitted to the approval of the cabinet who will deal with them swiftly before they are communicated to the press. Lines to Take for the daily midday press briefing must be cleared by 11:30 am at the latest.
- (v) Cabinet clearance may also be required for requests for interviews, draft replies to interviews and draft articles prepared by the SPP.
- (vi) Regular meetings should be organised by the cabinet, the SPP and the information and communication unit of the DG in order for communication instruments to be used in a coherent fashion.
- (vii) The spokesperson should share 'lessons learnt' from media events with the cabinet in order to improve the planning, coordination and coherence of political communication.

2. Communication and the Directorates-General

As a general rule, the SPP and the Representations of the Commission in the Member States are responsible for contacts with the media.

The information & communication unit of the DG is the key partner of the SPP. In order to allow it to fulfil this central role:

- (i) the spokesperson, the cabinet and the information & communication unit must be in regular contact through media planning meetings;
- (ii) the unit must be included in the management meetings of the DG;
- (iii) the unit should appoint a contact person in charge of relations with the SPP in order to ensure the quality and swift delivery of press material. This member of the unit must have the skills required to draft, or coordinate the drafting, of lines to take and other quality press materials at short deadlines;
- (iv) he/she should keep the spokesperson informed about any forthcoming announcement or event that will need proactive communication with the media or which may raise questions from journalists. The spokesperson will equally inform the DG in good time of his/her needs as regards the preparation of press material and provide political guidance for this material. In most cases, the best way to ensure the success of this joint planning process will be the preparation and regular updating of a written joint media plan;
- (v) he/she will deal with requests from the SPP addressed to the DGs, including requests for Lines to Take for use in the press room. This procedure should be swift and documented in writing. It should guarantee that a quick and precise reply can be provided to questions from journalists and the public;
- (vi) he/she will prepare draft press releases, draft interview replies and articles, press packs, technical briefing notes and replies to the technical questions from the press for the SPP. Following the agreed procedure, DGs will send their draft by e-mail to the spokesperson, with a copy to the Head of cabinet or the member of cabinet in charge of the file. The portfolio spokesperson will clear the press releases and ensure that they are issued through the RAPID database and transmitted to all the Representations of the Commission in the Member States;
- (vii) under the responsibility of the spokesperson and the cabinet, he/she will take care of the administration and updating of the Commissioner's website.

DGs will communicate with interested parties and the general public in coordination with the SPP and DG COMM, on the basis of the communication priorities established by the Commission and always in accordance with the Lines to Take established by the SPP. Communication activities should be part of the communication plan of the DG developed in consultation with the cabinet and the spokesperson.

DGs should provide the material for their external communication activities and keep, if the need arises, a team of personal ambassadors.

In terms of the media, as long as the request for information concerns a technical matter under the responsibility of the DG, the DG can reply to the request taking care to inform the aforementioned Communication and Information Unit and/or the person in charge of public relations in the DG as well as the portfolio spokesperson. The services must be particularly careful with any subject on which the Commission hasn't adopted an official position.

3. Relations between the cabinets and DG Communication (DG COMM)

DG COMM provides a number of services to members of the Commission and cabinets in order to strengthen the Commission's communication activities. It also provides daily press reviews from the most important news outlets in each member state, a political information service and an alert service highlighting the most important/urgent information from press agencies.

To direct the work of DG COMM the cabinets should:

- (i) provide the political direction for the content of external communication activities
- (ii) plan the activities of their Commissioner in the Member States, especially the Commissioner's visits. The Cabinet should involve the representations the Member States and DG COMM well in advance and use the check list prepared for this purpose (below) so that the latter can help in the preparation of the visit;
- (iii) respond to the information provided by DG COMM or the representations and ensure that it is followed up on;
- (iv) inform DG COMM and the representation concerned about any initiative that could have media or political repercussions, particularly letters and declarations. Instructions should be given to DGs under the responsibility of the cabinet to do the same for initiatives taken at the level of the DG.

The Representations of the Commission in the Member States should:

- (i) consult cabinets about sensitive political issues as well as, at the same time, inform the SPP and, where necessary, the DG concerned;
- (ii) following the request of the SPP, contribute to briefing packs for members of the Commission for their use when speaking to regional and national media during their visit to the Member State;
- (iii) in agreement with the SPP, adapt Lines to Take to the political and media situation in the Member States and, where necessary, propose Lines to Take to the SPP on important national issues which might have consequences for European politics. The principles described below are based on the Commission guidelines on external communication of March 2009.

How to plan Commissioners' missions to Member States

Check-list

The purpose of this document is to give Cabinet members a clearer understanding of how the Commission Representations can assist them before and during working visits of Commissioner to the Member States.

Our Representations are our voice, ears and eyes in the Member States. We have one office in each capital city and eight regional offices¹⁵ in which over 500 staff work. Representations are the ideal partner for preparing your Commissioner's missions. Whether your need to set up meetings with political leaders, interviews with key national media, working visits to projects or specific briefings, the Representations are there to help you.

The most important and first step is to contact the Head of Representation or his/her staff well in advance (but the representations have experience of delivering at short notice as well):

- Six weeks' notice is ideal
- Relevant information to share and/or discuss includes the objective of the visit, who will be part of the delegation, requests for briefings, meetings and deadlines and requests for logistical assistance
- You can find all the contact details and more here:

[HTTP://WWW.CC.CEC/DGINTRANET/COMM/REPS_CORNER/INDEX_EN.HTM](http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/comm/reps_corner/index_en.htm)

Catalogue of Representations' services

Catalogue of Representations' services	Contact	Deadline
<p>1. Setting up meetings with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government, Parliament, Political Parties • Civil society, general public and/or other stakeholders 		
<p>2. Increasing the visibility and media coverage of your visit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews and press conferences • Media monitoring of the visit 		
<p>3. Providing relevant contributions to your mission file:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice on formulating the mission's programme • Background information on your Commissioner's interlocutors (relevant briefings) 		
<p>4. Your logistical needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – confirm arrangements for arrival / transit / departure – confirm any fees which Commissioners and delegations will have to pay – inform relevant national authorities and EU agencies about the visit • Security: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – check whether national authorities require/offer extra protection - guards, motorcades, etc • Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – car for Commissioner: • Missions with official agenda of travel submitted beforehand : Representation car & driver under special provisions • all other cases: car to be rented, with/without chauffeur. These costs will be charged to the Commissioner's mission allocation. – Representation to assist at arrival/departure/transit at the airport/rail station 		

ANNEX 3: A COMPREHENSIVE COMMON MIGRATION POLICY (2008)

Over the coming years the EU will need to further reinforce and intensify a comprehensive common migration policy, based on a continuation of the work carried out over the last 7 years (flowing mainly from the Tampere European Council Conclusions).

Such a comprehensive policy covers the internal and external aspects of migration; it needs to deal with legislation, but also with practical cooperation. On the one hand we need a *consolidation* of the results which have already been achieved in the development of the EU's migration acquis (notably the control of the correct implementation and application of the already existing Directives and financial instruments). On the other hand, this process will include a deepening of our policies, including *new legislative proposals and new concepts* that will strengthen the implementation of existing policies.

These will be centered on five axes (legal migration, illegal immigration, integration, asylum and external relations) all equally important and mutually completing each other.

1. Better steered immigration

- Matching the EU's needs with due respect to acceptability in terms of capacity of absorption and guarantee of no brain drain.
- Migration has not to hamper the EU labour market – rules on priority and nondiscrimination must be respected
- Immigration is no panacea for problem of ageing populations – social policy, employment policy and family policies must address this problem in the first place
- Migration should not be a one-way street. Fostering brain circulation and voluntary return migration benefits both host and home countries

2. Tackle illegal immigration:

- External root causes: Improve situation in countries of origin through development, trade and foreign policies
- Internal causes: Reduce pull factors (in particular black/grey labour market)
- Defining appropriate instruments: Reinforcing border control; Co-operating with neighbouring States; Returning illegally staying persons; concluding readmission agreements with countries of origin and transit;

3. Quick and efficient asylum procedures

- Make sure that those who deserve protection obtain it, in full respect of the Geneva Convention;

4. No immigration without integration

- Successful integration key aspect for social cohesion: Acceptance of the basic values of the EU, knowledge of the host society's language and non-discriminatory access to education and employment are preconditions for living together in mutual respect and tolerance

5. Reinforce international dimension of migration management

- Structured dialogue and co-operation with third countries on all migration related topics including development and trade policies in a spirit of partnership and shared responsibility.
- Migration should lead to a triple win situation: for the host country, for the home country and for the migrant.
- Migration can support development through remittances, the transfer of knowledge, the upgrading of skills and the establishment of trade networks.

ANNEX 4: FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND SECURITY POLICY AREAS, FOR THE PERIOD 2007-2013

The framework programmes in the area of Justice, Freedom and Security, under the new Financial Perspectives 2007-2013 have been established to provide coherent support to an area of freedom, security and justice under the financial perspectives 2007 – 2013. The three key objectives of freedom, security and justice are to be developed in parallel and to the same degree of intensity, thus allowing for a balanced approach, based on the principles of democracy, respect for fundamental rights and freedoms and the rule of law. Each of the three key objectives is supported by a Framework programme underpinning and linking each policy area. This structure represents a major simplification and rationalisation of existing financial support. The three framework programmes are:

- *Security and safeguarding Liberties* (amount for the period 2007-2013: 745 M€);
- *Fundamental rights and Justice* (amount for the period 2007-2013: 542,90 M€);
- *Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows* (amount for the period 2007-2013: 4020,37 M€).

The objectives of the three framework programmes are in line with the political priorities identified in the respective policy areas in The Hague Programme.

Security and safeguarding Liberties

The framework programme on “Security and Safeguarding Liberties” aims at ensuring an effective operational co-operation in the fight against crime and terrorism and strengthening their prevention. The framework programme consists of two financial instruments encompassing the following specific programmes: *Prevention of and fight against crime* and *Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks*.

Security and safeguarding Liberties						Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 745 M€
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
58,00	67,00	91,00	107,00	133,00	142,00	147,00
<i>Prevention of and fight against crime</i>						Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 597,6 M€
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
44,60	50,90	71,80	85,60	108,00	117,20	119,50
<i>Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks</i>						Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 137,4 M€
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
12,70	15,20	17,70	20,30	23,00	23,40	25,10

Prevention of and fight against crime

To protect the freedom and security of its citizens and society from criminal activities, the European Union must support measures to prevent, detect, investigate, and prosecute all forms of crime efficiently and effectively, most particularly in cases with a trans-border element. To better achieve this objective, the Council adopted on 12 February a Decision establishing a specific programme "Prevention of and Fight against Crime" as part of the General Programme "Security and Safeguarding Liberties", with a global budget amounting up to 600 million euros for the period 2007-2013.

The programme shall contribute to stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order such as the work carried out in the European Union Crime Prevention Network, public-private partnerships, best practices in crime prevention, comparable statistics, applied criminology and an enhanced approach towards young offenders. It shall also promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, other national authorities and related Union bodies in respect of the priorities identified by the Council in particular as set out by the Europol's Organised Crime Threat Assessment. In addition, the programme shall contribute to promote and develop best practices for the protection and support witnesses and crime victims.

The programme shall provide financial support through grants and public procurement for the projects initiated and managed by the Commission with a European dimension, transnational and national projects implemented by the organisations in the Member States and for activities of non-governmental organisations pursuing on a non-profit basis programme's objectives on a European dimension. In particular, financial support may be provided for:

- actions improving operational cooperation and coordination (strengthening networking, mutual confidence and understanding, exchange and dissemination of information, experience and best practices),
- analytical, monitoring and evaluation activities,
- development and transfer of technology and methodology,
- training, exchange of staff and experts, and
- awareness and dissemination activities.

The programme is destined for law enforcement agencies, other public and/or private bodies, actors and institutions, including local, regional and national authorities, social partners, universities, statistical offices, non-governmental organisations, public-private partnerships and relevant international bodies.

To implement the programme the Commission will adopt within three months the annual work programme that will further specify the funding conditions such as the maximum rate of co-financing of the costs of the projects, eligibility, exclusion, selection, and award criteria and other conditions related to the management of the funds in 2007.

Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks

Prevention, preparedness and consequence management of security threats are essential aspects of the objective of maintaining and developing the Union as an area of freedom, security and justice. To fight terrorism more effectively and enhance protection for citizens, a specific programme "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related Risks for the Period 2007-2013" was adopted by the Council of the European Union on 12 February, as part of the general programme on "Security and safeguarding liberties" with the budget amounting to € 140 million.

The era of more open borders, integrated economies and new technologies in Europe has thrown up new security challenges. Classic threats to security (that is, military threats posed by hostile states) have been replaced by new, dynamic threats that risk disrupting our society and endanger our citizens (cyber attacks, terrorism, etc). While countering threats from terrorism is a priority, the security measures have to be based on an all hazards approach (i.e. terrorist attacks and natural disasters alike).

Tackling these new threats is one of the most important issues for the EU in the foreseeable future. The new financial instrument "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks", has been designed to meet these security needs.

The programme will offer a comprehensive framework and contribute to the development of the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) as well as policy measures

aiming at upholding, and/or guaranteeing security and public order during a crisis situation. The general objective of the programme is to support Member States' efforts to prevent, prepare for, and to protect people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security related incidents. Furthermore, the programme is intended to contribute to ensuring protection in the areas such as the crisis management, environment, public health, transport, research and technological development and economic and social cohesion, in the field of terrorism and other security and safety related risks within the area of freedom, security and justice.

Access to this programme shall be opened to bodies and organisations with legal personality established in the Member States. The programme shall provide financial support through grants and public procurement for the projects initiated and managed by the Commission with a European dimension, transnational and national projects implemented by the organisations in the Member States. In particular, financial support may be provided for

- actions on operational cooperation and coordination (strengthening networking, mutual confidence and understanding, development of contingency plans, exchange and dissemination of information, experience and best practice)
- analytical, monitoring, evaluation and audit activities,
- development and transfer of technology and methodology, particularly regarding information sharing and inter-operability,
- training, exchange of staff and experts, and
- awareness and dissemination activities.

To implement the programme the Commission will adopt within three months the annual work programme that will further specify the funding conditions such as the maximum rate of co-financing of the costs of the projects, eligibility, exclusion, selection, and award criteria and other conditions related to the management of the funds in 2007.

Fundamental rights and Justice

This framework programme consists of five instruments: *Prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (Daphne III), Drugs prevention and information, Fundamental rights and citizenship, Civil justice and Criminal justice.*

The framework programme on “Fundamental Rights and Justice”, will aim to promote the development of a European society based on European Union citizenship and which is respectful of fundamental rights, fighting anti-semitism, racism and xenophobia and strengthening civil society. The programme will contribute to the setting-up of an area of freedom, security and justice with the aim of contributing to the creation of a genuine European area of justice in civil and commercial matters, as well as in criminal matters. Moreover, it will smooth the EU action in the health policy area by combating violence and by providing information on and preventing the use of drugs.

The financial package for the whole framework programme is 542,90 million € for 2007-2013 (current prices).

Fundamental Rights and Justice				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 542,90 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
71,00	75,00	78,00	76,90	78,00	81,00	83,00
<i>Fundamental rights and citizenship</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 93,8 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
10,60	12,00	13,20	13,50	13,80	15,20	15,50

<i>Civil justice</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 100,85 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
13,30	13,50	13,80	14,60	14,90	15,20	15,50
<i>Criminal Justice</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 196,2 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
29,20	29,80	30,40	26,00	26,40	26,90	27,50
<i>Prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (Daphne III)</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 114,40M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
13,90	14,40	15,80	17,20	17,60	17,50	18,00
<i>Drugs prevention and information</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 21 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,50	3,50

Prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (Daphne III)

The aim of this programme is to contribute to the protection of children, young people and women against all forms of violence. Over the next twelve months, around 3,500 children under the age of 15 will die as a result of physical assault and neglect in the world's richest nations. One out of every ten schoolchildren faces violence at school – some of it so traumatic that suicide seems the only way out.^[1] Moreover, recent studies on gender-based violence suggest that an estimated one-fifth to one-quarter of all women in Europe have experienced physical acts of violence at least once during their adult lives, and more than one-tenth have suffered sexual violence involving the use of force.^[2] One particularly serious form of violence is human trafficking: the estimated number of trafficking victims in the EU is over 100.000 per year, and 80% of these are women and girls.

Since 1997, Daphne has funded around 460 projects that have worked to protect women from, and to prevent, various areas of violence including physical assault, sexual violence, emotional and verbal abuse, exclusion and quasi-structural violence, coercion and exploitation, virtual violence, psychological violence, gender-based violence and violent cultural practices (such as female genital mutilation). This new instrument builds on the previous Daphne programmes, with a budget increase of more than 50%.

The programme will support the work of NGOs, develop and implement awareness raising actions, disseminate results, contribute to best practice exchanges and research in this field, develop and implement support programmes for victims and people at risk and intervention programmes for perpetrators, whilst ensuring the safety of victims. The Programme will also support specific actions taken by the Commission, specific transnational projects of Community interest involving at least two Member States and the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest.

The European Parliament will vote on this instrument, most probably in March (2nd reading) and the Commission's hope is that the Council will be able to adopt the programme during the same month.

Drugs prevention and information

This programme builds on the EU's Drugs Strategy and Action plans, the ultimate aim of which is to significantly reduce the social harm and health damage caused by the use of, and trade in, illicit drugs.

The general objectives of this programme are: i) to prevent and reduce drug use, dependence and drug related harms; ii) to contribute to the improvement of information on the effects of drug use; iii) to support the implementation of the EU Drugs Strategy;

This programme will be open to public and private organisations working in the area of information on and prevention of drugs use and support the following types of actions: i) specific actions taken by the European Commission, ii) specific transnational projects of Community interest presented by at least two Member States, or at least one Member State and one other state under certain conditions; iii) support to the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest.

Following the amendments voted by the European Parliament on first reading, it is likely that the adoption of this instrument will take place later than initially foreseen, after further debates in the Council and in the Parliament.

Fundamental rights and citizenship

This programme has the following objectives: i) To promote the development of a European society based on respect for Fundamental Rights and rights derived from citizenship of the Union; ii) To strengthen civil society and to encourage an open, transparent and regular dialogue with it in respect of fundamental rights; iii) To fight against racism, xenophobia and anti-semitism; iv) To improve the contacts, exchange of information and networking between legal, judicial and administrative authorities and the legal professions, including by way of support of judicial training, with the aim of better mutual understanding among such authorities and professionals.

This programme will support the following types of actions: specific actions taken by the Commission; specific trans-national projects of Community interest presented by an authority or any other body of a Member State, an international or non-governmental organisation; support to the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest.

Civil Justice

This programme aims at promoting judicial cooperation and improving the contacts and exchange of information between legal, judicial and administrative authorities, as well as fosters the training of members of the judiciary. Finally, it is important to mention that this programme aims as well at improving the daily life of individuals and businesses by enabling them to assert their rights throughout the EU.

The Civil justice programme will promote the elimination of obstacles to the good functioning of cross-border civil proceedings in the Member States and aims to improve the daily life of individuals and businesses, notably by fostering access to justice. Projects financed under this programme will improve the contacts, exchange of information and networking between legal, judicial and administrative authorities and the legal professions, including by way of support of judicial training.

Following the amendments voted by the European Parliament on first reading, it is likely that the adoption of this instrument will take place later than initially foreseen, after further debates in the Council and in the Parliament.

Criminal Justice

The Council adopted on 12 February the specific programme "Criminal Justice" as part of the General programme "Fundamental Rights and Justice". With a total budget of 196,2 million Euro for the period 2007 – 2013 it will provide financial support for activities promoting judicial cooperation in criminal matters and thus contributing to the creation of a genuine European area of justice based on mutual recognition and mutual confidence.

The objectives of the programme are to promote judicial cooperation, create a genuine European area of justice in criminal matters based on mutual recognition and mutual confidence and promote the consistency of national rules applicable where necessary to improve judicial cooperation. In

addition the programme will promote a reduction in existing legal obstacles to the good functioning of judicial cooperation with a view to strengthening the coordination of investigations and to increase compatibility of the existing judicial systems in the Member States to the European Union with a view to providing adequate follow-up to investigations of law enforcement authorities of the Member States. The programme will also contribute to improve the contacts and exchange of information and best practice between legal, judicial and administrative authorities and the legal professions: lawyers and other professionals involved in the work of the judiciary, and to foster the training of the members of the judiciary, with a view to enhancing mutual trust. It will also aim at improving mutual trust with the view to ensuring protection of rights of victims and of defendants.

The programme will provide financial support through grants and public procurement for the projects initiated and managed by the Commission, transnational and national projects implemented by the organisations in the Member States and for the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest in accordance with the general objectives of the programme. In addition, the programme provides for an operating grant to co-finance expenditure associated with the permanent work programme of the European Judicial Training Network which pursues an aim of general European interest in the field of training of the judiciary.

The programme is destined for inter alia, legal practitioners, representatives of victims' assistance services, and other professionals involved in the work of the judiciary, the national authorities and the citizens of the Union in general.

Access to this programme will be open to institutions and public or private organisations, including professional organisations, universities, research institutes and legal and judicial training/further training institutes for legal practitioners, non-governmental organisations of the Member States. Bodies and organisations which are profit oriented will have access to the programme only in conjunction with non profit oriented or state organisations.

To implement the programme the Commission will adopt within three months the annual work programme that will further specify the funding conditions such as the maximum rate of co-financing of the costs of the projects, eligibility, exclusion, selection, and award criteria and other conditions related to the management of the funds in 2007.

Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows

The main objective of the framework programme is to address the issue of a fair share of responsibilities between Member States in the introduction of integrated management of the external borders of the Member States of the European Union and from the implementation of common policies on asylum and immigration. It will provide financial support to Member States in proportion to the efforts they undertake for the benefit of the Community as a whole.

The framework programme is part of a policy mix of instruments and measures available to the Community in the fields of an integrated management of the external borders of the Member States of the European Union and the implementation of common policies on asylum and immigration. In particular, the framework programme will operationally complement the European Agency for the management of operational cooperation at the external Borders (FRONTEX Agency, 272 million for the period 2007 -2013), the large scale information systems (SIS and VIS, 716 million for the management for the same period) and the thematic programme on cooperation with third countries in the area of migration and asylum as part of the Development Cooperation Instrument (384 million for the same period).

The framework programme consists of four specific instruments, namely: the *European Refugee Fund*, the *External Borders Fund*, the *European Fund for the Integration of Third-country nationals* and the *European Return Fund*. In each of the Funds the objectives and participating states are different. Despite the existence of four different instruments, the established solidarity mechanisms should constitute a coherent package both politically and operationally: each Fund reflecting the objectives of a policy, but in association with the three others, promoting the development of an area of Freedom.

Moreover, the Funds operate according to common implementation and management rules and will be the subject of coordinated evaluation processes.

The overall amount foreseen for the framework programme “Solidarity and management of migration flows” is 4020,37 million € for the period 2007-2013.

Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 4020,37 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
291,37	371,00	449,00	495,00	610,00	786,00	1018,00
<i>European Refugee Fund</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 699,37 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
71,37	82,00	98,00	98,0	110,00	110,00	130,00
<i>External Borders Fund</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 1,820 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
155,00	155,00	186,00	208,00	254,00	350,00	512,00
<i>Return Fund</i>				Total amount over the 2008-2013 period: 676 M€		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
	56,00	67,00	83,00	114,00	163,00	193,00
<i>European Fund for the Integration of Third-country nationals</i>				Total amount over the 2007-2013 period: 825 M€		
2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
65,00	78,00	98,00	106,00	132,00	163,00	183,00

The policy objectives of the Funds are to be implemented firstly by co-financing actions and secondly by contributing to the financing of technical assistance (either on the initiative of the Member States or the Commission).

The bulk of the resources for each Fund will be allocated to the Member States in proportion to their share of the burden. These are the resources which will be used for co-financing actions implementing annual programmes based on a multi-annual strategy document, approved by the Commission. These strategy documents would focus on the priorities to be established in Community strategic guidelines, which will be adopted by the Commission, assisted by a Committee (Member States' experts). Up to 50% of the actions or, in the case of Cohesion Fund countries and actions implementing specific priorities of the Community, 75% of the actions can be financed by the Fund. The implementation tasks relating to these actions are delegated by the Commission to the Member States ('shared management') like the Structural Funds.

The national programmes will co-finance inter alia national actions such as:

- upgrading the infrastructure on the 6.000 km of land border and 85.000 km of coastline that constitute the external border of the EU;
- preventing undocumented people from boarding planes and entering the EU, while ensuring the smooth crossing of the external borders by bona fide travellers (over 100 million passengers arrive at international airports in the EU every year);
- civic orientation courses and migrant platforms to make newly arrived third-country nationals feel at home in our societies (about 2.2 million permits are granted each year to third-country

nationals to reside or stay, for the purpose of employment, family reunification, study, research or other reasons);

- providing adequate reception conditions for persons asking for international protection in the EU as well as a fair and efficient examination of their request for asylum (about 300 000 persons apply for asylum or subsidiary protection in the EU every year);
- counselling for unsuccessful asylum seekers or apprehended irregular migrants to ensure their return to their country of origin in full compliance with fundamental rights and, where necessary, forced return flights, where possible in cooperation with other Member States (joint flights)(about 500.000 apprehensions of illegally staying third country nationals a year EU wide).

In addition, a small part of the resources will support 'Community actions' ('transnational actions and actions of interest to the Community as a whole) inter alia to provide for the Member States' authorities common tools and reference documents such as a common Handbook for best practices in the field of return, including on escorts and (updates to) the Handbook on integration. Each year, for each Fund, the Community actions would be implemented through an annual work programme and a subsequent call for proposals (grants) and, in the case of procurement, calls for tender. The actions will be managed by the Commission. Depending on the Fund, 6 to 10% of the total annual amount can be dedicated to Community actions.

The European Refugee Fund

The European Refugee Fund has been in place since 2000 and has served as a very important source of inspiration for the approach to the structure, the mechanism for allocation of resources, the programming cycle and management and control provisions common to the Funds. Currently, the second generation of the Fund is being implemented by the Member States (Council Decision of 2 December 2004 (2004/904/EC).

The general objective of the European Refugee Fund (ERF) is to support and improve the efforts of Member States to grant reception conditions to refugees, displaced persons and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection, to apply fair and effective asylum procedures and to promote good practices in the field of asylum so as to protect the rights of persons requiring international protection and enable Member States asylum systems to work efficiently.

The new instrument will be applicable as of 1 January 2008. In light of the objectives and priorities of the Hague Programme for carrying further the development of the Common European Asylum System in its second phase, it introduces new actions namely to support the capacity building for the asylum systems in general, the voluntary efforts of Member States to provide a durable solution in their territories to refugees and displaced persons identified as eligible for resettlement by the UNHCR and the voluntary burden sharing between Member States consisting of the transfer of beneficiaries of international protection from one Member State to another, which grants them a similar protection.

The resources will be distributed annually among the Member States on the basis of objective criteria, reflecting the burden borne by each Member States through its efforts in receiving asylum seekers and integrating persons benefiting from international protection (refugees, persons benefiting from subsidiary protection).

Further, an increase of the Community actions from 7% to 10% will enable the Community to offer adequate support for efforts by Member States to establish practical cooperation. Lastly, it will also be possible in the future to use the reserve established for the implementation of emergency measures to provide temporary protection in the event of a mass influx of refugees pursuant to Council Decision 2001/55/EC of 20 July 2001 (10 million each year) to address particular pressures situations resulting from sudden arrivals of large numbers of persons who may be in need of international protection and which place significant and urgent demands on Member States' reception facilities or asylum systems.

All Member States participate except Denmark.

The External Borders Fund

The general objective of the External Borders Fund is to contribute to accomplishing a key objective of the Schengen acquis, namely to share responsibility for an efficient, high and uniform level of control at the external borders. Moreover, the Fund will contribute to the development of the common visa policy as, on the one hand, part of a multi-layered system aimed at tackling illegal immigration through the enhancement of handling practices and local consular missions, and, on the other hand, facilitating legitimate travel to the Member States. This Fund will be complementary to the efforts of the External Borders Agency (FRONTEX) the task of which is to facilitate and render more effective the application of the Community acquis relating to the management of external borders through coordination, technical support and expertise.

The instrument incorporates aspects of the 2004–2006 Schengen facility for seven beneficiary Member States^[3] extends the facility for the Kaliningrad Transit Programme for one beneficiary Member State^[4] and builds on the experiences gained with the 2002-2006 ARGO programme for administrative cooperation in the fields of external borders, visas, asylum and immigration^[5]. It will be complementary to the efforts of the FRONTEX Agency^[6] to facilitate and render more effective the application of the Community acquis relating to the management of external borders through coordination, technical support and expertise.

The resources will be distributed annually among the Member States on the basis of objective criteria, reflecting the burden borne by each Member States in the field of border control and visa policy. The criteria will be broken down according to the type of borders, taking into account the flows and the levels of threats at the external borders of the Member States of the European Union.

108 million of the total resources for the period 2007 -2013 will be allocated to Lithuania for foregone fees from transit visas and additional costs incurred in implementing the Kaliningrad transit schemes in accordance with Council Regulations (EC) 693/2003 and 694/2003. This is a continuation of the current Facility.

There is also the possibility to allocate up to 10 million each year to specific actions which contribute to the development of the common integrated border management system of the beneficiary states by addressing weaknesses at strategic border points identified in the risk analyses made by the FRONTEX Agency, as a complement to the operational cooperation developed under the aegis of this Agency.

All Member States participate, except UK and Ireland. Denmark should decide whether to participate within six months after the adoption. The countries associated with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis also participate, subject to bilateral agreements to be concluded.

Additional Funding for Romania and Bulgaria: From 2007 to 2009, a Cashflow and Schengen Facility of 800 M€ will be available to Romania (558,8 M€) and Bulgaria (239,5 M€), out of which the two beneficiary Member States should use at least 50% for the implementation of the Schengen acquis and border controls.

The Return Fund

The general objective of the European Return Fund (applicable as of 1 January 2008) is to support the Member States in their efforts to improve the management of return in all its dimensions, on the basis of the principle of integrated return management, with a preference to voluntary return and with a view to supporting a fair and effective implementation of common standards on return. To enhance the efficiency in return management at national level, the Fund shall also cover actions relating to voluntary return of persons who are not under an obligation to leave the territory, such as applicants for asylum who have not yet received a negative decisions or persons enjoying a form of international protection. The voluntary return actions, previously covered by the ERF will therefore be eligible under the Return Fund in the future.

The resources will be distributed annually among the Member States on the basis of objective criteria, reflecting the burden borne by each Member States in the field of return. The criteria refer to the number of third country nationals subject to an obligation to leave the territory of the concerned Member State and the number of third country nationals who actually left that Member State in previous years. The instrument will build inter alia on the experiences gained with the preparatory actions on return in the period 2005 -2006 and the actions supported in the field of return under the ARGO programme (2002-2006).

All Member States participate except Denmark.

The European Fund for the Integration of Third-country nationals

The general objective of the Integration Fund (applicable as of 1 January 2007) is to support the efforts of Member States to enable third country nationals to fulfil the conditions of residence and to facilitate their integration into European societies, in accordance with the Common Basic Principles and complementary to the European Social Fund (ESF). The Fund will target specific needs of legally staying third country nationals in the area of integration arising from the development of the common immigration policy.

In terms of the co-financing of concrete actions supporting the integration process of third country nationals in Member States, the Integration Fund is targeted primarily at actions relating to newly arrived third country nationals. For example, the Fund would support "programmes and activities in Member States aimed at introducing newly arrived third country nationals to the host society and enabling them to acquire basic knowledge about the host society's language, history, institutions, socio-economic features, cultural life and the fundamental norms and values. Moreover, the Fund would also support Member States in a) enhancing their capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate in general all integration strategies, policies and measures for third country nationals, and b) the exchange of information, best practice and co-operation in and between Member States contributing to enhancing this capacity.

The resources will be distributed annually among the Member States on the basis of objective criteria, reflecting the burden borne by each Member States in the field of integration of third country nationals. The criteria refer to the number of legally staying third country nationals having been admitted over the previous three years in the concerned Member State ('recent flows') and the total number of legally staying third country nationals in that Member State ('stock').

The instrument will build inter alia on the experiences gained with the preparatory actions INTI in the period 2003-2006 and the actions supported in the field of immigration under the ARGO programme (2002-2006). For 2007, the EP approved a preparatory action called Migration management - Solidarity in action. The purpose of the action is to test hypotheses in the field of migration management. The action will be based on four components and the amount available is 15 M €. All Member States participate except Denmark.

¹¹¹ Communication kit for Regional Consultation for the UN Study on Violence Against Children, July 2005 ([HTTP://WWW.VIOLENCESTUDY.ORG/EUROPE-CA/KIT.HTML](http://www.violencestudy.org/europe-ca/kit.html))

¹¹² Council of Europe, "Combating violence against women – stocktaking study on the measures and actions taken in Council of Europe member states", 2006.

¹¹³ Article 35(1), Act of Accession; Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia

¹¹⁴ Commission Decision C (2003) 5213; Lithuania

¹¹⁵ Council Decision 2002/463/EC (OJ L161/11, 19.6.2002) as amended by Council Decision 2004/867/EC (OJ L371/48, 18.12.2004)

¹¹⁶ Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 (OJ L349/1 25.11.2004)

ANNEX 5: NEW PROGRAMME TO COOPERATE WITH THIRD COUNTRIES IN THE AREAS OF MIGRATION AND ASYLUM WITH A BUDGET OF €380 MILLION FOR 2007-2013

Building on the experience of its predecessor, AENEAS, the programme will seek to support third countries in their efforts to ensure better management of migratory flows in all its dimensions. The focus will be countries along the Southern and Eastern migratory routes towards the European Union, although other migratory routes as well as South-South migrations will also be covered.

The new Thematic Programme for the cooperation with third countries in the field of asylum and migration is created by and based on the European Parliament and Council Regulation 1905/2006 adopted on 18 December 2006 through a co-decision procedure. The Thematic Programme is endowed with an indicative financial envelope of €380 million (excluding the allocation for covering administrative expenditures) over the period 2007-2013, which means a yearly average allocation of approximately 54,5 M EUR per year, distributed as follows:

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-13
47,955	51,392	51,309	53,444	56,775	57,869	62,589	381,333

This clearly represents a substantial increase if compared to the yearly 40 million available in average under the 2004-2006 Aeneas Programme, although this increase will only be felt in a progressive manner.

The 2007-2010 Multi-Annual Indicative Programme adopted on the 22nd June 2007 defines more precisely the financial allocations agreed per sub-region for the first 4 years of existence of the programme. Three quarters of the available allocation will be destined to fund **actions linked to a specific migratory route** or sub-region, namely:

Route migratoire méridionale (notamment, Afrique du Nord et Afrique subsaharienne)	70
Route migratoire orientale (notamment, Europe de l'Est, Fédération de Russie et Asie centrale)	50
Moyen-Orient et pays du Golfe (notamment pays de l'est du bassin méditerranéen couverts par la PEV, Iran et Iraq)	5
Asie du Sud et de l'Est et région Pacifique	16
Amérique latine et Caraïbes	16

These allocations will be principally spent to fund projects which will be selected through competitive procedures, within the framework of Call for Proposals yearly launched by the European Commission, the first one being scheduled for Autumn 2007. The Commission will, however, use all the other modalities made possible by the Financial Regulation to select and contract projects to be funded.

In addition to the initiatives targeting the migratory routes, 28 Millions EUR will be dedicated to five specific **initiatives of global character** or which at least will involve more than one of the above migratory routes or sub-regions. These initiatives will concern the following themes:

Migration and Development	10
Labour Migration	8
Asylum and Refugee Protection	4
Smuggling of and Trafficking in human beings	3
Illegal immigration	3

More details on the contents of these initiatives are provided in the Multi-Annual Indicative Programme, although their final feature will only be decided at a later stage.

Last but not least, an allocation of **20 M EUR** is left as reserve to fund the so-called "**special measures**". This reserve could be mobilised most particularly to finance interventions in a third country, in case the involved migrants' human rights, lives and safety, or the border security and public order of the country itself, or of any other country affected by the same migratory flow (including the EU MS) are put at risk. The mobilisation of such assistance would be especially justified when the situation in the field of migration worsened in a quick manner (for instance following a sudden increase or a change in nature of the migratory flows) and at the condition that the provision of assistance in a timely manner can contribute to improve the situation.

Scope

The action under the New Thematic Programme will complement the initiatives on migration and asylum developed under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European development Fund. Geographically speaking, the amount available for the thematic programme can be spent for actions benefiting any country in the European Neighbourhood and Partnership region (including the Russian Federation) and any developing countries in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia and the Pacific Region. However, the thematic programme will not finance actions in the countries that are potential or actual candidate to the EU accession, which may only be funded by the Instruments for Pre-Accession.

Thematically speaking, the programme will include the following areas of activity:

(a) fostering the links between migration and development, especially by encouraging the contribution of diasporas to the development of their country of origin and increasing the value of migrants' return; mitigating brain drain and promoting the circular movement of skilled migrants; facilitating financial transfers of migrants to their country of origin; supporting voluntary return and reintegration of migrants and building capacities for migration management; fostering capacity building efforts to help countries in the formulation of pro-development migration policies and in their capacity to jointly manage migration flows;

(b) promoting well-managed labour migration, in particular by informing about legal migration and conditions of entry in and stay on the territory of the Member States of the Community; providing information on labour migration opportunities and needs in Member States and on qualifications of third country candidates for migration; supporting pre-departure training for candidates for legal migration; and encouraging the definition and implementation of legislative frameworks for migrant workers in third countries;

(c) fighting illegal immigration and facilitating the readmission of illegal immigrants, including between third countries, and in particular, fighting the smuggling of and trafficking in human beings; discouraging illegal immigration and raising awareness of the risks related to it; improving capacities in the areas of border, visa and passport management, including the security of documents and the introduction of biometric data, and detection of forged documents; implementing effectively readmission agreements concluded with the Community and obligations arising out of international

agreements; and assisting third countries in the management of illegal immigration and in the coordination of their policies;

(d) protecting migrants, including the most vulnerable such as women and children against exploitation and exclusion through measures such as developing third countries' legislation in the field of migration; supporting integration and non-discrimination as well as measures to protect migrants from racism and xenophobia; preventing and fighting the smuggling of and trafficking in human beings and any form of slavery;

(e) promoting asylum and international protection, including through regional protection programmes, in particular in strengthening institutional capacities; supporting the registration of asylum applicants and refugees; promoting international standards and instruments on the protection of refugees; supporting the improvement of reception conditions and local integration, and working towards lasting solutions.

Activities under AENEAS

Actions in all these fields were already eligible for funding under the AENEAS Programme, within the framework of which **67** actions are currently being implemented (an estimated quantity of approximate 40 actions will be additionally contracted by the Commission after Summer 2007, as a result of the last Call for Proposal launched under the AENEAS programme, for which the evaluation process has just been completed).

Some of the ongoing AENEAS projects facilitate the cheaper transfer of migrants' remittances and their pro-development and pro-business utilisation for the benefit of the origin communities (for instance this is the scope of a project being implemented in particular in Latin America, but also in Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, by the International Fund for Agricultural Development, targeting specifically rural communities, for which the Commission has committed up to 4 M EUR).

Other projects contribute to preventing illegal migration, like for instance a project which is being implemented by the Ghana Immigration Service. The latter requested 2 M EUR to promote the modernisation of its border equipment and to enhance the training of the staff dealing with border surveillance and migration, with the aim in particular to increase their capacity to detect forged travel documents or to identify persons not entitled to cross the border.

Other projects help third countries to take better advantage of the possibilities of legal migration, which are made available to them by European Union countries. This is for instance the case of a project, which is being implemented by the Municipality of the Spanish city of Cartaya, which helps workers from the Chaouia Ourdiga region of Morocco to take full advantage of the seasonal job opportunities offered in the rural sector by employers of Andalusia province of Huelva.

The AENEAS programme furthermore supports the implementation of Regional Protection Programmes in Eastern Europe and in the African Great Lakes' region. Actions in this field, for instance, are currently being carried out by the UNHCR in Tanzania and Belarus, and by the Danish Refugee Council and Caritas Austria in Ukraine, and aim at enhancing the capacity of national authorities to treat asylum seekers and refugees in accordance with the requirements of Geneva conventions and its Protocols. Other projects help the implementation of the readmission agreements signed by the European Communities. This is for instance the case of a project, being implemented by the Ministry of Interiors of Greece, which aims at supporting Albanese authorities in assisting their citizens returning back home. The project promotes social and professional reintegration for these people. There are also projects aiming at protecting migrants' rights against any form of exploitation, mistreatment and exclusion. This is the case for instance of a project implemented by the NGO Memorial', which in Russian Federation provides legal assistance to migrants in distress, or by a project implemented by the IOM, which promotes the prevention and the fight against trafficking in human beings in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus as well as support for the return and reintegration of the victims, or a project implemented by the International Labour Organisation, which in Asia promotes the respect of migrant workers, with focus on women, by employers.

ANNEX 6: COMMUNIQUÉ DE PRESSE: RÉUNION DE HAUT NIVEAU UNION EUROPÉENNE – MALI SUR LES MIGRATIONS ET LE DEVELOPPEMENT

COMMUNIQUE DE PRESSE

Dans le cadre du dialogue euro-africain sur les migrations et le développement, M. Louis Michel, Commissaire européen au Développement et à l'Aide humanitaire, Mme Brigitte Girardin, Ministre déléguée à la Coopération au Développement et à la Francophonie de la République Française et M. Bernardino León, Secrétaire d'Etat aux Affaires Etrangères du Royaume d'Espagne, ont effectué une mission au Mali dans le but de contribuer à la mise en oeuvre de l'approche globale de l'UE sur la migration et le développement. Dans ce contexte, une Réunion de Haut Niveau Mali - CEDEAO - Union Européenne a eu lieu à Bamako le 8 février 2007. Le gouvernement du Mali était représenté par le Ministre des Maliens de l'Extérieur et de l'Intégration Africaine, Pr. Oumar H. Dicko. La CEDEAO était représentée par M. Baber Tandina, Directeur a.i. de la libre circulation des personnes.

S'inspirant de la Déclaration de la Conférence de Rabat et de son Plan d'Actions, des Conclusions de la première session de Consultation UE- Mali sur les Migrations du 26 septembre 2006 et des résultats de la Conférence ministérielle Afrique – Union Européenne « Migrations et Développement » de Tripoli en novembre 2006, les Parties ont eu des échanges sur leurs coopérations bilatérale et communautaire en matière de migrations.

Les Parties ont réaffirmé le sens de leur coopération dans le domaine des migrations internationales qui doit rester celui d'une approche globale de la problématique migratoire, dans un esprit de partenariat orienté vers l'intérêt mutuel dans le cadre défini par l'article 13 de l'Accord de Cotonou. Les échanges ont porté sur le renforcement des capacités du gouvernement du Mali en matière de gestion des flux migratoires et des Maliens à l'Extérieur, de l'accompagnement de la migration légale, de la formation et de la réinsertion des migrants de retour, de la valorisation du capital humain, financier et technique des Maliens de l'extérieur, des actions de co-développement et de la lutte contre la migration clandestine.

Afin d'approfondir leur coopération dans ces domaines, les Parties ont convenu d'appuyer la création, par le Mali, de la Maison des Maliens de l'Extérieur et d'un Centre d'Information et de Gestion des Migrations et de préciser la contribution européenne à ces institutions. Parmi les tâches principales de ces institutions maliennes figureront la collecte et la diffusion des informations sur les migrations i) sur les conditions et les opportunités de travail et de formation au niveau national, sous-régional et européen, ii) sur les risques et aléas de la migration clandestine et iii) sur l'accompagnement des migrants de retour pour leur réinsertion.

Les autres tâches porteront sur l'appui à la valorisation de l'épargne et aux transferts financiers, l'encouragement au retour des compétences, l'appui aux projets de co-développement et à la

coopération décentralisée et sur la promotion des liens entre les jeunes de la deuxième génération d'immigrés vivant en Europe avec ceux du pays d'origine. La Maison des Maliens de l'Extérieur appuiera les fonctions et missions du Haut Conseil des Maliens de l'Extérieur. Les Parties ont noté l'importance de la dimension sous régionale des migrations et ont souligné qu'il s'agit d'un projet pilote appelé à être reproduit dans d'autres pays de l'espace CEDEAO afin de constituer un réseau opérationnel s'inscrivant dans une politique régionale commune.

Les participants ont noté avec satisfaction l'importance accordée au domaine Migration et Développement dans la stratégie nationale et régionale du 10ème FED qui prévoit des fonds pour renforcer les capacités du gouvernement du Mali et de la CEDEAO dans ce domaine.

ANNEX 8: LIST OF PERSONS, INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED

REPRÉSENTANTES D'ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES ET GOUVERNAMENTALES

NOM	FONCTION	ORGANISME
Marc TAQUET- GRAZIANI	Fonctionnaire de l'Information et la Communication	Commission européenne DG COMM A 5 002
Carlos CARDAO	Fonctionnaire	Commission européenne DG HOME 02
Francesco LUCIANI	Fonctionnaire	Commission européenne DG HOME 02
Jacopo LOMBARDI	Fonctionnaire de l'Information et la Communication	Commission européenne DG COMM B 1
Paula Cristina FERNANDES	Chargée de programme	Délégation de l'UE au Mali
Bernard SORET	Conseiller politique	Délégation de l'UE au Mali
Emile JEANNEE	Head of Cooperation	Délégation de l'UE au Mali
Patrick Medori	Conseiller adjoint du chef du service de coopération et d'action culturelle	Ambassade de France
Stéphane Darmas	Directeur	OFII – Office Français de l'immigration e de l'intégration
Vicki Lourdes Melendez GARCIA	Ambassadeur	Ambassade du Royaume de l'Espagne
Abdoulaye Konate	Directeur	Centre d'Information et de Gestion des Migrations CIGEM
Hamidou A. Ganaba	Chargé de communication	CIGEM
Seydou Keïta	Conseiller	Ministre du MMEIA - Ministère Malien de l'Extérieur et de l'Intégration Africaine
Hamidou Bathily	Chef	Cellule CODEV
Oumarau Diakite	Coordinateur	Programme TOKTEN - The Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals programme / Programme Transfert de connaissance par les expatriés nationaux
Bassirou Diarra	Secrétaire General Adjoint de la	Comité franco-malien sur les

	Presidence de la Republique	migrations
--	-----------------------------	------------

JOURNALISTES

NOM	JOURNAL	E-MAIL
Alexis Kalambry	Les Echos	LESECHOS@JAMANA.ORG
Dotigui Niaré	Les Echos	NIARE-DOT@YAHOO.FR
Bandiougou Diabaté	L'Indépendant	BANDJOU@HOTMAIL.COM
Sikou Bah	Info- Matin	SIKOUBAH@YAHOO.FR
Mahamadou Kané	Radio Kledu	MKONE1@YAHOO.FR
Abdoulaye Coulibaly	Radio Guintan	ABDOULAYEB2@YAHOO.FR
Mohamed Bellem	Le Combat	
Mah Traoré	La nouvelle Patrie	SALIMATABELLEM@YAHOO.FR
Baba Diarra	Radio Bamakan	BABINADIARRA@YAHOO.FR
Amadou Guindo	Le Matin	AMASSAGOU2@YAHOO.FR

REPRÉSENTANTES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ CIVILE

NAME	ASSOCIATION
Coulibaly Amadou	AME (Association Malien des expulsés)
Ousmane Diarra	AME
Oumar Sidibé	AME
Bassekou Siby	AME
Mahamadou Keita	AME
Marine Renard	AME
Souhab Touré	AME
Mariam Témé	AME
Inna Touré	AME

ANNEX 9: BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1999 Presidency conclusions, European Council, Tampere, 15/16 October 1999
- 2001 Presidency conclusions, European Council, Laeken , 14/15 December 2001
- 2001 COM(2001) 672 final - Common Policy on Illegal Migration
- 2002 COM(2002) 703: “Integrating migration issues in the European Union’s relations
- 2002 COM (2002) 564 final - Communication on Community Return Policy of Illegal Residents
- 2002 Presidency conclusions, European Council, Seville 21/22 June 2002
- 2003 COM (2003) 323 final - Communication on a Common Policy on Illegal Migration, Smuggling, and Trafficking of Human Beings, External Border, and Illegal Residents
- 2004 Presidency conclusions, “The Hague Programme”, European Council Brussels 4-5 November 2004
- 2005 COM(2005) 621: “Priority actions for responding to the challenges of migration: First follow-up to Hampton Court,”
- 2005 COM (2005) 388 final: “On regional protection programmes“
- 2005 EC communication COM (2005)514 final on EC approach for fighting trafficking in human beings.
- 2005 Strategy for the external dimension of JHA, Global Freedom Security and Justice – 15 December 2005
- 2005 COM(2005)134 – 01 and COM(2002)703 final – Policy Coherence for Development
- 2005 COM(2005) 390 final: “Migration and Development : some concrete orientations”
- 2006 Rabat Declaration, 2006
- 2006 COM(2006) 735: “The Global Approach to Migration one year on: Towards a comprehensive European migration policy,”
- 2006 Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 establishing a financing the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)
- 2006 Consultations sur les Migrations (art. 13) - Union Européenne – Mali (26 -27 septembre 2006)
- 2007 COM (2007) 24: ; “Applying the Global Approach to Migration to the East and South-Eastern regions neighbouring the European Union.”
- 2007 COM(2007)247 final: “Applying the Global Approach to Migration to the Eastern and South Eastern regions neighbouring the EU,”
- 2008 COM (2008) 359 – Strengthen the Global Approach to Migration
- 2008 European Council (COUNCIL 13440/08), which adopted the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum (COM (2008) 360 final)
- 2008 A comprehensive Common Migration Policy
- 2008 Communiqué de Presse: Réunion de Haut Niveau Union Européenne – Mali sur les Migrations et le Développement

- 2009 Evaluation à mi-parcours du projet Centre d'Information et de Gestion des Migrations au Mali (FED 2009/ 224-718)
- 2010 The Working Methods of the Commission 2010-2014 – A Communication from the President issued in accordance with Article 17 (6) TEU - C(2010) 1100, Brussels, 10 February 2010
- 2011 Evaluation of the EU/UN Joint Migration Initiative, June 2011



PARTICIP GmbH
Germany



Aide à la Décision Economique
Belgium



Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik

German Development
Institute

Deutsches Institut für
Entwicklungspolitik
Germany



Development
Researchers'
Network

Development Researchers' Network
Italy



European Centre for Development
Policy Management
Belgium



Overseas Development Institute
United Kingdom

A consortium of
Particip -ADE-DIE-DRN-ECDPM-ODI
c/o Particip GmbH, leading company:

Headquarters

Merzhauser Str. 183
D - 79100 Freiburg / Germany
Phone: +49-761-79074-0
Fax: +49-761-79074-90
INFO@PARTICIP.DE

BELGIUM OFFICE

Avenue des Arts 50 (5th floor)
B-1000 Bruxelles / Belgium
Phone: +32-2-5501160
Fax: +32-2-5501169
INFO@PARTICIP.DE

Framework contract for
**Multi-country thematic and regional/country-
level strategy evaluation studies and synthesis
in the area of external co-operation**
Ref.: EuropeAid/122888/C/SER/Multi

**LOT 5:
Evaluation of EC main policies and strategies in
the areas of external cooperation**

**EVA 2007 – Lot 5
Request nr: Version 1**

**Evaluation of Visibility of
EU external action**

**Final Report
Volume 7 – Thematic Report
on Migration
Part 2 - Lampedusa**

**Authors: Federica Petrucci (thematic
expert) with Sara Monti**

June 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Reason for the choice.....	1
1.2. The context.....	1
2. EVIDENCES FROM THE MEDIA COVERAGE ANALYSIS.....	2
2.1 Research on Italian newspapers.....	3
2.1.1 <i>Methodology</i>	3
2.1.2 <i>Context</i>	3
2.1.3 <i>Findings</i>	3
2.1.4 <i>Conclusions</i>	6
2.2 Research on international newspapers	6
2.2.1 <i>Methodology</i>	6
2.2.2 <i>Findings</i>	6
2.2.3 <i>Evidences form interviews to different stakeholders</i>	8
3. ANSWER TO SELECTED EVALUATION QUESTIONS	9
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	11

ANNEX

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PEOPLE MET

ACRONYMS

AENEAS	Financial assistance to third states for Migration and Asylum
AIDCO	EuropeAid Co-operation Office
CIE	Centre for Identification and Expulsion
COM	Commission Communication
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DG	Directorate General
DG COMM	Directorate General for Communication
DG DEV	Directorate General for Development
DG HOME	
DG JHA	Directorate General for Justice And Home Affairs
DG JLS	Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security
DG RELEX	External Relations
EASO	European Asylum support Office
EBF	External Borders Fund
EEAS	European External Action Service
EC	European Community - European Commission (when referring to Lisbon)
EIB	European Integration Fund
EP	European Parliament
ERF	European Refugee Fund
EQs	Evaluation Questions
ERF	European Refugee Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
EUD	Delegation of the EU
FRONTEX	External Borders Agency
GAERC	General Affairs and External Relations Council
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human Rights
HRFASP	High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
HRVP	High Representative/Vice President
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization

NSA	Non-State Actor
SEC	Commission Staff Working Document
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reason for the choice

“Lampedusa emergency” has been selected as additional case study for the migration theme since it is representative of the most visible recent events related to migration.

Since years Lampedusa has become a key entry point for illegal migrants and asylum-seekers attempting to enter Southern Europe by sea. However, the turmoil in North Africa and the war in Libya are creating additional pressures as regards migration on a large scale and attract considerable media attention. During the first months of 2011 (January-August) the wave of migrants from Tunisia and Libya landing on the small Italian island reached 54,000.

This case raises important questions as to the visibility and coherence of EU external action. For evaluation purposes this case is relevant to the analysis of the external policy objective of *global solidarity*. However, the Directorate responsible for the migration policy at the Commission is the DG Home, which is excluded of the mandate of this evaluation; hence the focus of the assessment will be limited to the policy *coherence* of EU external actions and the *complementarity* with Member States.

1.2 The context

EU through DG Home allocates almost EUR 4 billion with the Programme SOLID in the 2007-2013 period to ensure the fair sharing of responsibilities between EU States for the financial burden that arises from the integrated management of the Union's external borders and from the implementation of common asylum and immigration policies. SOLID consists of four instruments: External Borders Fund (EBF), European Return Fund (RF), European Refugee Fund (ERF) & European Integration Fund (EIF)

Italy benefits of the EU support which amount of 47 million EUR for the years 2010-2011. However the only projects that deals directly with *Lampedusa is the “Praesidium”* one. The project Praesidium, started in March 2006, and was designed to contribute to a protection-sensitive reception system for asylum seekers and others arriving by sea in the context of irregular mixed migratory flows to southern Italy, notably to Lampedusa.

The project is implemented by 4 agencies together: the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), Save the Children (Italy) and the Italian Red Cross, with the financial support of the Italian Ministry of Interior and, for the first three years (2006-2009), with the funds of the European Commission (Former JLS).

The support provided by the European Commission at the time was considered an important expression of international solidarity, since it dealt to big increasing of migrants in the island from 2006. In addition the presence of international agencies at the point of arrival proved the commitment of the Italian authorities of the EU in addressing the complex challenge of mixed migration in a humane and rights-based manner.

In recent years, Lampedusa has become an important entry point for irregular migrants and asylum-seekers attempting to enter southern Europe by sea. Those travelling together on the unseaworthy boats that depart from Libya and Tunisia do so for a range of reasons: economic opportunity, the desire to join family members, exploitation by traffickers, human rights violations, conflict and persecution. Several hundred are known to perish on the journey each year. Some arrive directly on Lampedusa, but in the years since the project began, the majority have disembarked on the island following search and rescue operations conducted by the Italian maritime authorities.

Praesidium formed part of what became known as the „Lampedusa model“ within which those arriving in the context of mixed migration flows were accommodated temporarily on the island, registered and channelled into appropriate administrative and legal procedures, and rapidly transferred to reception or detention centres in other parts of Italy. Whilst the majority of asylum-seekers are accommodated in open reception centres, those who apply after having received an expulsion order are generally held in CIE (Centre for Identification and Expulsion), under the regime applicable to illegal migrants. A further element contributing to the success of the project was the role of the cultural mediators. Their job descriptions centre on support to the field officers by providing information and counselling to potential asylum seekers with a view to removing the linguistic and cultural barriers between staff and beneficiaries.

The context within which the project operated nonetheless changed in the course of 2009 and then in 2011. In **2009** there was a shift away from the model of rapid onward transfer, and currently, a new government policy of enhanced cooperation with the Libyan authorities on preventing irregular departures, together with the interception of boats outside Italian territorial waters and the return of those on board to Libya, has resulted in a sharp drop in the number of arrivals in Sicily and Lampedusa. A more restrictive approach has also been adopted in relation to the disembarkation of those rescued at sea in Italy. Many agencies working there expressed strong concerns that in the absence of adequate safeguards, the policy of *respingimento* or “pushbacks” to Libya could prevent access to asylum and undermined the implementation of the international principle of *non-refoulement*.

In 2011 the situation of arrivals in Lampedusa changed suddenly following the recent uprising in Tunisia and the civil war in Libya with the consequent flow of thousands of migrants and refugees wanting to come to Europe to Lampedusa causing the collapse of the reception structures in the Island. Personnel had to face arrivals of even two thousand people in a day. The number of people disembarked on the island from January to August reached 54.000 of which: 26.000 from Tunisia, 28.000 from Lybia, plus 3.000 arrived in the Italian southern region of Calabria.¹² Most of the refugees arriving in Italy wanted to go in other European countries notably in the northern Europe, France and Germany since the integration prospects for those granted international protection in Italy are extremely limited, and this remains one of the most problematic areas of the Italian asylum system.

In relation to this situation the Italian government, when the wave of arrivals reached more than 20.000, asked to the EU for sharing the burden of the migration flow. Also Malta called for an EU-wide emergency mechanism that made burden sharing obligatory.

2 EVIDENCES FROM THE MEDIA COVERAGE ANALYSIS

Media coverage is the main tool used to document the Lampedusa case. It is not linked to concrete projects financed in Lampedusa, but show the reactions and perceptions of the press and the general public from a more general and political level.

The main challenge in conducting the media coverage analysis was represented by making a selection of the more relevant articles among the huge amount of the articles available through the press at national (Italian) and international level.

The time period taken corresponds to the increase of the flow of migrants debarked to Lampedusa following the events in Tunisia and Lybia and to the related discussions among the EU and the Member States on how to tackle this emergency. Media sources documented extensively all the process.

¹² Source: UNHCR; Italian Ministry of Interior

2.1 **Research on Italian newspapers**

2.1.1 **Methodology**

What: internet research on Italian daily newspapers performed against the following criteria:

- 3 keywords: Migration, Lampedusa, European Union;
- 5-month period: February 2011 (rise of arrivals on Lampedusa) – June 2011 (Council Conclusions on: “*Borders, Migration and Asylum - Stocktaking and the way forward*”)

After a preliminary search, extended to all relevant publications, we focused on 4 major Italian newspapers covering different political views (“Il Corriere della Sera”, “Il Giornale”, “Libero”, “La Repubblica”) and the sample was thereby limited to 50 articles.

2.1.2 **Context**

The result of the analysis of this media coverage is linked to the peculiar condition of the media in Italy which is characterised by: i) control by the government party and also directly by the Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi on part of the media, who can influence the opinion expressed on *friendly* newspapers and TV especially on specific sensitive matters; ii) limited possibility of the EU to have enough room in the Italian media to respond to harsh articles and present its view, even if the most reputed and diffused newspapers (Il Corriere della Sera” and “La Repubblica”) published interviews with the EC commissioner; iii) very tough political and economic situation in the country, which caused very strong confrontation among ruling and opposition parties; iv) the use of strong aggressive language by some politicians and journalists.

2.1.3 **Findings**

The arrival on the tiny island of Lampedusa of thousands of migrants, fleeing political turmoil in North African countries since January/February 2011, caused concerns among the Italian politicians and public opinion.

The challenges in dealing with this emergency, which is defined by government officials as “an exodus of biblical proportions” is linked to the role of the EU and of its Member States and the recognition that the sudden and intense migration waves are matters that do not concern an individual country, but Europe as a whole. This resulted in the unanimous appeal for a strong EU engagement and a more strategic and integrated EU policy. Representatives of the Italian executive branch, as well as the Italian President of the Republic, members of the opposition parties, NGOs, civil society and the Catholic Church joined the call to the EU for help, many of them also showed a critical attitude towards Europe, which was blamed for not being ready and well-suited to cope with this migration crisis¹³.

However in April, despite calls by Italy, and Malta as well, to activate the solidarity mechanism obliging member states to share the burden of the current migration flows from Libya and Tunisia, Home Affairs Commissioner Cecilia Mallmstroem has argued against the proposal, stating that ‘the numbers are not yet huge’ to merit the activation of the 2001 EU directive 55 on temporary protection¹⁴. Italy can benefit from the classical solidarity aid coming from FRONTEX which would increase operations in that context¹⁵. Subsequently, the EU formally refused the proposed during the Justice and Home Affairs Council held in Luxemburg in April 2011.

¹³ For instance, Father Gabriele Bentoglio, Undersecretary of the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerants, stated: "The States of the European Union are unprepared to cope with a situation which is a structural problem. A coordinated legislation at the EU level is missing and no State can be left alone to cope with it. We hope to have a clear stance from the UE on what is happening". La Repubblica, 14.02.2011.

¹⁴ According to this directive all EU states are obliged to take refugees in the case of a mass immigration.

¹⁵ La Repubblica, 06.04.2011 and 11.04.2011; Corriere della Sera, 12.04.2011 ; Il Giornale, 12.04.2011; Libero, 12.04.2011.

What is given great relevance across most articles is the series of violent disputes that erupted in the EU arena, which sees Italy opposed to EU institutions and some Member States, and accusations on both sides. On the one hand, Italy firmly complains of a lack of solidarity and concrete action from its EU partners (box 1) while, on the other hand, some Member States, and most notably France, which is more directly involved, but also Germany, Denmark and Spain, sharply criticize the Italian policy, stating that Italy is dramatizing over a situation that can be easily handled and that it has broken EU laws by handing out temporary permits to illegal migrants in order to get rid of them quickly and passing the buck over responsibility for migrants to other Member States¹⁶.

In this controversial scenario, the EU institutions, mainly the European Commission, show more diplomatic coolness in refusing Italian accusations¹⁷. The EC also stressed the fact that Italy already received important aid from the Home Affairs budget (External Border Funds, Return Funds, and European Refugees Fund) to tackle the migration crisis (129,000 Euro in 2010/2011)¹⁸.

Box 1 – Lampedusa: Italy left alone in the migration crisis

“We are alone, Europe doesn’t do anything”

(Il Giornale, 12.02.2011, Il Corriere della Sera, 13/14.02.2011, La Repubblica, 10.05.2011)

“It is unbelievable and incredible that the European institutions are completely inert and wait to see what is happening in front of the political and social crisis caused by the arrivals in Lampedusa in recent days”

(Il Giornale, 16.02.2011)

“The European contribution to the humanitarian emergency? Nil. More than 21 thousands of refugees, € 30 million allocated by the Italian government, dozens of flights and boats, patrols in the Mediterranean 24 hours a day. All at the expenses of Italy. Other countries say: Dear Italy, this is your business. Manage it on your own”

(Liberio, 16.02.2011)

“Europe boasts about great principles, but little attention to real problems”

(Liberio, 09.04.2011; Il Corriere della Sera, 11.04.2011)

“The European Union is an institution that is ready to save banks and to declare wars, but when it comes to show real solidarity with a country like Italy, it hides”

(La Repubblica, 11.04.2011, Il Giornale 12.04.2011, Libero 12.04.2011)

Source: Quotation from Maroni, the Interior Minister of Italy, various articles

The Italian Interior Minister Maroni, who belongs to the conservative, anti-immigration and Euro-sceptic Northern League, is certainly one of the leading actors in the Italian-European controversy,

¹⁶ Among the comments of EU member states:

- ✓ Frans-Peter Friedrich, the German Interior Minister : (i) “Italy has no reason to complain about lack of solidarity, twenty-three thousand refugees in relation to the country’s entire population is not a problem; (ii) Rome’s plan to issue travel visas violated the spirit of Schengen; (iii) We cannot accept numerous economic migrants arriving in Europe through Italy. This is why we expect Italy to respect the existing legal framework and to live to its responsibility ”
- ✓ Claude Guéant, the French interior minister: “Solidarity among EU members states should be based on the Treaties, no signal should be given that we accept irregular migration into the EU”.
- ✓ Maria Fekter, the Austrian interior minister: “if word is spread that Italy is handing out visas to illegal immigrants, in order to get rid of them quickly, we might have a huge vacuum effect”; “the arrival of refugees from North Africa would prepare the ground for criminality”.
- ✓ Gerd Leers, the Dutch minister for immigration and asylum: “I was quite dissatisfied with Italy’s surprise decision to pass on its problems to all the others without prior notice”.

¹⁷ Statement by Michele Cercone, EC Spokesperson for Home Affairs, on behalf of Cecilia Malmström: "I was very surprised by the recent press statements by some Italian authorities on the alleged bureaucratic and slow response by the European Commission to their request for help concerning the increased migratory pressure from Tunisia.

I had personal contacts with the Italian authorities already on Saturday and I asked if they needed our help to cope with these exceptional circumstances. Their reply was clear: no thanks, we do not need the European Commission’s assistance at this stage. Despite the lack of a request from their side, I immediately asked my services, the Frontex Agency and the European Asylum support Office (EASO) to assess how the European Commission could support the Italian authorities in this difficult situation (14.02.2011).

¹⁸ Liberio, 12.04.2011, La Repubblica, 06.04.2011, Il Giornale, 12.04.2011.

and the message he passes on is clear. On one occasion, following the EU refusal to activate the 2001 EU directive 55 on temporary protection as proposed by Italy, he even questioned whether it still makes sense to remain in the European Union (“we are better off alone than in bad company¹⁹”); the Prime Minister, Berlusconi, declared in similar terms: “Either Europe is something that is real and concrete, or it is not; in that case, it is better to go back to each one going their own way and following their own fears and ego²⁰”.

Even if this anti-Europe threat was essentially a taunt (made more for covering some deficiencies in the Italian reception and protection system), it still received some support from right-wing newspapers (“Is it excessive to think of leaving Europe²¹?”), Egoist and insensitive: moving away from this Europe is not a curse²²”, “Brussels, go to hell – Europe holds only duds: let’s halve our debt and then go away²³”) and has been harsh enough to alarm President Napolitano (“We should not joke with Europe²⁴”).

Along the same line the enormous tension arisen as a result of the migration question is presented as an alarm bell for the future of Europe, where Member States are heavily influenced by domestic political considerations and opt for individual solutions instead of looking for a **“single and united European voice capable of considering immigration as an important global question²⁵”**. The financial worries across the euro-zone, the growing populism and the rise in support for far-right, racist parties are certainly among the main reasons why many European leaders are winning support by dropping hints that border controls may return, putting into question the Schengen rules or threatening a departure from the EU. As recognized by the catholic editorialist Giorgio Ferrari “the ratio of this backshop accountability that disguises behind the Treaties and hides behind smoky and inconsistent solidarities is the fear of losing power and consensus: a political short-sightedness very close to blindness”.

Among the EU institutions, the Commission, and most notably the European Commissioner for Home Affairs Cecilia Mallstroem, was certainly the most active in the matter. Besides some initial misunderstandings with the Italian authorities, she recognised the need for a European role to face the problem²⁶; among the same lines also President Barroso²⁷. However, from an overall reading of the articles the Commission seems to be more concerned with trying to accommodate fears and priorities of each single MS rather than expressing a firm position vis-à-vis the continuous arrivals and the related debates between MSs. What is more, other important actors in the EU external relations appear as absent from the overall picture (Catherine Ashton) or even insensitive towards Italian requests and needs (European Council)²⁸.

Generally speaking, less attention is given to concrete plans and proposals put forward by Europe to face the problem. The articles include generic references to on-going support to Italy, but no

¹⁹ Il Giornale, 12.04.2011; La Repubblica, 11.04.2011; Il Corriere della Sera, 12.04.2011.

²⁰ Il Giornale, 12.04.2011.

²¹ On 12.04.2011, the newspaper Il Giornale launched an on-line survey. The majority of the respondents, that are presumably right-wing readers of the newspapers, confirmed that they do not consider it as an exaggeration. (79,12 %)

²² Il Giornale, 12.04.2011.

²³ Libero, 14.04.2011.

²⁴ Libero, 12.04.2011. The articles published on La Repubblica on the 11.04.2011 and entitled “Migrants, warning of Napolitano: No retaliations, Europe is one”, quotes Napolitano’s reaction to Maroni’s and Berlusconi’s statements: “My feeling is to support a strong Italian engagement in Europe so as to pursue a common vision and a common policy also as regards the matter of migration and without taking into account positions of retaliation, harassment, division or even separation”.

²⁵ Frattini, the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Libero, 12.04.2011.

²⁶ For instance she recognised that: “the EU cannot leave that the countries more exposed to migration flows are left alone to cope with the emergency coming from the North African migration flows. If the Commission cannot impose solidarity, it is however necessary to better share responsibilities and to increase solidarity within Europe”, Libero, 04.05.2011.

²⁷ In line with the Commissioner Mallstroem, Barroso stated: “The countries that are more exposed to migration flows cannot be left alone to face with the problem; it is the duty of all countries to help them. The obligations should be equally divided among all member states who should take their responsibilities. This is the European spirit. Solidarity and responsibility are the key words of our answer to migration. The answer, therefore, should be European. We should find a joint governance and not unilateral solutions”, La Repubblica, 10.05.2011.

²⁸ Some reactions expressed by MSs during the Justice and Home Affairs Council of April 2011 have been presented in the note 4.

indication is given to the EU's reaction for building a more articulated and coherent EU strategy in the field of migration and asylum, as reflected in the Communication adopted in May 2011²⁹, and in the subsequent Council Conclusions on: "*Borders, Migration and Asylum - Stocktaking and the way forward*".

As a result, the prevailing image coming from the newspapers points to a divided Europe, guided by national priorities, and reflects the growing perception of the distance of Europe with regard to Italian situation. This image seems to have negatively affected the Italian perception of the EU and the support to the European institutions ("And after that wall we discover ourselves euro-sceptic³⁰"). According to a survey commissioned by the newspaper "Il Corriere della Sera", the majority of Italians (72%) did not approve the EU decision to reject Maroni's request to allow temporary permits and over a period of a few months (January-April) the confidence towards the EU dropped from 60% to 42%.

2.1.4 Conclusions

The opinions conveyed through the media during the "Lampedusa emergency" (which decrease from October but is still going on) are sometimes rhetoric but show the negative image of the EU in a founding EU Members States public opinion (Italy is one of the most pro-Europe country) when EU cannot quickly react with a single voice to crisis and has an hesitating attitude towards sensitive issues (MSs influence EU position on migration).

This is very well showed by the growing disaffection among Italians towards Europe bureaucracy documented in the survey carried (see above) out after the quarrel between Interior Minister Maroni (supported by the majority of public opinion) and different EU politicians and the Commission.

2.2 Research on international newspapers

2.2.1 Methodology

The Italian media coverage has been completed with the research and the analysis of media at International level to check what was the European and International perception on the Lampedusa case and the image of the EU to this extent.

What: internet research on international daily newspapers performed against the following criteria:

- 3 keywords: Migration, Lampedusa, European Union;
- 5-month period: February 2011 – June 2011.

The analysis is based on 40 publications from various sources, mainly on the following: "TV5 Monde", "France 24", "Le Figaro", "Spiegel Online", "EU Times", "The Economist", "New York Times" and "Reuters".

2.2.2 Findings

There are two messages that come out clearly from the articles:

- The difficulties in managing the migration crisis and to give a common response which is seen as a crucial test for the European Union
- The presence of mixed positions among EU actors.

²⁹ Communication on Migration – Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2011) 248 final, Brussels, 4.5.2011.

³⁰ Il Corriere della Sera, 18.04.2011.

As pointed by many titles (“The next EU crisis: boat people³¹”, “Immigration crisis strikes at the heart of the European Union³²”, “The end of the EU project?”; “Another project in trouble - First the euro, now Schengen. Europe’s grandest integration projects seem to be suffering³³”, “Immigration et politique extérieure: l’Europe en panne?³⁴”) the EU disputes over illegal migrants as a consequence of the Arab pro-democracy awakening is given strong emphasis for its potential impact on the overall EU architecture. Along the lines of the financial crisis of 2008 and the ongoing debt crisis that raised fears for the future of the euro, also the migration crisis has raised considerable concerns for the future of another key EU achievement: the Schengen borderless zone.

As a matter of fact, the influx of migrants is singled out as a source of alarm leading some EU politicians under populist pressure to request, in exceptional circumstances, a restoration of border controls and a reform of the Schengen agreement: *«Incapable of finding their balance faced with the consequences of the ongoing revolution in the Arab world or of resisting pressure from domestic anti-immigrant parties, European Union leaders are succumbing to the temptation to retrench. The development could have serious consequences for the 25 countries that have implemented the Schengen Agreement.»*³⁵ [...]

In practice, national demands and sensitivities require a watering down of the rules that make up the building blocks of Europe. According to this logic, Europe will continue to be a formidable crucible of internal tensions and a weak engine driving the common policy. The problem is that questioning the Schengen rules will not halt the flow of desperate migrants. The revolution in the Maghreb, like that in communist Europe, is playing out in historical time, not that of television³⁶.

It also underscores divisions in Europe on how to tackle immigration illustrated in the following extracts:

- «Lampedusa: 25.000 migrants économiques divisent l’Europe³⁷».
- « Fears of immigrants, fanned by right-wing parties and voter discontent over economic malaise, have deepened already profound divisions within Europe. Experts say the issue is proving to be at least as problematic — and potentially as destabilizing — as Europe’s struggle to manage a succession of financial crises.³⁸
- «What to do with the thousands of North African refugees arriving in Italy and Malta? The issue has hopelessly divided the European Union's member states³⁹».
- Since the global financial crisis, the European Union has been deeply divided over economic policy. With the Libya intervention, it has split over foreign policy. But today few issues are proving more divisive within the bloc than immigration⁴⁰.
- «The influx of economic refugees from Tunisia has exposed deep rifts in the European Union. Italy wants help in dealing with the thousands of immigrants who have arrived since the beginning of the year, but the rest of the bloc refuses to provide it. It is just one more example of an EU struggling to stay united⁴¹».
- «The dispute over what to do with the Tunisian refugees on its southern flank is far from the only conflict battering the European Union. Indeed, the 27-member bloc has rarely been as divided as it is today, despite hopes that the Lisbon Treaty would bring EU countries closer together. Common interests are fading while the self-interest of individual countries is on the rise once again. The supposedly unified continent, which

³¹ The economist, 11.04.2011.

³² Big Peace, 13.05.2011.

³³ The economist, 28.04.2011.

³⁴ TV5 Monde, 13.05.2011.

³⁵ Is Border Dispute a Betrayal of EU Values?, Spiegel Online, 27.04.2011.

³⁶ “Is Border Dispute a Betrayal of EU Values?”, Spiegel Online, 27.04.2011.

³⁷ TV5 Monde – 12.04.2011.

³⁸ The New York Times, 12.04. 2011

³⁹ “NORTH AFRICA NEEDS A MARSHALL PLAN”, Spiegel Online, 12.04.2011.

⁴⁰ The New York Times, 12.04. 2011

⁴¹ “Is This Your Democracy? Refugee Influx Exposes Limitations of European Solidarity”, Spiegel Online, 18.04.2011.

benefited from the great upheavals of 1989, has never been as unpopular with its citizens as it is today. Immigration is an issue that motivates voters in all EU countries, as evidenced by the rise of right-wing populist parties in France, the Netherlands, Sweden and now Finland. But skepticism of a flux of newcomers from North Africa is everywhere - and national interests have clearly trumped collective solidarity⁴²».

Also the position among EU institutions is not always united, for instance while European Parliament requests a burden-sharing system among all members in the management of external borders, asylum and immigration and is against the reintroduction of border checks within the Schengen areas, the Council and the Commission accepts the proposal coming from the joint French-Italian letter.

Generally speaking, most articles tend to have a rather critical view vis-à-vis the EU institutions' reactions that are often presented as hesitant and as an expression of the EU incapacity to respond in a constructive and coordinated manner to the challenges of migration, as put in the following statements:

- «Italy-Tunisia migrant crises highlights failed EU policy⁴³».
- «Les révolutions nord-africaines soulignent l'incapacité à agir de l'Union européenne⁴⁴».
- «Une Europe en panne à l'abri de sa forteresse⁴⁵».
- «Soutenir les révolution arabes tout en refoulant ses migrants? Où sont les "solutions communes" de l'Union européenne face à ces flux migratoires engendrés par les révolutions arabes, l'émergence de nouveaux régimes et de nouvelles données économiques? Au delà des rappels de grands principes appuyés par une mission intitulée "Hermès" de l'agence Frontex à Lampedusa, la commission européenne ne semble pas prête à répondre pleinement à ses engagements de "solutions communes"⁴⁶».

On the other side, some articles recognise that the immigration crisis has engendered a healthy pressure towards the reform of the migration and asylum policy, where the Commission is playing an active role with a concrete proposals presented to the EU Council in May and June 2011.

The impact of migratory flows to Schengen free circulation rules was also discussed at the EU Parliament the 11th May 2011 and this meeting has been reported into press articles. The Commission behaviour is considered by EU Parliamentarians incapable to give a common and shared answer to this issue. In addition the Commission is considered to be not much coherent, as on one side refused the activation of the temporary permits to migrants disembarked in Lampedusa due to their not exceptional numbers but accept to consider the introduction of temporary border control in Schengen countries for exceptional situation (France stopped migrant /refugees from Lampedusa to enter in France, and Denmark which re-established unilaterally border control in June). EU Parliament asked also to activate a parallel policy to south Mediterranean country to manage in a coordinated manner the migratory flows, on one side, and to give concrete aid to the most affected Mediterranean countries on the other side (Tunisia, Lybia, Egypt and Siria)

2.2.3 Evidences form interviews to different stakeholders

The findings in this section are related to the interviews done with people working with organisations, NGOs and the Italian governmental agency in Lampedusa and in general dealing with migration issues. The kind of answers are limited to concrete actions in response to the emergency, they are more of technical than of political nature.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Agence France-Presse, 02.05.2011.

⁴⁴ «Immigration et politique extérieure: l'Europe en panne?», TV5 Monde, 13.05.2011.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Lampedusa: 25 000 migrants économiques divisent l'Europe, TV5 Monde – 12.04.2011.

All stakeholders interviewed are very committed in working with migrants and refugees in Lampedusa. Personnel found themselves working effectively in „emergency“ mode. The demands of working extremely long hours day and night, dealing with large numbers of people, who were often traumatized and in need of immediate assistance following their long and strenuous journeys, put an enormous strain on the on the ground.

Lampedusa officers reported that migrants themselves have different levels of information and of perception of the situation. Some are well educated and knows the difference between the EU and Member States and of the systems regulating the asylum policy. The most of them are not aware and came by boat in Lampedusa just to enter in Europe for escape to taught poverty or conflict situations. They wanted to reach some European countries that they knew mainly in Northern Europe, France or Germany. The integration prospects for those granted international protection in Italy are extremely limited, and this remains one of the most problematic areas of the Italian asylum system.

The Ministry of Interior supports financially and strongly welcomes the Praesidium project and its approach to contribute to tackle the emergency through International agencies and specialised NGOs. The *Protezione civile* (Italian government agencies dealing with emergencies) appeared mutually helpful and constructive in working with the responsible organisations in Lampedusa. Protezione civile has a different mandate being in charge of the coordination of the challenging national pan to transfer the migrants from Lampedusa to different locations spread all over the Italian territory. The Praesidium project has a very good track record and it is considered to be a good practise in the reception of mixed flow of migrants; a publication have been issued to explain this practices that can be replicated in other similar contexts.

All the organisations have a good perception of the EC as a founding organisation; it is considered a good and helpful partner in this domain. The EC supported the Praesidium project from the beginning and finances different other projects on migration and integration all over the Italian territory and at regional level. They believed that a direct EC contribution to the Praesidium project could be beneficial, but in any case funds are provided by the Italian Minister of Interior.

3 ANSWER TO SELECTED EVALUATION QUESTIONS

- ***EQ1: The image of the external action of the EU perceived by the stakeholders.***

The prevailing image is that of a divided Europe, guided by national priorities; these seem to have negatively affected the perception of the EU in Italy in relation to the Lampedusa events, but also internationally.

Italian and international media consider that the sudden and intense migration waves to Lampedusa are a matter that should concern Europe as a whole and not just Italy.

In concrete terms, the perception is that relatively little is at stake; the number of stranded North Africans is still manageable. But of all the European disputes, this one could prove the most difficult to resolve. Immigration is an issue that motivates voters in all EU countries, as evidenced by the rise of right-wing populist parties in most of EU countries such as in France, the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland. But scepticism of a flux of newcomers from North Africa is everywhere – and national interests have clearly trumped collective solidarity.

The tensions resulting from the Lampedusa crisis raised the alarm about the fact that MSs are heavily influenced by domestic political considerations and prefer to opt for individual solutions rather than to look for a **“single and united European voice”**.

The majority of Africans seeking work or refuge in Europe are Tunisians, but a growing number are sub-Saharan Africans fleeing Libya or the crisis in Somalia. Migrants arriving in Lampedusa generally have no perception of the difference between MS and the EU. But some have knowledge of the rules governing asylum & refugees in the different EU countries (Dublin II). The majority of migrants

wants to reach Northern EU Countries, they are not interested in staying in Italy due to the weak integration policy.

Migrants interviewed by the press have mentioned that there was little evidence of solidarity upon their arrival. This is mainly due to the condition of the refugee camp in Lampedusa.

- **EQ4:** *How well do stakeholders perceive the benefits of EU external action ...?*

The perception on the external European action in the migration field is strongly influenced by the EU internal migration and asylum policy. Fears about immigration deepen EU divisions and prevail in the press articles and in the people's perceptions. The EU actions in the development matters with the Mediterranean countries were not at the centre of the press and public opinion attention in the EU countries during migration emergency to Lampedusa.

At the Italian level, from a survey commissioned by the newspaper "Il Corriere della Sera", the majority of Italians (72%) did not approve the EU decision to reject GoI's request (activation art 55 of protection directive on global solidarity) and over a few months (January-April) the high confidence towards Brussels dropped at that time from 60% to 42%.

EU seek to act in a coherent manner as far as external action is concerned tackling not just migration flows issues but also the root causes of migration with financial contributions to the relevant Mediterranean countries. The EC prepared at that time a plan to help those countries after the Arab spring, notably Tunisia. The support to Tunisia for the democratic transition and economic reforms amounts to 250 million euros plus 140 million to help the country to readmit nationals deported from Europe. This plan was announced by the president of European Commission M Barroso which aimed at alleviating the sharp conflicts within the EU on the question of the Tunisian refugees, which has become political dynamite. EU recognized that the only possible solution that would prevent crises like this from happening again and to effectively prevent a mass influx of migrants is to improve living conditions in the countries of origin and transit.

- **EQ6:** *Messages are coherent across different EU external action and internal policy areas? Are the messages conveyed and activities carried out by the EU in the country contradictory with those of its member States?*

The Commission seemed to be a weak actor in relation to these events, more attentive in trying to accommodate fears and priorities of each single Member States than of expressing a common position (i.e unilateral revision of Shenghen of some MSs). Global solidarity objective comes into conflict with MS reluctance to find common solution.

The Commission behaviour is considered by EU Parliament as well incapable to give a common and shared answer. EU Parliament stressed the need to link internal EU migration policy with EU external support to the most affected Mediterranean countries.

- **EQ8.** *How far the resources mobilised by the EU adequate to carry out visibility/communication strategy?*

At the internal level the action of the EC is well structured. The EU Communication strategy in the Member States is managed by DG COMM through the Commission's Representations in each country.

The EU Representations have specific dedicated budget and professional staff to implement the EC communication priorities defined at the beginning of each year.

There are clear criteria for the definition of the EU Representations' communication budget which is related to the population and to the size of each MS (number of seats at the European Parliament).

The main tasks of the EU Representations in relation to communication with media includes to follow national media trends, to provide media with information on EU policies, to feed media with articles and, when necessary to rebutt to misleading information.

In some countries EU has also management partnerships with government to carry out joint communication activities. In Italy, for instance, the partnership is with the *Dipartimento delle Politiche Comunitarie della Presidenza del Consiglio* which acts as Intermediary Body.

4 **CONCLUSIONS**

- The EU reaction to influx of immigrants in Southern Europe was an additional recent extraordinary test, together the economic crisis and Libyan intervention, for cohesion and European strategy, and the result is clearly very mixed.
- There have been signs of a coherent EU external action intervention in the migration and development field during the flows of migrants in Lampedusa that follows the Arabs turmoil, but this coherence is not much visible. For instance, the EC actions to support the democratic transition and the economic reforms in Tunisia were just briefly mentioned in press articles.
- EC invests a lot in term of financial resources for migration, notably within the Union, but the projects and activities are not much known especially by general public in MSs.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PEOPLE MET

NAME	FUNCTION	ORGANISATION
Barbara Molinario	Lampedusa Field officer	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Riccardo Clerici	Praesidium Project co-ordinator	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Simona Moscarelli	Praesidium - Project legal co-ordinator	International Organization for Migration (IOM), Office of the Director for the Mediterranean and Chief of Mission for Italy and Malta
Giovanni De Siervo	Head of the International Relations Office	The Civil Protection Department, Presidency of the Council of Ministers
Fiorito	Lampedusa Team Leader	The Civil Protection Department, Presidency of the Council of Ministers
Juri Pittaluga	Coordinator - The Head of Department Press Office	The Civil Protection Department, Presidency of the Council of Ministers
Carlotta Bellini	Project Manager	Save the Children Italia Onlus