



Brussels, 28 November 2022
(OR. en)

14776/22

LIMITE

MIGR 351
JAI 1466
ASIM 93
RELEX 1526

NOTE

From: Presidency
To: Delegations
Subject: Evaluation of the implementation of the MOCADDEM

DOCUMENT PARTIALLY ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC (06.07.2023)

In accordance with Article 6 of the Council implementing Decision on the Operational Coordination Mechanism for the External Dimension of Migration (MOCADDEM)¹, Coreper shall review the implementation of the MOCADDEM based on a report submitted by the Presidency no later than 12 months after the entry into force. The Czech Presidency in close coordination with the trio Presidencies, France and Sweden, drafted a questionnaire in order to evaluate the functioning of MOCADDEM since its establishment in January 2022 and to support the preparation of the report.

Based on the replies to that questionnaire submitted to the Member States, the Commission and the EEAS, the Presidency has prepared below an initial summary of the evaluation of MOCADDEM for the EMWP community with a view to taking stock of its first year of functioning and to finding ways for improvement.

¹ Council Implementing Decision (EU) 2022/60 of 12 January 2022 on the Operational Coordination Mechanism for the External Dimension of Migration (OJ L, 17.1.22, p.79).

Based on those initial findings and following the EMWP debate, a draft report will be issued and consulted, as foreseen by the Implementing Decision, with the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, before being submitted to Coreper at the beginning of the Swedish Presidency.

To streamline the debate on 30 November at EMWP, the Presidency would like to focus on the following questions:

1. *Do you consider the summary of replies reflects well the overall assessment of the functioning of MOCADDEM?*
 2. *Would you like to highlight any other key message?*
-

Summary of the replies from the Member States, the Commission and the EEAS to the questionnaire

1. What do you consider to be the main achievements and added value of the mechanism so far?

Most Member States perceive action fiches and common messages as main achievements. In general, Member States pointed out the ability of MOCADDEM to identify actions and stakeholders without unnecessary lengthy political discussion. The comprehensive approach to all the migratory routes and the flexible and operational character of MOCADDEM was underlined repeatedly. Several Member States positively assessed the summarization of EU institutions' and agencies' actions, as well as Member States' bilateral activities, improving coordination between all stakeholders.

A few Member States noted that MOCADDEM ensures better information sharing and coordination of EU efforts and contributes to a swift and effective implementation of the EU's migration policy in the external dimension. In general, the timeframe for specific actions was welcomed. Some Member States underlined the usefulness of follow-ups of the action plans and clear and specific formulation of goals towards the priority countries and regions that contribute to transparency and better coordination.

2. How could the operational output of the MOCADDEM be further enhanced, notably in terms of implementation (action fiches) and follow-up (implementation reports)?

In the replies regarding the enhancement of the operational output of MOCADDEM, many respondents voiced the need for implementation reports that provide an opportunity for the assessment of individual activities and areas of cooperation. Regular and systematic evaluation will then, if necessary, create space for improvements and amendments. In general, Member States prefer quality over quantity when it comes to action fiches.

Many respondents called for reasonable and sensible timetables for the implementation and progress monitoring of the actions as well as an evaluation mechanism needed for the implementation. Some Member States would prefer long-term planning of the agenda to ensure high-quality discussions. Some member States suggested organizing a country, region and thematic action fiche into groups.

Some respondents would favour a more detailed list of contributions from the Member States, a more operational and less descriptive format of the action fiche and the inclusion of the short-term priorities (1 to 6 months). Responses include a notion to allow MOCADDEM to identify third countries willing to cooperate, to which, based on this assessment, priority as regards action fiches would be given.

Some respondents provided suggestions for the facilitation of the work in MOCADDEM meetings, including the establishment of the rules of procedure, timetables and workflow from the first draft of the action fiche to presentation to COREPER and scheduled and regular updates in 6-months cycles. Some Member States suggested focusing more on future-oriented action fiches and implementation reports.

3. How do you ensure the common messages annexed to individual action fiches are used while engaging with a third country of interest?

According to replies by some Member States, the EU should speak with one voice when communicating with partner countries. Therefore, the common messages, one of the strongest communication tools at our disposal, should continue to be included in the action fiches and communicated by the EU delegations to key third countries of origin and transit. However, there is no clear consensus on whether the common messages should be an inherent part of the bilateral engagement of the individual Member States. Some respondents prefer to regard the common messages only as a subsidiary tool, an addition to bilateral engagements with third countries. Some Member States, on the other hand, consider the common messages to be a basis for any political contacts with partner countries.

Some respondents would prefer to review the common messages periodically, so the up-to-date information is disposable for the embassies and other relevant stakeholders. According to some Member States, the common messages could become leverage on the political level.

4. How could the working methods of the MOCADDEM be adjusted to:

a) further improve the EU's coordination and responsiveness in a timely manner on pressing migration issues?

Member States, in general, pointed out the need for better coordination between different working groups and mechanisms involved in the external migration issues on the EU level. The Council's strategic preparatory bodies (EMWP, SCIFA) and COREPER should provide strategic guidance, and the operational level (MOCADDEM, IPCR) should follow up on the strategic discussions, implementation of actions in the external dimension, monitoring and practical substance of the migration matters, e.g. development of toolboxes.

MOCADDEM should also remain well connected to the priorities for action identified in the EMWP. Some Member States prefer MOCADDEM to assume the operating characteristics of the IPCR in the event of a crisis. On the opposite, other member States stress the already established role of the IPCR for crisis management. Some Member States would appreciate more coordination and information exchange with the regional working groups (COAFR, COASI etc.) and the related increase in the size of the delegation to the MOCADDEM (the current format 1+1). Most Member States, in any case, highlighted the need to maintain a close link with COREPER.

b) better involve Member States and increase their engagement?

Member States should be, according to some, more involved in the Commissions activities (trips at the political and technical level) in countries of origin and transit and MOCADDEM should be informed about such undertakings.

Most Member States stressed the need to circulate documents in advance to ensure sufficient time for internal consultations. To better engage Member States, clear objectives, expectations, and contributions from them should be clarified, together with more structured reporting on Member States' activities. Some expressed the need to reinforce the link between discussions in EMWP and MOCADDEM and high-level political discussions.

c) further engage the EU delegations in third countries of interest?

The Member States stressed the importance of the involvement of the EU delegations in key countries of origin and transit in the development and implementation of the action fiches, given the available situational picture on the ground and knowledge of the local environment. According to some, regular (monthly) meetings should be held on the level of EU HoMs/EMLOs, where action fiches for respective countries, information on the MOCADDEM discussions and reporting from the side of the delegations would be on the agenda. Their operational role could translate into strengthened coordination, better disseminating the communication campaigns in the key countries of origin and transit and identification of the needs on the ground.

d) ensure one-voice communication to achieve agreed objectives?

The Member States are of the opinion that ensuring one voice is a key element of EU communication with key countries of origin and transit in order to achieve agreed objectives while also respecting areas of particular priority at a bilateral level. Broader coordination should be ensured together with the common messages in the action fiches that are a prerequisite for some Member States. **DELETED**

5. Which specific country and/or thematic fiches would you consider necessary to address in MOCADDEM in the short to medium term, to ensure effective implementation of the European Council conclusions of December 2021 on EU relations with third countries in the field of migration?

Without prejudice to the strategic guidance of COREPER, in their answers to the questionnaire, Member States voiced their priorities regarding the specific countries/regions and thematic fiches that should be addressed in MOCADDEM and emphasized the need for regional balance, which is currently reflected in the action fiches. The regional focus should be on the Western Balkans, Silk Route countries, Central Asia, and North Africa, more specifically **DELETED**

The answers regarding the thematic fiches included Article 25a, return and readmissions, visa leverages (also development policy and trade), as well as combatting irregular migration and smuggling activities resonated. On the other hand, some Member States would prefer to focus on the implementation of the existing fiches as opposed to the enlargement of the list of priority countries based on clear assessment.

Member States in their answers also appreciated a balanced approach in the external dimension, regular updates from the Commission and the EEAS, as well as thematic debates and regional/migration route action fiches under the Czech presidency.

6. Any further comments?

Member States also suggested a set of concrete measures to improve the coordination and functioning of the MOCADDEM, including creating a compilation/matrix of deliverables and achievements and an overview of the initiatives and all stakeholder activities in the external dimension of migration to avoid unnecessary duplications and competences overlapping. Some Members suggested that the participation of the Schengen Associated States or international organizations such as IOM or UNHCR in the MOCADDEM meetings could be considered on a case-by-case basis. Some countries also pointed out the need to follow the Team Europe approach.