



# Dialogue with CPR partners

## Lessons learned applying the partnership principle – HOME Affairs funds

Ari Valila – HOME E.1  
12 June 2024

# Monitoring Committee (MC) (Art. 38 CPR)

- To be set within 3 months of the date of notification of the Commission decision approving the programme.
- One single MC can cover more than one programme.
- Each MC must adopt its rules of procedure (voting rights/procedures, transparency, meetings, attendance...) and make them public.
- **Balanced representation** (also see Art. 8 CPR and Art. 4 AMIF Reg.). List of participants to be made public. COM in monitoring & advisory role. Decentralised Agencies may participate. Non-members can be invited on ad-hoc bases.
- No specific partnership Articles in the basic acts of BMVI and ISF.
- Art. 8 CPR is applicable to DG HOME funds, although not the Partnership Agreement part (Art. 8 concerns PAs and **programmes**)

# Functions of the Monitoring Committee (MC) (Art. 40 CPR)

- Approving:
  - Proposals by the Managing Authority to amend the programmes (incl. introduction of SCOs and financing not linked to costs - Art. 94 and 95 CPR)
  - Selection criteria
  - Annual performance reports
  - Evaluation plan
- Examining (mostly relevant for HOME Funds, not exhaustive):
  - Programmes' implementation & performance
  - Communication & visibility actions
  - Fulfilment and reporting conditions on horizontal enabling conditions
  - Administrative capacity building
- NB: Managing Authorities to support and provide information to the MC
- **Implementation, monitoring and evaluation phases may require different “relevant” partners.**

# State of Play

- 47 Monitoring Committees (MC) across the 78 programmes
- All MCs now set up and the first meetings have taken place.
- MC composition & rules of procedures not publicly available for all programmes.
- Main points raised by DG HOME during the process:
  - the composition does not fully comply with the legal requirements, especially as regards civil society representation (esp. BMVI and ISF)
  - no voting rights for all members, as per the CPR requirements
- MS must ensure adequate level of visibility and easy access to information by relevant stakeholders

# Lessons/challenges learned so far 1/3

- Early findings, since the implementation just started in 2023.
- Several Member States have had difficulties in securing commitment of certain categories of partners (civil society, regional and local authorities) to participate as members in monitoring committees and thus ensuring balanced and comprehensive structure of the monitoring committees
- This has been the case in BMVI (Border Management and Visa policy (national sovereign powers for activities such as border management and visa policy, much funding for large-scale IT systems)) and in particular ISF (Internal Security (national sovereign powers in counterterrorism, de-radicalization, serious and organized crime, cybercrime etc. (national security and confidentiality))), to large extent due to specific scope of policy/substance.
- In some cases, organisations did not want to be associated with decision making in migration and border management since they felt their independent status could have been put into question.

# Lessons/challenges learned so far 2/3

- In some cases, both the administration and the organisations concerned felt that establishing full partner status would not align with the role they can play institutionally in the policy area given the specific scope of the Home funds.
- Examples:
  - a) while social and economic partners are appropriate actors in the framework of Funds such as ESF+, they are not obvious partners for a Fund supporting visa and border management, where governance is based on other principles than social market economy considerations;
  - b) while regional and local authorities are appropriate actors in the framework of Funds such as AMIF (integration), ESF+ and ERDF, they are not obvious partners for Funds supporting visa and border management and law enforcement, where governance is not territorially organised and powers are centralised.

# Lessons/challenges learned so far 3/3

- Some Managing Authorities had concerns with the involvement of certain organizations in the monitoring committee as they could be potential beneficiaries of the funding under the programmes.
- And finally, especially in small Member States (and in sparsely populated areas), the number of organizations active in the Home Affairs policy areas is more limited.

# Good practices and responses to lessons learned

- DG HOME will continue supporting Member States in ensuring compliance with the CPR requirements on the composition of the monitoring committee, especially when it comes to the involvement of civil society organizations.
- Work of MCs and incl. balanced representation (Art. 8 CPR and Art. 4 AMIF Reg.) is within the scope of mid-term evaluations 2021-2027.



# Thank you!



© European Union 2022

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

Slide xx: [element concerned](#), source: [e.g. Fotolia.com](#); Slide xx: [element concerned](#), source: [e.g. iStock.com](#)

