**EAPN Task Force: Advocating for a human rights**

 **approach to migration, refugees, and asylum seekers.**

**26th September 2016**

**Draft Notes**

**Participants:** Eleni Karaoli (EAPN Cyprus), Kadri Soova (PICUM), Aleksandra Selak-Zivkovic (EAPN Croatia), Robin Hanan (EAPN Ireland), Rachele Bezzini (EAPN Italy), Stefan Stefanovi, (EAPN Serbia), Magnus Paalsson (EAPN Sweden), Giacomo Manca (Eurodiaconia).

**EAPN Staff:** Sian Jones (EAPN Policy Coordinator), Elke Vandermeerschen (Communication Officer).

1. **Introduction and presentation of each participant.**

Each participant presented themselves to the group. Sian briefly introduced the background to the Task Force and the main aims of the Task Force. The agenda was also introduced.

1. **Issues facing EAPN members on migration.**

Eleni introduced the session, where members of the TF summarized their national fiches, highlighting the key trends, main issues as well as EAPN national actions.

* **Aleksandra/Croatia**: Croatia is not a hot spot for refugees. There was a wave of migrants going to the N of Europe. They were housed in a good standard of camps, but these are not now being used. The refugees now are being kept in social welfare premises and 1 old camp. The key actors are the Ministry of the Interior. Before there was a lot of support from local civil society, but now there is less. The government doesn’t provide many services. It’s mainly Red Cross, Caritas and service providers. But civil society is not much included or Croatia EAPN. We would like to change this.

**Main issue** is supporting inclusion and integration of migrants.

* **Stefan/Serbia**: 700.000 migrants passed through Serbia last year. Normally they have to have documents, otherwise they are held. But in this case, even though most have no documents, Serbia allows them to pass. There were camps before, but now they are mainly refugees in transit. There are however, issues of human security with migrants travelling from Greece to Serbia. The State has no reason to be obstructive. Now, at the borders we have stranded people because the borders with Macedonia etc have been closed. The majority asked for asylum – around 200 daily, then others would leave. There are no big camps, except near the border with Hungary.

**Main issue** is how to deal with the stranded people who don’t want to stay in Serbia. Who will provide help?

* **Magnus /Sweden** – EAPN Sweden is not working much on migration concentrating on groups facing poverty and social exclusion. A year ago the migration flows increased dramatically. At that time, Sweden had the same approach as Germany ie to welcome refugees and try to manage it. In November, the centre left and centre right had the same policy. Only the right wing populist party raised issues of keeping migrants out. But now the numbers have become a major challenge. So the breaks have been put on. In 2015, the figures doubled from 2014. More than 160.000 refugees came to Sweden. One of the biggest groups were unaccompanied children and young people (35.000). 2/3 of these came from Afghanistan. It seems to be a semi-organized flow by way of Iran. There are 100.000 plus asylum seekers awaiting a decision, to find if they will get residence. Normally 55% are granted a stay in Sweden. The main debate has focussed on the challenges to the welfare system, the access to the labour market and to the education system. Some schools have been forced to take a major responsibility when a half of the pupils are recent migrants. There is now a new focus to determine their age through medical examination, finding that several are not minors. This is a very sensitive decision. The Doctor’s Associations don’t want to play that role. But this is changing. When they are first taken in they often end up in rural areas, because there are houses available. But most want to move to the bigger cities because of work opportunities. On the whole they are very well received by local communities, particularly in N Sweden. Civil society does a lot of work – Red Cross and other local initiatives, sports etc. In cities, there are major problems of housing – ie Stockholm and Malmo. EAPN wants to engage, but has no formulated position.

**Main issue** is supporting integration and access to services, particularly for children and young people.

* **Rachele/Italy** - Last year there were 150.000 arrivals in Italy, this year there will be probably the same number. They mainly come from Africa –Nigeria, Eritrea, Gambia, Guinea, Sudan, Ivory Coast, Somalia, Senegal, Mali – most are not refugee-producing countries. 70% of these migrants are men. The first step is the rescue at sea (within the EU intervention FRONTEX since 2015). The migrants are then put in centres, in different parts of Italy, usually managed by NGOs. They can be put in apartments or houses, and in the country or the city. Also people offer to take them into private houses. They will not be sent back, but probably they will not get asylum. They are more or less treated as workers, after 2 months from the request of asylum (which usually takes place a few weeks after the arrival) they are allowed to work with some restrictions. They can go to University. The children can go to school. It takes around 18 months to get a response. In the meantime, if they get a full job, they can’t stay in the centre. Many want to go to other countries, also because of other family members, language, etc. They usually get support from local NGOs and receive Italian classes, health care assistance, etc.
* **Main issues**: migrants shouldn't be seen as a problem. They are not really big numbers. It is necessary to look more at the causes – about supporting adequate development in these countries, not just manage the crisis. There are some good practices among local associations. It would be good to highlight them and learn from the best practice. Also peer support from migrants to each other could be useful in the management.
* **Giacomo/Eurodiaconia** - Eurodiaconia has always worked somewhat on migration, but now it they are doing more work because of the asylum seekers crisis. Before they worked more on inclusion and integration of migrants, as with any excluded groups. They don’t work on accession, as they don’t have the capacity – ie issues of granting rights. They work on integration – the early welcoming of migrants through to full integration, including access to work, health and housing, with many organizations providing social housing. At EU level it is mainly advocacy in coalitions/alliances. They also provide Information and capacity building to members ie EU funding, applying for project money. They encourage good practice exchange with members, ie on the integration of children and one on access to health and social services. But they don’t focus on the rules themselves. Eurodiaconia members focus on using an integrated approach, so not just services to migrants but a broader range of general services – ie long-term unemployment, helping them to get skills, organizing language courses. For example, the Reform Church of Hungary has a refugee mission, and is helping them to improve their skills and adapt to the labour market. They provide language classes and support children’s integration in the schools. They also provide services for homeless people.

**Main issue** is integration and access to services.

.

* **Robin/Ireland:** Historically Ireland was an island of emigration. Half of the children will eventually emigrate. Immigration has only become an issue since the 1990s. Before that there was no asylum system, with only 5-7.000 a year. Ireland has been very resistant to providing asylum status to refugees. The acceptance rate is only 5%. NGO lawyers have managed to challenge this system. Ireland tries to deter migrants from coming, with a draconian system. They have opted out of the EU reception system. People can end up waiting 10 years for a decision. The children can go to school. They stay in centres which are clean and they have food, but it is very disempowering. They are not allowed to study or work. There are 3.000 currently in such centres. The main instrument has been the Dublin Convention, and new forms of carrier liability. Ireland has a closed door policy, and as a result there are very small numbers. From the time of the accession of Central European states, in 2004-8, there was a large amount of labour migration. The government encourages short-term stay for such migrants. The policy has been to try to attract skilled workers and professionals. There has also been concerns about exploitative manual labour eg PICUM in Ireland have done a campaign about people exploited in domestic households, those who are trafficked, without passports, or are on farms. This is helped by Government policy which is designed to link visas to a particularly employer, then migrants can be deported or exploited by trafficking. In general, the Irish government response to the Middle East crisis of refugees, is to avoid it. They have promised to resettle 2.000 but have only take 270 from Syria. Ireland has isolated itself. So we are not in the front line, just trying to keep people out. Migration is always seen as a problem. The Media also concentrates on scare stories about migrations and abuse of the system. In terms of the NGO sector, there is a lot of support and good networking. There is a specific campaign to overcome the government’s position stopping asylum seeker from working. The campaign won, but now it has changed again. There has been a strong campaign on undocumented migrants as well in Ireland. The government supports the position of undocumented migrants in the USA, so the campaign tries to make this link with Ireland’s own treatment of migrants. There has been a strong wave of public support to Syria and Syrian refugees. There is a strong campaign for Ireland to increase its share of the quotas. There is also a more personalized response from civil society - collecting clothes for people in Greece and in Calais. Most NGOs work with refugees and other migrants regarding access to services. Basically the Irish Government wants highly skilled migration from other EU countries and avoids any other. EAPN sees a lot of the problems are about the lack of an effective EU approach, so we would want Ireland to a more progressive approach.

**Main issue:** is defending migrant’s rights and tackling abuse, as well as integration. An adequate EU approach is vital**.** EAPN works strongly in alliances with migrant groups.

* **Cyprus/Eleni:** We don’t face the same problem as Italy/Greece. We get a few people coming in, but not many. The legislation is based on EU rules. There is a 6 month wait for a decision on asylum. There are 2 camps. 1 for new comers and 1 for those on a longer stay. They get allowances and maybe able to work. When they are granted full status they can work. There is no integration policy from the government, only from NGOs. For example, working with unaccompanied children. Very recently, Caritas has started supporting women refugees and their rights. We do try to get involved, and are in touch with these organizations. The Government doesn’t know what it wants. Civil Society is sympathetic, and collects food and sends it to Greece. People also go to assist in Lesbos and other hot spots. There has been a narrative about migrants taking our jobs, but it’s not a very big issue. 230,000 Cypriots are refugees in both directions, so we know what it means to be a refugee. This means that society is more sympathetic. Eapn is not working on this specifically but some NGOs are – ie PICUM.

**Main issue** is integration and support, including access to services, particularly unaccompanied children and women.

**Kadri/PICUM:** PICUM has specific expertise and work with other NGOs. Red Cross at EU level is very active. Main concerns is what could be EAPN added value to this debate, as antipoverty network? Our starting point is undocumented migrant’s rights and their social rights, starting in 2001. Now PICUM has 150 organization members in EU and some overlaps with EAPN. They have moved forward on issues eg access to health care for all migrants, labour rights and exploitation, education, children and specific work on woman who experience violence. They look at what kind of regular channels exist beyond asylum – particularly labour and family reunifications. They look at hard EU policies, FRONTEX, detention and issue of returns and expulsions. They try to cover the issues that other organizations don’t want to cover. They work with Eurodiaconia/Feantsa. Core issues are the same. There are key problems– experiencing poverty, looking for work and ems of precarious work permits and vulnerability, with weak migration status. PICUM doesn’t look specifically at asylum policies, as they see it as creating more undocumented migrants. Across the EU there are very different approaches. The result depends on state policy, and the narrow interpretation given to it, not to the migrant’s story. There is strong concern about the criminalization of migrants. PICUM looks at the fall out of these policies, not just the conditions, for example: detention. They focus less on conditions (other organizations do this), but as a tool.

Kadri emphasized the importance of a common language/terminology**:** PIUM have booklets about this, ie avoid use of the term illegal migration – use regular and irregular. Should speak of children, not minors. From a child right’s perspective, this covers anybody under 18, but varies from country to country. Should also not use the term asylum seeker, but refugee. We need to broaden the scope, and demand that governments also have a plan B. Everybody applies for asylum but a minority are accepted.

**What Advocacy are members carrying out?**

The group had a brief exchange on how far national networks and European Organizations are focussing on service provision and/or advocacy in the area of migration.

* **Italy:** Associations which are part of EAPN may deal with migrants, in reception centres, for example, but not EAPN directly. EAPN primarily works on anti-poverty issues.
* **Cyprus**: 1 organization in the network is working on migrant’s rights.
* **Ireland**: As a network, they don’t lead on it, but support campaigns as part of alliances. The EAPN IE policy group relies on Migrant Rights Centre and Refugee Council. Key issues on integration, but also as part of alliances on increasing migrants quotas, and improving access to rights. EAPN Ireland supports migrants as with other people experiencing poverty to be activists.
* **Eurodiaconia**: does some work on advocacy at the European level ie the Action Plan on Integration – they support it, and the report in the EP. At the local level, they have organizations which are service providers and are more or less active, with the tightening of integration opportunities.
* **Sweden**: like Ireland, EAPN nationally supports the work of local organisations. There are activities in 8-10 cities, but not really advocacy. Red Cross is the main organization that is doing this work..

**What are members’ expectations?**

* Want to learn from each other – what’s happening in Hungary or other countries. To know about the reality on the ground**.**
* Want to be clearer about what we can do together, what kind of advocacy could be effective**.**

**What could be the role of EAPN**? **What could be EAPN’s value added in this debate**.

* **Emphasizing the rights of people coming to Europe for a better life**, for whatever reason – escaping poverty, wars, persecution. Avoiding the divisions between good and bad migrants ie refugees/ and undocumented
* **Highlighting migration and poverty - what happens to people when they arrive?** the conditions they face- poverty and social exclusion, the criminalization…
* **EAPN could help to provide a balancing voice**, within the divisions between organizations backing asylum seekers and others focussing on the right to a dignified life for all.
* **Present a positive narrative of migration as a benefit**, and not demonizing migrants. – The demographic challenges, and the importance of diversity, as well as rights. **We need them and they need us**.
* **Highlighting the reality on the ground** **and supporting migrant’s voices and participation.**

**Summing up: Common Issues**

Sian provided a summary of the key issues discussed.

* **Safe passage.**
* **Support and Integration – access to jobs and services (health, social services, housing, education) from first arrival to long-term integration**.
* **Ensuring rights of asylum and residence**
* **Exploitation/abuse/trafficking/ and returns.**
* **Specific vulnerable groups: children, women, older people.**
* **Legal routes/legal rights/different institutional settings and policy responses and why**
* **EU role and policy – underpinned by neo-liberal regime**
* **Tackling the causes/re-thinking EU development role**
* **Changing the narrative– the right to a better life for all/ we need them they need us.**
* **Challenging the media.**
* **Participation – supporting migrants as activists. Giving a direct voice to migrants, avoiding being patronizing. Taking their views and needs seriously.**
1. **EU Context, Internal and External Opportunities**

**EU Policy overview presentation – Eve/PICUM**

* It’s important to start with the overall picture ie what is happening on EU migration policy as a whole. We need to look beyond integration policy. The message at the moment is that the EU is only for recognized refugees (PICUM doesn’t work on this – although there are issues)..
* MS are continually trying to limit the EU role. Ireland opts out and UK on home affairs. Always geared towards selecting migrants, and then getting rid of those they don’t want. This is primarily MS led. It is possible to work on key issues with the European Commission, but MS level is key and it is they who are dictating.
* **PICUM now has a new focus on expulsions**: ie with the Returns Directive, enforcement levels are very uneven.. Countries are lazy, but with increased numbers, it becomes a new priority This is being driven by Junker and high levels in the Commission and Council. It’s very reactive, reactionary, and linked to post Brexit. The general context now is towards making deals with MS that is palatable for everybody. MS asking for expulsions.
* **There is a new role for FRONTEX** with joint returns. Should be 2 countries, but now can be just 1 country with FRONTEX. It’s true that FRONTEX has produced a Right’s handbook, but in reality they have a very low focus on rights or enforcement. There is no accountability.
* **There is more of a move by EU to work bilaterally** to take people back. EU is making this easier with EU travel documents and the EU-Turkey deal. They cover their back.
* **PICUM’s advocacy position is that you need to have to have minimum standards** about mass expulsions. There should be a conditionality clause to development aid. The EU is the World’s biggest donor. There is a new line from the EU saying that they are not a development agency, but political. Their 1st objective is to return people and stop people from coming ie a 2 pronged approach. Migration control, appears in 3rd country deals, and makes some attempt or at least reference to addressing root causes, but also exercizing migration controls is the priority eg with Sub-Saharan Africans. PICUM is working with Development Organizations eg Oxfam.
* **New legislation** ie the Asylum package – could create more people that fall out of the system. There is no plan B for people who don’t achieve status.
* **Other regular channels?** EU has a Seasonal Workers Directive which looks at low wage work, then the Blue Card scheme which is aimed at high wage workers. However, the threshold is around 6000 Euros a month. The EU wants the high-skilled workers above all. PICUM raised the issue with the European Commission. The EU also needs low wage/medium waged workers – eg retail/health/social services. 10 years ago there was an approach that was more horizontal, now sectoral based on wages with a focus on high skills, apart from seasonal workers. The Seasonal Worker legislation is good, and gives good standards. But what is the logic? It’s important to challenge the neo-liberal logic. The EU just wants migrants for their work, but without rights.
* **Child Detention**: There is a very important clear ask which it would be important that EAPN backs. The EU should avoid this last resort language – ie only detained as last resort. Detention is always a child’s rights violation. EU is pulling down the standard at global level, where they are trying to advocate to end child detention. There is some good practice at EU level ie 12 countries that don’t do it. With the Returns Directive, they can’t ask to reject it, but should look at how it can be changed. There are some good elements here, but no political interest in implementing it.
* **Employers sanctions directives** has some safeguard for workers, but no political interest in implementing it. Had some success on this, but not seen as a priority for EU now.
* **Issue of inclusion is crucial**: access to basic services regardless of status – housing, education, healthcare…

**Opportunities**

* PICUM is the Consultative forum on FRONTEX, and can give input. But this is expected to be technical expertize. Fundamental questions about the objectives, impact and bigger picture can’t raised. It would be a key issue to get observers.
* The national level is crucial: The EU has less its own agenda, just trying to please member states’ Post Brexit.
* Focus on working together and in alliances. NGOs have a regular meeting with Timmermans. They try to issue Joint statements and have same messages. It is crucial that Civil Society work together.

**National level**

* Croatia: we focus on having a strategy on poverty reduction – so migrants are one group at risk. This is a potential hook. We don’t have this direct experience where rights are being violated. We can only say that it’s being ignored, given low priority. We should be more in contact with human rights organizations. We need to take a bigger role, but have no funding as a network. We have good relationships with the Commission and with trade unions. We are policy orientated, also have Red Cross/Caritas as members.
* Serbia: our focus is poverty and social exclusion. Some member organisations are working on advocacy and support in the field. We are not an EU country, but this will increase if we are in the EU. Issue of safe transit is important: they are given temporary permits, but don’t have to ask for asylum. The government decides when it starts and ends. There were no changes on policy, during the crisis – ie groups of migrants, no policies on vulnerable groups. We should advocate for a national policy framework which would manage mass flows, and recognize different groups, temporary stay etc. Around 2000 people at the moment, but this will increase. Push backs- not really a problem in Serbia. Main problems are in Macedonia which can’t pass to Serbia. There is more of a problem on the border to Hungary – with the new law – criminal trespass.
* Sweden: EAPN doesn’t have a policy but tries to raise awareness of the issues. We need to find out what is happening at the local level and provide constructive examples. National framework is the most important. EU framework doesn’t have much muscle. (There is however binding legislation at EU level).
* Italy: Migration could be seen as an opportunity for locals and migrants. All parts (civil society, associations, policy-makers, etc.) need to meet migrants directly and know this reality. National level reception has to be organized and linked to integration. Also necessary an EU approach to migration and a broader than national perspective. Distinction between short and longer term measures is needed.
* Eurodiaconia: we want to move outside the short-term focus. However, we are social service providers. We don’t focus on accession/or expulsions, but recognize it’s important to be voice for their concerns. Our main priority is ensuring social services accession, regardless of legal status. Also the issue of coordination ie with the European Pillar of Social Rights could be a key opportunity ie – access to services – health education and job market.
* Ireland: The Irish National Action Plan for Inclusion is still a central document for Ireland and EAPN. We are working with politicians, to be drawn up next year, the last one was 10 years ago. We would like to see 1 every 5 years. We focus on the specific position of asylum and undocumented migrants and to try to bring them into the mainstream, to become part of the debate on poverty and access to rights. Ireland is not part of Schengen, although it part Eurozone, but wants to maintain its strong links to UK. Historically always considered as part of common travel area with UK. So post Brexit context is not looking very positive. Key issues are rights, welfare, provision for asylum, housing, right to work, going beyond migrants group; habitual residency condition used as a way for pushing people out of the country. EAPN is not the leading group, but very engaged. Our role is mainly on the narrative – supporting local community based organizations to understand the broader context of migration as a long-term phenomena. Providing support for specific campaigns and bringing those issues into joint campaigns. Mainstreaming it into the Poverty and Social Inclusion Agenda.

Cyprus: there is a lack of coordination between different organizations. Maybe EAPN can play a bit this role, try to coordinate in Cyprus. We must remember that we are poverty/social inclusion organizations.

**EAPN: Other Opportunities**

* **Most of our members are local organizations offering services**. So we need to exchange also our ideas of services/common projects and what could be done better.
* **Developing advocacy approach at national level is important, but will be complicated, and will need to be done in alliance with the expert NGOs**.
* **At EU level, we need to have a clear common view and** see if we can support, or create a common action with other NGOs.
* **EAPN has expertise in other key areas and we should be aware of the opportunities to mainstream into these, but also the implications for poverty and other people in poverty.**
* **Key areas are: EU funds – ie ESF and FEAD which are now giving more priority and extra funds to migration/refugees – with implications for funding for other groups.**
* **The European Pillar of Social Rights** – at the moment migrants are not a visible group within this.
* **European Semester and Europe 2020 –** see how it can be mainstreamed – ie in the country reports and the CSRs.
* **Sustainable Development Goals** – likely to be a keyEU narrative from 2020 – 2030 ie post Europe 2020 – could be a key instrument to deliver a more global rights based approach.
* **EAPN internally** – the group should be aware that the EAPN Membership Development Group has prioritized capacity building and training for members on the issue of migration/refugees. They were looking at an on-line platform. The TF will need to coordinate with them. The EAPN staff member Magda working on this.

**Discussion**

* **Kadri/PICUM:** Using EAPN’s expertise in these areas is very important**.**
* **Robin/Ireland:** Funding is important, but it is nibbling at the edge of the important political issues. We should be careful to keep our focus on challenging Fortress Europe - rather than a Europe driven by solidarity.
1. **TF Terms of Reference: scope, objectives and outputs**

Sian presented the TF Terms of Reference and clarified the scope, objectives and outputs.

These had been developed closely with the EUIS Group, adapting the initial proposal developed by the Spanish and Italian networks. The main changes from the original proposal was to focus on broader migration rights concerns, rather than only refugees/asylum seekers and to prioritize capacity building and developing a consensus and common messages rather than detailed technical reports.

The main outputs for 2016 would be the briefing and the planning for the capacity building, with the workshop itself taking place in 2017, followed by the advocacy strategy and position paper.

**Key discussion points**

* How to draw on expertise from the rest of network, beyond the Task Force? It will be difficult to get detailed info from other members, it can only be voluntary, but the workshop with the EUISG and maybe EXCO will be a key opportunity to facilitate this and develop common messages.
* It will also be important to get people who participate to take responsibility for sharing the info/capacity building with their own members.
* We need to support a step by step approach, which encompass short and long-term measures.
1. **Moving forward on the Briefing**

The group discussed the approach to the Briefing – aims, who it’s targeted at, style and content, and who will do what**.**

**Aims/target audience/style**

* **Who is the Briefing targeted at**? Primarily EAPN members – in the EUISG and national members. The Briefing is first and foremost a tool for discussion and use for EUISG members. The EUISG members will then have to see how they adapt for their own members.
* **Style?**  It should be accessible, useful and understandable, with key terminology explained, ie include short glossary with a link.
* **What length?** 10 pages. There could be a shorter document/summary which could then be translated by members? It can have links to longer, more explanatory documents.
* **Key national context examples** – some key examples can be added in the text or in annex/on-line.
* **It should include a list of institutional instruments**

**Approach**

* **The overall focus/approach should be person-centred,** giving a voice to the migrant’s own story – highlighting the situation/reality then the instruments they face and the challenges/obstacles.
* **The overarching message is the right for all to a dignified life.** Not criminalizing people who merely seek a better life. No hierarchy of reasons.

**Contents List**

1. **Setting the political context and big picture – broad view of what’s happening with EU migration policy and its impact.**
2. **Arrivals:**
	* How many/who are they?
	* Why do they come?
	* What routes from what countries?
	* What do they want? some profiles/examples of people – different groups – children, families, older people. Testimonial box.
3. **Status: What EU legal frameworks do they meet:** asylum/migration/rights frameworks - a mapping of the key instruments; **What are the regular channels availabl**e?
4. **What happens next?** Emergency support and longer term/ return policy**.**
5. **What do they need?** Integration and Inclusion: Access to services/jobs and housing, social protection.
6. **What are the Barriers and the Gaps? Where are the most serious violations of rights?** – labour exploitation, children and women/criminalization/trafficking
7. **What do migrants bring? Challenging the myths** – migrants contribute more than they take; diversity helps build secure/social cohesive societies/migrants fill the gap left by demographic ageing etc.
8. **What is the role of NGOs? What opportunities/good practices exist?**
9. **What are the opportunities/threats – what’s missing?**
10. **Who does what**
* **Kadri** will do the 1st draft of the briefing**. Eleni** will prepare the rationale introduction and the key terms.
* **Sian** will coordinate with Kadri/Eleni and the rest of the Task Force , provide minutes and other support, help to finalize the products and manage the liaison with broader EAPN membership and structure including EUISG.
* **Elke,** as Communication Officer will advise with style and do the lay-out – publication is likely to be in-house, also develop it as an on-line tool; disseminate and print the document; liaise with national communication officers.
* **Other members of the TF:** will finalize their national fiches, provide input to the drafts and other discussions, including concrete examples from the national level and testimonials.
1. **Next Steps**
* **1st Draft of the Briefing – 17th October**
* **Comments and examples – 1st November.**
* **2nd draft by 18th November.**
* **Task Force meeting on Monday 28th November**
* **Finalize Briefing by 18th December**
* **Last draft goes to EUISG.**
* **TF members to update Fiche by 10th October and send back to Sian to go on member’s rooms.**

**Revised timetable (28/10/2016)**

* **1st draft of the briefing – 28 October**
* **Comments and examples – 11th November**
* **2nd Draft by 22nd November**
* **Task Force Meeting discussing 2nd draft – 28th November.**
* **Finalize Briefing by 18th December**
* **Last draft goes to EUISG**
1. **Evaluation**
* **Eleni –** well prepared Terms of Reference document was very useful and useful meeting.
* **Kadri** - positive meeting, well prepared, key points all useful. Pleased with the proposed result because of it. Glad to work more with EAPN, glad we are all on the same page.
* **Robin** – think it’s one of the most important subject but worried before. But now feels positive that we can come up with something great. So really happy.
* **Giacomo** – happy with the meeting. It’s important to make the starting point real experiences. Looking forward to read 1st draft and contribute.
* **Rachele** – good meeting. The very mixed experiences are very interesting, but missed Greece…
* **Magnus** – happy to meet you all and learn from your interesting experiences and views.
* **Elke** – enjoyed the meeting, and was amazed at the progress and the consensus in 1 day.
* **Stefan** – positive meeting. I didn’t know what to expect and wasn’t sure of my role as we do research not advocacy. But now think it can be useful. Important to chart Migrants own experiences and talk directly to the organizations in the field.
* **Aleksandra** – happy with the preparation, and getting started with this important topic. Will try to involve EAPN members and engage more with the relevant rights organizations.
* **Sian** – very pleasantly surprised by the progress made in the TF. Very interesting mix of experiences and inputs. Feeling very positive.
1. **Next Meeting**

The original date was set on the 5th December, but has now been agreed as Monday 28th November.

Briefing – moving forward.

Next Step