Summary/Conclusions

1. On 9-10 December 2013, the 21st Meeting of the Budapest Group of Senior Officials was held in Istanbul, Turkey.

2. The Senior Officials meeting gathered 73 participants from 39 countries – Afghanistan, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Italy, Kyrgyz Republic, Lithuania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom – as well as the European Commission, the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (FRONTEX), the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

3. As specifically mandated by the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration, the first senior officials meeting following the 5th Budapest Process Ministerial Conference served the purpose to agree on priority areas for concrete actions to implement the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration. The purpose of the meeting was in more detail to discuss the multiannual strategy 2014 – 2016, including:
   a. Operational activities under the BP Silk Routes Programme
   b. Geographic working group structures and thematic expert meetings
   c. Links to regional and global fora such as the GFMD

4. In addition, the meeting served as a platform for senior level discussions on tomorrow’s migration management and on implications of crises for countries of origin, transit and destination, especially following recent events in Syria.

5. Turkey as the Chair of the Budapest Process opened the meeting, emphasising the strong link between this regional dialogue and the global migration debate. In fact, the objective and most priority goals in the “Istanbul Ministerial Declaration” of April 2013 are reflected in the “Declaration of the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development”. Further opening statements were made by Hungary as the Co-Chair and ICMPD as the Secretariat.

6. In the first session, Pakistan reported on the 4th Silk Routes Working Group Meeting held on 28-30 October 2013 in Islamabad and thanked all Budapest Process countries for their active participation. It was the first meeting to take place in the Silk Routes
region and it served to identify several concrete areas for cooperation (see separate conclusions).

7. Turkey introduced the draft multi-annual strategy paper, building on preparatory project work and related consultations, incorporating the results from a survey carried out by the Secretariat as well as the results of the 4th Silk Routes Working Group meeting.

8. The chairs of the three regional working groups presented their respective activities, achievements and strategic outlook for the upcoming implementation period:
   
a. The Silk Routes Working Group, chaired and co-chaired by Turkey and Afghanistan, will focus on supporting the implementation of the BP Silk Routes Programme.

   b. The Black Sea Working Group, chaired by Bulgaria, will continue the exchange of experience and knowledge on different types of migration (legal, irregular and refugee flows) in the region.

   c. The South East European Working Group, chaired by Croatia, will aim at discussing mixed migration flows in the region including through the development of an action plan.

9. Initiatives and priorities under the Silk Routes Programme were presented by stakeholders:
   
a. The upcoming larger scale project “Support to the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration under the Budapest Process” with the overall objective to strengthen the migration management capacities of the Silk Routes countries (Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan) was presented by Hungary (lead implementer) with comments by Turkey and the European Commission. The project is supported by the European Commission, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and ICMPD. Presently, the project has a budget of 3,230,000 Euro and is financed as follows (Euro): European Commission 2,600,000; Turkey 450,000; Hungary 50,000 and Sweden 30,000.

   b. Switzerland announced the positive decision to join the above mentioned project as partner with a financial contribution of 100,000 EUR. Also the Netherlands announced its interest to join as partner with a contribution of 300,000 EUR after finalising internal procedures.

   c. The Netherlands and Switzerland also announced an interest in the project “Diaspora Engagement in the Silk Routes Region” and are looking into funding opportunities. Further partners and donors were encouraged to join.

   d. Norway aims at participating actively in the Silk Routes Programme as of 2014. Concrete priorities will be specified in the beginning of the year.

   e. The United Kingdom, which is currently funding the first concrete follow up action of the Istanbul Ministerial Declaration, namely -the project “Bridging Measures for Migration Management in the Silk Routes Region” implemented by ICMPD, welcomed the plans presented for implementation – which will allow partners to go from “process to progress” and stated an interest to participate also in further follow up initiatives.

   f. IOM described a project aiming at the development of complementary actions to implement the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration funded by Turkey and due to be implemented in 2014. IOM also expressed support to
the Budapest Process and mentioned its capacity to add specific value in program delivery in the region tied to the Multi-Annual Strategy.

g. Further projects are in the pipe-line under the Silk Routes Programme (i.e. on legal migration and mobility or return and reintegration assistance) and are to be further elaborated and concretised in the upcoming year. Several countries and international organisations have expressed an interest to participate and contribute.

10. Specific priorities for the implementation of the BP Silk Routes Programme were shared by the Silk Routes countries:

a. Afghanistan pointed out that there are several measures ongoing in the country, but broader capacity building assistance is still needed in the area of interagency cooperation, the establishment of focal points and networks, methods for analysing data and formulating migration policies and welcomed the initiation of the project “Support to the Silk Routes Partnership for Migration under the BP”.

b. Iraq emphasised the need for a tailor made approach, translated to their specific situation with carefully chosen topics and themes. The administrative region, the Kurdistan Regional Government – welcomed the exchange of information offered and international expertise to be provided.

c. Pakistan referred to the detailed results of the Silk Routes Working Group and the adjacent study visit – giving very specified areas for concrete cooperation – ranging from awareness raising to support to victims of migration related crime.

d. Iran welcomed the invitation to the meeting, indicated interest to engage in further discussions and receive more information relating to the Budapest Process and proposed a continued information exchange after the meeting.


12. In the second session, looking into future migration management structures, Turkey presented the new “Law on Foreigners and International Protection”, the principles of Turkish Migration Policy as well as the structures of the newly established Directorate General for Migration Management (DGMM).

13. Sweden as the current chair and Turkey as the incoming chair of the Global Forum for Migration and Development (GFMD) reiterated the importance of cooperation and a partnership approach. Turkey presented main priorities for the Chairmanship and announced its intention to increase the contributions of the regional processes such as the Budapest Process to the global migration debate. A few states also suggested drawing linkages to regional processes such as the Bali, Colombo and Prague processes.

14. IOM proposed to draw on post-2015 UN Development Agenda which had adopted many important migration related recommendations under various thematic areas.

15. With a view to the strong implications of crises on migration management, Turkey’s Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD) presented the challenges Turkey has been facing with the enormous influx of Syrian refugees into Turkey since 2011. Several initiatives for education, health care, shelter and food are running (i.e. free health care, cooking facilities instead of canteen food, etc.), but further support is
needed. The international community was encouraged to continue providing support. In
the ensuing discussion the following main comments were made;

a. UNHCR recognised the remarkable support to Syrian refugees by Turkey
and other countries (i.e. Germany, Sweden, Bulgaria, Greece) and urges the
countries to continue their efforts and provide for Syrian citizen.

b. IOM highlighted its work within the Migration Crisis Operational Framework,
its recent study on Afghanistan which looks at the ramifications on mobility
with the withdrawal of the international forces in 2014 and the establishment
of the EU task force in response to the current situation in the Central
Mediterranean.

c. Iraq has been managing many incoming Syrian refugees, especially in the
Kurdish region. International support has mainly targeted refugees, but not
the local society or security situation.

d. The European Commission stated their strong support to all countries
providing for Syrian refugees.

16. The Chair summarised discussions held, thanked all participating countries for their
engagement and contributions and entrusted the Secretariat with the task of
summarising discussions and conclusions as well as to circulate results.