



## First Meeting of the Working Group on the Organisation of the IMC, Rome, 14.12.2009

### PREAMBLE

The creation of the Working Group on the Organisation of the IMC (hereafter called FONCIM, an abbreviation of its French name) was approved at the Gothenburg Plenary Assembly, further to a proposal by Lazio Region.

On this occasion, the IMC Assembly confirmed its interest in the issues examined in “Notes for a Policy Paper”, which Lazio Region had already presented at the 21st General Assembly of the IMC in Rome on 17 July 2009, and asked Lazio Region to coordinate a working group to tackle the subjects concerned.

Lazio Region’s paper dealt with *“different aspects linked to the IMC organisation. Some proposals even concern a possible strategic position among the Mediterranean political and administrative bodies.”*

It should be stressed that the proposals made in this paper were not referring to “general policy choices in the Mediterranean area, but mainly to the strengthening of operational modalities used by the Mediterranean regions to interact more efficiently in order to promote specific policies.”

The key points were as follows:

- 1) Criteria for a balanced representation inside the IMC

- 2) Criteria for the election of the bodies
- 3) Concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes
- 4) IMC economic and financial management

For greater clarity, the minutes follow the points set out in the agenda and refer to the articles in the Internal Rules that are being changed (see full comparative text attached), sometimes irrespective of the real chronological order of the speeches and contributions, which have nevertheless been reported as accurately as possible.

## MINUTES

On 14 Decembre 2009, at 11.00, the following members of the Working Group on the Organisation of the IMC met in Rome, at the Direzione Regionale e Cooperazione tra i Popoli of Lazio Region, Via del Tintoretto, 432:

1. Maria Leal Monteiro, President, Alentejo Region (Portugal)
2. Lina Branco Freitas Jan, Directora do Departamento da Promoção, Alentejo Region (Portugal)
3. Maria de la Paz Heredia, Asesora del Departamento de Accion Exterior, Andalusia Region (Spain)
4. Angel Cortadelles, Director General de Relaciones Internacionales de la Generalitat de Catalunya, Catalonia Region (Spain)
5. Laura Alcoverro, Asesora en la Dirección General de Relaciones Internacionales de la Generalitat de Catalunya, Catalonia Region (Spain)
6. Joseph Scerri, Permanent Secretary, Gozo Region (Malta)
7. Mercedes Gallego, Asesora en la Direccion General de Relaciones Institucionales y Accion Exterior, Murcia Region (Spain)
8. Corinne Giacometti, Vice-President, Languedoc-Roussillon Region (France)
9. Dorothee Moussu, Direction des Politiques europeennes et contractuelles, Languedoc- Roussillon Region (France)
10. Paolo Lupino, Dirigente Aree Naturali Marine Protette, Lazio Region (Italy)
11. Philippe Cichowlaz, Directeur Général Adjoint en charge des Relations Internationales et des Affaires Européennes, Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur Region (France)
12. Domenico Zonno, Servizio Mediterraneo, Puglia Region (Italy)
13. Josefina Moreno Bolarin, IMC Executive Secretary
14. Aida Galindo Ortiz, IMC trainee

Mr LUPINO thanked the participants on behalf of Lazio Region and went through the points listed on the agenda which had been emailed to the members of the working group.

1. The system for electing the different bodies of the IMC
2. Criteria for a balanced representation inside the IMC
3. Concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes
4. IMC economic and financial management

Material made available to the working group included the following papers:

1. “Notes for a Policy Paper for the 21st General Assembly of the CPMR Intermediterranean Commission”, prepared by Lazio Region for the IMC’s 21st General Assembly in Rome on 17 July, which had already been published on the CPMR–IMC website.
2. A revised set of internal rules which Languedoc–Roussillon Region had prepared specifically for this meeting of the working group.
3. A paper with some observations, which Murcia and Valencia regions had drafted together specifically for this meeting of the working group.
4. A paper prepared by Lazio Region with an article–by–article comparison between the IMC’s current Internal Rules, the observations made in the three above–mentioned papers and a corresponding proposal for changes to the Internal Rules.

For practical reasons, it was suggested that the last paper in this list be used to guide the discussion during the meeting.

Before starting the discussion on the points listed on the agenda, Mr LUPINO firstly spoke of the problems arising as a result of **the IMC’s current internal communication system regarding the working group**. He explained the disadvantages of having to send all correspondence firstly to the CPMR General Secretariat in Rennes, which would then send IMC members the papers received, with the Executive Secretary’s signature. This procedure, particularly when applied to correspondence within the working group, is not very efficient and also causes unavoidable delays and possibly errors. As there is no predefined rule of procedure regarding this matter, and as the Assembly entrusted us directly with the coordination of the FONCIM Working Group, **it would be more appropriate for future correspondence to IMC members to be sent by the coordinator (Mr Lupino) or by the Executive Secretary (Ms Josefina MORENO)**, evidently sending a copy to the General Secretariat of the CPMR if it believes this to be necessary.

On the issue of efficiency, Ms MORENO, Executive Secretary, took this opportunity to emphasise the need to formalise the seat and all logistical matters in the agreement between CPMR and Lazio Region, because she had long felt that there were certain problems due to matters that everybody would understand and which at all costs needed to be resolved.

Ms GIACOMETTI, Vice-President of Languedoc-Roussillon Region, agreed that the system of sending all correspondence via the General Secretariat in Rennes did not work well and that improvements were needed as far as the seat in Rome was concerned, because Rome had been chosen in order to improve the situation and not to make it worse.

Mr LUPINO introduced the first item on the agenda concerning **the system for electing the different bodies of the IMC**. He presented a set of slides, which had been prepared by Murcia and Valencia regions, with a comparative table on the Internal Rules of the six CPMR geographical commissions as far as the election of their respective bodies was concerned. The table showed that the presidents of four geographical commissions were directly elected by their general assemblies, whereas only two geographical commissions (Atlantic and Mediterranean) had their presidents elected by their political bureaus. Given this situation, if the Political Bureau failed to ensure the balanced representation of IMC member regions, the method of electing the President would not be able to justly take into account the will of all the members of the Assembly. **It would be necessary and appropriate to amend Article 6 of the Internal Rules to ensure that the President and Vice-Presidents were elected directly by the Assembly.**

Concerning Article 6 of the IMC's Internal Rules, there were three other issues that need to be addressed:

1. The lack of any clear definition of the role of the Secretary to the President, which is referred to in the last paragraph (an issue already raised in the paper prepared by Murcia and Valencia regions).
2. The arrangements and timetable regarding deadlines for submitting candidacies for the position of President (an issue that emerged during the discussion).
3. The number of Vice-Presidents (an issue that emerged during the discussion).

Regarding the first issue, given that the President would be fully entitled to use a secretary, it would be inappropriate to have a rule governing something that goes without saying. Except in cases where there was a desire to give a secretary particular responsibilities, which should among other things be specified and might overlap with those of the Executive Secretary or even the Secretary General, **it would be necessary and appropriate to amend Article 6 of the Internal Rules to remove the reference to the position of Secretary to the President.**

Concerning the arrangements for electing the President and the deadlines for submitting candidacies, it was emphasised that they were not currently stipulated in the Internal Rules in force. To resolve this problem, Article 7, paragraph 2 of the CPMR's Charter could be referred to. Taking into account the points that emerged from the discussion within the working group regarding deadlines, it was proposed to increase the deadline (from 15 days to one month) for sending candidacies received by the Executive Secretary to all the IMC regions, in order to give them more time to assess the candidacies. **It would seem to be necessary and appropriate to amend Article 6 of the Internal Rules regarding the arrangements for electing the President.**

Regarding Vice-Presidents, the working group unanimously felt that it was important to highlight the current role of the "deputy vice president" in order to include this figure more within the IMC Presidency. However, as far as the number of Vice-Presidents was concerned, there were different views which could be summed up by the following the two positions:

Ms GIACOMETTI said that it would be desirable to have as few Vice-Presidents as possible in order to keep the structure of the IMC simple, bearing in mind that these figures have very little to do.

Ms MONTEIRO said that one of the requirements of the IMC was to involve the regions as widely as possible and the appointment of Vice-Presidents can encourage this process. Thought should therefore be given to the possibility of appointing at least one Vice-President per country represented within the IMC.

Mr LUPINO took note of the different opinions expressed and stressed their highly political nature. He thus noted the unanimous opinion of the working group, which decided to postpone the proposal to set a specific number Vice-Presidents **and opt only for the possibility of amending Article 6 of the Internal Rules regarding the number of Vice-Presidents, without specifying a specific number and by explaining to the Political Bureau the points of view that had emerged**

within the working group, so that it could adopt a position of a more political nature on the matter.

At the end of the discussion on the first item on the agenda concerning the system for electing the different bodies of the IMC, the following proposal to amend Article 6 of the Internal Rules of the IMC was made.

Current Internal Rules	Proposed change
<b>ARTICLE 6: The President</b>	<b>ARTICLE 6: The President</b>
The President is elected by the members of the Political Bureau for a two-year term of office, renewable only once. If the President is unavailable, his/her functions shall be carried out by the deputy Vice-President. If the deputy Vice-President is also unavailable, the President's functions shall be carried out by the most senior in age of the Vice-Presidents.	The President is elected by <del>the members of the Political Bureau</del> <b>by the IMC General Assembly</b> for a two-year term of office, renewable only once. <b>When the President is appointed, the Assembly shall also appoint a First deputy Vice-President and <u>XXXX</u> Vice-Presidents.</b> If the President is unavailable, his/her functions shall be carried out by the <del>deputy</del> <b>First</b> Vice-President. If the <del>deputy</del> <b>First</b> Vice-President is also unavailable, the President's functions shall be carried out by the most senior in age of the Vice-Presidents.
	<b>Full members of the Assembly may be elected as Presidents or Vice-Presidents. The Executive Secretary shall issue a call for candidatures to the regions represented, <u>four months</u> before the end of the President's "term". All candidatures must be sent to the Executive Secretary at least <u>two months</u> before the end of the President's term, together with a brief letter of intent concerning the policies they want to pursue inside the IMC. All candidatures received shall be sent to the regions <u>one month</u> before the deadline at the latest.</b>
The President supervises and coordinates the work of the Commission. S/he acts as a link between the Commission and the Political Bureau of the CPMR. The President is assisted by a private secretary appointed by him/her.	The President supervises and coordinates the work of the Commission. S/he acts as a link between the Commission and <del>the Political Bureau of</del> <b>the CPMR</b> . <del>The President is assisted by a private secretary appointed by him/her.</del>

Other less extensive amendments similar to the one made to Article 6 were also made to Article 7 (see the full comparative text of the Internal Rules attached).

Mr LUPINO presented the second item on the agenda concerning **criteria for a more balanced representation within the IMC**, which focus on Article 7 of the Internal Rules on the composition and tasks of the Political Bureau.

Some graphic illustrations were presented, which showed that the current composition of the Political Bureau as stipulated by the current Internal Rules (five

members respectively for Italy, Greece and Spain, three France, three for Morocco, two for Portugal, one for Tunisia, one for Cyprus, one for Lebanon, one for Malta = 27 members) in no way corresponds to the real composition of the Assembly (the number of participating regions, dues, population represented, etc.). In particular, some countries' representation was significantly underestimated (for instance the 14 Italian regions). The issue raised in the presentation above all concerned the need to find a common criterion for the composition of the Political Bureau, which matched the shape of the Assembly and worked well for its activities: there should be a move towards a non-proportional Political Bureau, with a member per country represented, as is the case for the Political Bureau of three geographical commissions and even the CPMR itself.

The following points emerged unanimously from the discussion within the working group:

1. Given the high number and wide variety of countries represented in terms of number of regions and population, the Political Bureau of the IMC could retain its proportional character.
2. It was noted that the representation of regions participating in the IMC was not balanced inside the Political Bureau and that it would be necessary to review this composition to ensure that it took account of objective criteria such as the number of regions and population represented.
3. Due to the need for the Political Bureau to work effectively, it may be that the number of members should be no higher than the number of members of the IMC. It was noted that, following the departure of the Region of Saida in Lebanon, which was agreed at the last CPMR General Assembly in Gothenburg, the IMC currently has 47 members and the Political Bureau should therefore have at least 23 members instead of the current 26 (27 minus the Region of Saida).
4. It was deemed essential that in all events all countries represented in the IMC should have at least one member within the Political Bureau.
5. Given that the Political Bureau would in all events be a "major" body as far as representation is concerned, even further to the changes planned under the previous points, it would be desirable to entrust the Political Bureau itself with responsibilities that bear witness to this importance, such as the ability to adopt political positions on behalf of the IMC (through resolutions, declarations, notes, messages, etc.) during the periods between one

assembly and the next. This amendment to the Internal Rules would enable the IMC to be more dynamic, as it would be able to adopt positions on politically important events of concern to the Mediterranean area.

The representative of Catalonia Region, Mr CORTADELLES, agreed to draw up a set of hypotheses on the composition of the Political Bureau taking into account the above criteria, which would be sent to the members of the FONCIM working group and then presented at the next meeting of the Political Bureau.

On the fringes of the discussion, Mr CORTADELLES, Mr CICHOWLAZ and Mr LUPINO stressed that, bearing in mind the unquestionably strategic need to involve as many regions as possible from North Africa and the Mediterranean Middle East in the IMC, **it would be necessary to permit forms of involvement for non-EU regions to overcome the problem of dues. Indeed, it was not just the case that dues (because they are in short supply) did not reflect a real contribution to the activities of the IMC, but they ultimately constituted an obstacle, particularly of a bureaucratic nature, to their involvement.**

At the end of the discussion on the second item on the agenda regarding **criteria for a more balanced representation within the IMC, the following proposal to amend Article 7 of the Internal Rules of the IMC was made.**

Current Internal Rules	Proposed change
<b>ARTICLE 7: The Bureau</b>	
The members of the Political Bureau are elected by the Plenary Assembly for a period of two years, which may be renewed. The Bureau thus appointed elects one or more Vice-Presidents from among its members.	The members of the Political Bureau are elected by the Plenary Assembly for a period of two years, which may be renewed. The Bureau thus appointed elects one or more Vice-Presidents from among its members.
It is composed as follows: Cyprus is represented by one member, Spain by five members, France by three members, Greece by five members, Italy by five members, Lebanon by one member, Malta by one member, Morocco by three members, Portugal by two members and Tunisia by one member.	It is composed as follows: Cyprus is represented by one member, Spain by <del>five</del> <b>XXX</b> members, France by <del>three</del> <b>XXX</b> members, Greece by <del>five</del> <b>XXX</b> members, Italy by <del>five</del> <b>XXX</b> members, Lebanon by one member, Malta by one member, Morocco by <del>three</del> <b>XXX</b> members, Portugal by <del>two</del> <b>XXX</b> members and Tunisia by one member.
In the event of a tied vote, the President's vote will decide	In the event of a tied vote, the President's vote will decide

the matter.	the matter.
The Bureau meets at the invitation of the President or at the initiative of a majority of its members.	The Bureau meets at the invitation of the President or at the initiative of a majority of its members.
In the event of a major requirement or particular need, and if the reasons are explained, the President may propose, at his/her initiative or at the request of a member of the Bureau, the written adoption of a decision between two Bureau meetings. In such an event, s/he will fax or e-mail the draft decision to all Bureau members, asking for a reply within 15 days. If no reply is received by the deadline, the proposal is considered approved. In exceptional and justified emergencies, a five-day deadline may be given. In addition, if the President refuses to accept a request for a written procedure, s/he must give the reasons for doing so.	In the event of a major requirement or particular need, and if the reasons are explained, the President may propose, at his/her initiative or at the request of a member of the Bureau, the written adoption of a decision between two Bureau meetings. In such an event, s/he will fax or e-mail the draft decision to all Bureau members, asking for a reply within 15 days. If no reply is received by the deadline, the proposal is considered approved. In exceptional and justified emergencies, a five-day deadline may be given. In addition, if the President refuses to accept a request for a written procedure, s/he must give the reasons for doing so.
The tasks of the Bureau:	The tasks of the Bureau:
to propose topics for the Commission to work on	to propose topics for the Commission to work on
to determine working methods	to determine working methods
to monitor the work undertaken by the Commission	to monitor the work undertaken by the Commission
to propose Commission meetings	to propose Commission meetings
to decide which resolutions to submit to the CPMR General Assembly.	to <b>propose</b> which resolutions to submit to the CPMR General Assembly <b>and to adopt political resolutions between general assemblies.</b>

Mr LUPINO introduced the third item on the agenda concerning **concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes.**

Lazio Region presented the different tools the IMC currently had at its disposal for analysing Mediterranean phenomena and studying issues of interest, namely its working groups and IMC involvement (through the CPMR) in European projects.

Lazio Region argued that the objective in Article 4 of the current Internal Rules about developing “*concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes*,” could be developed further if there were better rules on involvement in European projects (financing possibilities) or if European Groupings for Territorial Cooperation (EGTCs), as provided for in Regulation (EC) No. 1086/2006, were used properly.

The group then examined the contribution of Murcia and Valencia regions and that made by Languedoc–Roussillon Region concerning the general redefinition of the IMC’s objectives, which the working group believed were too briefly explained in Article 4 of the current Internal Rules.

Mr CORTADELLES supported the need to state the objectives in more detail, using the proposal submitted by Languedoc–Roussillon Region, and he also felt it would be necessary to list them in order of importance, taking into account the results of the IMC survey of 2008. He said that the while principal role of the IMC was to undertake political lobbying, activities of a more practical nature should be considered as being vital. In any case, it was felt that it would be difficult to include something on the promotion of EGTCs, because they should be considered as instruments that were primarily designed to support cross–border co–operation between regions and did not seem to be suitable for use by the IMC.

Mr CICHOWLAZ said he agreed that the IMC should above all have a political role and it was difficult to include EGTCs in the activities of the IMC, given the difficulty of establishing this form of cooperation. Regarding the participation of the CPMR–IMC in European projects, he emphasised that this would require ad hoc political approval, based on selection criteria of a strategic nature, because thousands of projects are submitted to transnational and interregional cooperation programmes and the CPMR–IMC could possibly participate in all of them.

Mr LUPINO noted that the unquestionably political nature of the IMC does not exclude **the need for tools for analysis and further development**, without which it would be difficult to find the reasons, ideas and policies for lobbying activities. The creation of working groups and involvement of the CPMR–IMC in European projects (AMAT I–II, MAREMED, Med GOVERNANCE, IC–MED) highlighted the need for practical schemes. It was also emphasised that regulation 1082/2006 establishing the possibility to create EGTCs represented a novel opportunity which had not yet been fully understood or appreciated. It was limiting to believe that EGTCs should solely be used for cross–border co–operation, because this

regulation offers much wider possibilities. For example, they could be used for tackling interregional cooperation issues that were quite similar to those that have already been dealt with in European projects in which the CPMR-IMC is involved (governance, adaptation to climate change, etc.), but using a permanent structure that would make it possible to work much more effectively. **Nevertheless, it was noted that certain members of the working group had doubts about this and it was requested that further discussion on possible involvement in EGTCs should be postponed until a later date and therefore references to them in the proposals should be removed.** Furthermore, it was emphasised that the expression “concrete ... schemes” should be maintained in Article 4 and rules should be introduced on the procedure for creating working groups and joining European projects, as none currently exist.

Mr CORTADELLES felt that it was important **to clarify the role of the IMC**, in other words to define whether it should act as partner or be the coordinator, as regards the participation of the IMC regions in projects. He thought that the IMC should act as the coordinator of the regions.

Ms GALLEGO of Murcia Region said that the contribution of the paper prepared by Murcia and Valencia stressed certain key objectives, namely to “lobby European institutions” and develop “concrete cooperation through projects and exchange programmes”.

The working group emphasised that the lack of any precise rules governing participation in European projects is to be regretted as it may cause problems. Thus a new procedure for such activity is required, which also raises the issue of the desirability/need for the IMC to have a legal personality (budget, signature, etc). This point therefore needs to be further developed and this would be discussed the fourth item of the agenda below.

At the end of the discussion on the second item on the agenda regarding concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes, **the following proposal to amend Article 4 of the Internal Rules of the IMC was made:**

Current Internal Rules	Proposed change
<b>ARTICLE 4 : Objectives</b>	
To examine common issues and develop concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes to promote economic, scientific and cultural development.	To examine common issues and develop concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes to promote economic, scientific and cultural development <b>by adopting appropriate measures, including:</b>

To devise specific joint programmes.	1. to promote Euro-Mediterranean policy and the key role of regional authorities;
To organise exchanges of experiences in the framework of measures supported by the Structural Funds.	2. to promote a territorial approach to development across the whole Mediterranean basin;
To bring the specific problems of the Mediterranean area to the attention of the European institutions.	3. to defend the specific interests of the Mediterranean regions in the principal European negotiations and EU policies
	4. to identify and promote cooperation projects that will have a structural impact on the main issues of concern to the Mediterranean area;
	5. to pursue the development of closer links with Mediterranean networks and cooperation bodies.

During the discussion, the participants were also unanimous in wanting to establish rules for the creation of working groups. Lazio Region's proposal to adopt Article 6 of the Internal Rules of the Atlantic Arc Commission on working groups as a new Article 12 of the IMC's Internal Rules was accepted. This article makes a distinction between permanent working groups (which must have the structure and sufficient resources) and ad hoc working groups (such as the FONCIM working group, which exist for a given period and have a specific objective for a limited time). To avoid overloading the Commission's bodies, it was decided that the last paragraph of the article of the Internal Rules of the Atlantic Arc Commission on a Coordination Committee, would be removed. It was emphasised that it would be necessary to stipulate the procedure that the Political Bureau should use when disbanding working group if its objectives had been achieved or if there was no longer any point in it continuing.

At the end of the discussion on the second item on the agenda regarding concrete Mediterranean interregional cooperation schemes, **the following proposal to introduce a new Article 12 into the Internal Rules of the IMC was made.**

Current Internal Rules	Proposed change
	<b>ARTICLE 12: Working Groups</b>
	<b>The permanent working groups</b> are designed to help provide input for the discussions and positions of the Commission with regard to priority issues for its member regions.

	<b>The ad hoc working groups</b> fulfil the same objectives as permanent working groups but meet a specific need for a limited time in order to adhere as closely as possible to the priorities of the EU agenda.
	Each working group is chaired by one or more member Regions that shall draw up terms of reference specifying the aims, operating rules and actions to be implemented by the group. The Bureau shall approve the creation of a group and the termination of its work when the members deem that the objectives have been reached or there is no longer any point in continuing.

On the fringes of the general discussion, it was observed that, at the Gothenburg General Assembly last September, two changes were made to the CPMR’s Charter. These were also of interest as far as the IMC’s Internal Rules were concerned.

1. The term “Euro–Mediterranean partnership” had been removed and replaced by the term “Union for the Mediterranean”. The participants of the FONCIM working group felt that it would be more appropriate to update the IMC’s Internal Rules by adding the term “Union for the Mediterranean” to the term “Euro–Mediterranean partnership”. Following this discussion on updating the Internal Rules to take account of the creation of the Union for the Mediterranean, **the following proposal to amend Article 3 of the IMC’s Internal Rules was therefore made:**

<b>Current Internal Rules</b>	<b>Proposed change</b>
<b>ARTICLE 3 : Participating regions</b>	
All Mediterranean regions in the European Union that are members of the CPMR are members of the Intermediterranean Commission. Regions and sub-state authorities of countries involved in the Euro-Mediterranean partnership that are associate members of the CPMR are members of the Intermediterranean Commission.	All Mediterranean regions in the European Union that are members of the CPMR are members of the Intermediterranean Commission. Regions and sub-state authorities of countries involved in the Euro-Mediterranean partnership <b>and/or the Union for the Mediterranean</b> that are associate members of the CPMR are members of the Intermediterranean Commission.

2. The Assembly of the CPMR wanted to determine the length of the functions of the Secretary General and subject the renewal of his/her contract every five years to an act of explicit confirmation. By paraphrasing paragraph 5 of

Article 8 of the CPMR's Charter, **the following proposal to amend Article 8 of the IMC's Internal Rules was therefore made:**

Current Internal Rules	Proposed change
<b>ARTICLE 8 : The Executive Secretary</b>	
The Executive Secretary is appointed to or dismissed from his/her position by the Plenary Assembly, further to a proposal by the Bureau.	The Executive Secretary is appointed to or dismissed from his/her position by the Plenary Assembly, further to a proposal by the Bureau.
S/he reports to the Plenary Assembly and the Bureau. She organises the work of the Commission in accordance with its provisions, liaises with the Secretary General of the CPMR and represents the CPMR Secretary General within the Intermediterranean Commission.	S/he reports to the Plenary Assembly and the Bureau. She organises the work of the Commission in accordance with its provisions, liaises with the Secretary General of the CPMR and represents the CPMR Secretary General within the Intermediterranean Commission.
The Secretary acts as moderator during working meetings and is responsible for drafting the minutes of each meeting.	The Secretary acts as moderator during working meetings and is responsible for drafting the minutes of each meeting.
	The Secretary General must necessarily enjoy the confidence of the General Assembly and Political Bureau. This confidence must be expressed by a vote at least once every five years.

Mr LUPINO introduced the fourth item on the agenda concerning the **IMC's economic and financial management.**

He presented some graphic illustrations showing the IMC's current financial commitments regarding both dues paid for the running of the Commission and the running of the CPMR. It emerged from these illustrations that the Intermediterranean Commission clearly played a bigger role than other CPMR commissions, and that the activities within the IMC were of considerable importance, bearing in mind the dues paid for the same purpose by other commissions. Regarding the management of funds allocated to the running of the IMC, it was pointed out that there were no instructions on the arrangements for managing these funds, in contrast for example to other commissions which have established rules in this regard.

Ms MONTEIRO wanted to emphasise that it was vital to highlight clearly and precisely the importance of the Mediterranean regions in the context of CPMR, given that they were members of the most important geographical commission,

which contributed the most to the running of the CPMR, in the interest of all other European peripheral regions. This aspect, which should be repeated in the best possible way as often as possible, should also be reflected in greater autonomy for the IMC regarding the management of the dues used by the regions which fund it.

Ms MORENO pointed out that the North Sea Commission had a separate legal personality, which enabled it to manage its funds completely autonomously. The Atlantic Arc Commission had opened a current bank account under the responsibility of the Secretary General of CPMR, which it used to manage its funds directly.

Mr LUPINO explained that Lazio Region’s proposal was to adopt Article 9 of the Internal Rules of the Atlantic Arc Commission, adding a reference to the Executive Secretary’s obligation to present expenditure which has effectively been committed, as mentioned in Article 5, paragraph 2 of the Charter for the North Sea Commission, along with explanations on arrangements for participating in European projects and managing the funds they provide.

At the end of the discussion on the fourth item on the agenda, **the following proposal to include a new article (No. 13) in the Internal Rules was made regarding the IMC’s financial management:**

Current Internal Rules	<b>Proposed addition</b>
	<b>ARTICLE 13 : Financial management</b>
	<p>The Commission shall have the following resources at its disposal for its running:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) a contribution from the Regions, in the form of a single one-off payment, the amount of which shall be decided annually by the Commission</li> <li>b) possible contributions by the CPMR;</li> <li>c) contributions via the Commission’s active participation in EU initiatives such as projects, programmes, open tenders, etc.</li> </ul>
	<p>The decision whether the Commission should participate in European projects of interest to the Commission belongs to the Bureau alone, further to a proposal by the Executive Secretary. Participation may be allowed as long as the funds available to the Commission can cover it. The Secretary General of the CPMR must be informed about</p>

	this sort of involvement. Given the importance of the issue, if there is an emergency, the Executive Secretary can use the written procedure via e-mail to check that the Political Bureau approves of such involvement. All members of the Commission must in all events be informed beforehand about the proposal to participate.
	The regions' contribution and funding from the European Union shall be paid into a specific account managed by the Commission's Secretariat under the responsibility of the Secretary General of CPMR.
	Regions hosting the Commission's Bureau meetings shall be responsible for covering organisation costs and simultaneous interpretation costs.
	The region hosting the Executive Secretariat shall cover office costs and expenditure on office supplies and equipment.
	The Executive Secretary shall keep accounts on the Commission's funds in accordance with the criteria of transparency and economic efficiency. S/he must submit a draft set of accounts each year and an overview of the consolidated budget with expenditure duly justified by relevant supporting documents.

At the end of the discussion on the four items listed in the agenda, it was agreed that the proposals for amendments/additions to the Internal Rules would be included in a comparative text appended to these minutes, which would enable the Political Bureau to examine the changes made in the simplest way possible.

Ms MORENO, on the fringes of the discussion, raised the matter of the need to update the IMC logo, which is perceived as being necessary given the current lack of consistency between logos of the geographical commissions and that of the CPMR. The matter was referred to the attention of the working group so that it should be examined by the Political Bureau in Murcia.

**The FONCIM working group agreed on the need for the IMC logo to be updated and proposed to undertake a graphic study in order to do this.**

At the end of proceedings of the first meeting of the working group on the organisation of the IMC (FONCIM), the participants were reminded of the matters which had not been settled, which would be referred to the Political Bureau for discussion or possibly another specific meeting of the FONCIM working group:

- Rules for appointing the First Vice-President and the number of Vice-Presidents
- Analysis of the possibilities offered by European Groupings for Territorial Cooperation and potentially useful interaction with the IMC.

The meeting rose at 16.30.