

THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL
RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 1 OCTOBER 2008

Agenda Item	
Report No	

European Activity Update.

Report by Head of Policy & Performance

Summary:

This report advises Members of the applications being submitted by the Council for funding from the 2007-13 European Regional Development (ERDF) and European Social (ESF) Structural Fund Programmes. The projects proposed are set out in Appendix 1. An up-date on LEADER and Convergence funding is provided. The report also seeks approval of the nominations for members to represent the Council on the European networks it participates in. In addition there are two consultation responses which members are asked to consider: the Scottish Government's Action Plan for European Engagement; and the future of the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Council has a commitment in its Programme 2008-11 to work with the Highlands and Islands European Partnership and the Scottish Government to secure the maximum benefit for the Highlands from European funding programmes for the region and play a full part in key European organisations.

This report updates members on recent activity and developments in respect of :

- Project applications seeking E.U funding assistance (applications details are set out in Appendix 1);
- The need to nominate members to represent the Council on European networks; and
- Responses to consultations on the Government's Action Plan on European Engagement and the Future of the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions.

2. European Union Structural Fund Programmes - Highlands and Islands.

- 2.1 The deadline for the latest application round to the European Union's Regional Development and Social Fund Programmes for the Highlands and Islands is 10th October 2008. The stage 1 forms (expressions of interest) were submitted on 5th September 2008 and have all been accepted.

2.2 European Regional Development Programme.

One project will be submitted seeking £250,000 in grant. This project was submitted last year but required to be re-profiled due to the reduction in grant available. Council funding for this project has been included in the Capital Programme. Three sections of road are included, the A896 Kinlochewe to Strathcarron; the A855 Portree to Uig and the B8007 Salen to Kilchoan. TEC Services budget is available to provide the match funding required.

2.3 European Social Fund

Three project applications will be submitted seeking grant totalling £154,680. These are:

- Community Based Language Assistants - £50,000
- Deaf Communications Project - £33,000 and
- English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) - £71,680.

All three projects have previously been submitted in 2007 seeking support for two years. Approval was given for one year, so these applications relate to the second year of the projects. Council budget for match funding has been identified by the ECS and Social Work Services.

2.4 The above projects have passed the first stage technical assessment and have been invited to submit the second stage applications to meet the 19 October deadline.

2.5 Strategic bid for Structural Funds from the Community Planning Partnership

The Council is invited to submit a bid for elements of structural funding for 2009 onwards on behalf of the Community Planning Partnership. The bid will be based on the Single Outcome Agreement agreed by the Council, its partners and the Scottish Government. It will also support the development of an employability strategy for the Highlands, reported separately at this meeting. It will enable a range of projects to be fast tracked for funding awards. Clarity on the bidding process is being sought, with the bid prepared for December 2008.

2.6 European Union Convergence Funding and the LEADER programme.

Members have been advised of the delay in launching the new LEADER programme because of uncertainty in the award and conditions attached to convergence funding. The Council was advised on 18 September 2008 that the Highland community planning partnership had been awarded £7.5m convergence funding and an additional £130k to bring its original LEADER award to £6.76m. Total funding for the Highland LEADER Programme is now £14.26m. This award announcement is welcomed but further work is required on the level of public match funding required and whether the two funding streams should be combined or not before the Programme is launched. Efforts will now be focused on resolving all outstanding issues to enable an early launch of the Programme and a call for a shadow round for applications, based on the interim area allocations agreed at agreed at the Committee meeting in June 2008. A further report will be brought back to Resources Committee to consider the proposed full area allocation along with allocations for strategic, trans national / regional projects and administration costs.

2.7 European Fisheries Fund (EFF).

This national Programme was approved by the European Commission on 9 September and is now open for business. The EFF will be targeted to assist with capital investment in the aquaculture, fishing and fish processing industries. The programme can also support strategic trade initiatives, fisheries dependent communities and Scottish Government and European Community policy initiatives for the sustainable development of fisheries.

Scotland has secured a sizeable share of the UK's EFF allocation; approximately £12m for the Highlands and Islands and around £26m for the rest of Scotland.

Current priorities for funding are:

- Innovation. For example, in the reduction of discards and improved selectivity in the catching sector or support diversification into new farmed or cultivated species or improvements in containment;
- Fuel and other efficiencies to contribute to a sustainable future for Scotland's catching, farmed and fish processing sectors;
- Added value through the fisheries industry with a particular focus on fish processing.

Eligible applicants will include individuals, companies, trade and public bodies that have a direct interest in commercial fisheries. The Council's involvement in the process would be through the Planning and Development Service and Committee.

2.8 Previously at Resources Committee, members were advised that a number of briefings on EU programmes would be delivered to encourage take up of grant funding. It is planned to do a briefing for members following the Resources Committee meeting in December 2008.

3.0 Council Representation on European Networks.

The Council is currently a member of three European networks and representation needs to be confirmed on the following groups.

3.1 **Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions (CPMR)** – the CPMR is a pan European network of peripheral and maritime regions. It remains one of the most effective lobbying networks for regional government in the European arena. The CPMR has been particularly influential on the following policy areas: regional funding, agriculture, maritime issues, maritime safety, energy and the E.U. budget. This will be of particular interest to the Council's new Land, Environment and Sustainability Strategy Group. With the future of the CPMR being considered (see paragraph 4.4 below) it will be important for the Council to maintain its links and have its voice heard. The CPMR meets annually, with work streams taken forward through the committees set up to examine specific issues. These tend to be time limited.

The Council has recently been involved in the in the agriculture committee and has been asked to speak at the next seminar on this subject in Nantes on 23 October. This particular group will report by the end of 2008.

3.2 **North Sea Commission (NSC)** - The Commission is a network of local/regional authorities around the North Sea and is particularly influential on matters relating to the North Sea, the environment, climate change, marine transport, pollution including nuclear pollution and maritime policy including safety. The Commission is a particularly useful vehicle for gaining and exchanging experience on a range of matters across the remits of its five thematic groups: culture and tourism; education and innovation; fisheries; sustainable development, marine resources and transportation. In light of the Council's new Programme, officers are actively monitoring the work of the sustainable development and culture and tourism groups.

The Commission meets annually with the thematic groups meeting on a quarterly basis.

3.3 **Euromontana** – is well connected to the European Commission at the present and is an extremely influential vehicle for the Council in influencing the forthcoming EU debates on: mountain definition and EU mountain policy issues; Cohesion policy; EU budget and in particular the agricultural budget; and Less Favoured Area Status (LFASS). The Board meets on roughly a quarterly basis whilst the organisation as a whole meets annually with a larger mountain convention taking place alongside the annual meeting biennially.

3.4 Further to changes in the Administration and the resignation of Councillor Pauline Munro, who represented the Council on CPMR and NSC matters previously, it is necessary to review the membership of these EU Networks. In order to take advantage of the expertise and interests of members and to ensure that the Council is represented if some members are unable to attend, it is proposed to identify a pool of members to address European issues to enable substitution at network events.

The following members are proposed to represent the Council on European matters:
Councillor Michael Foxley - CPMR
Councillor Isobel McCallum – NSC, Euromontana
Councillor John Lang – substitute for Euromontana

Other members to substitute as required:

Councillor Caroline Wilson
Councillor William Ross
Councillor Richard Green
Councillor Martin Rattray

4. Consultations

4.1 **The Scottish Government - Action Plan on European Engagement.**

Earlier in the year the Scottish Government launched its proposals on how it wished to engage with Europe and the E.U. Comments are invited as part of the public discussion on the Action Plan on European Engagement.

4.2 The main points in the Action Plan can be summarise as follows:

- The Government is keen to gain the most from Europe for Scotland;
- It wishes to maximise the opportunities that Scotland has for the future development of the E.U.;
- This will be done via a “bottom up approach” in partnership with stakeholders;
- The basis of engagement will be in support of the Government’s five strategic objectives of creating a wealthier, fairer, smarter, safer, stronger and greener Scotland;
- The Government will look to learn lessons form Europe and in particular from the countries of the so called Arc of Prosperity (the smaller northern countries);
- The Government aims to gain more influence in the development of E.U

- policies and legislation;
- Work will be focussed on five priority policy areas - fisheries and aquaculture; budget; agriculture; justice and home affairs and energy;
- The Government will monitor other policy areas that are of relevance to Scotland and these will be reviewed on a six monthly basis via the External Affairs Committee;
- Steps will be taken to ensure an effective transposition of E.U legislation into Scottish law;
- The Government will work with the UK Government, the devolved administrations of the United Kingdom, the European Commission and Parliament and the Scottish Parliament in pursuing its goals of achieving a stronger voice for Scotland in European matters;
- It also wants to work with Stakeholders in Scotland via a “team Scotland” approach to delivering the Action Plan.

The proposed response to the Government's Action Plan is attached as Appendix 2.

4.3 **The Future of the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions (CPMR)**

With the retirement in 2010 of the current General Secretary of the CPMR, a debate on the future of the CPMR has been instigated. A copy of the questionnaire circulated by the CPMR, including a draft Council response, on this matter is attached as Appendix 3. Whilst the questionnaire addresses the scope, focus and the structure and remit of the CPMR and its geographic Commissions, the primary purpose of the exercise is to ascertain the views of members regarding the future structure and remit of the organisation for the future.

- 4.4 Three key options for the CPMR have emerged. These are described below along with the pros and cons of each option.

Option 1

The status quo with scope for expanding the CPMR membership and interests.

Pros:

- potential influence could grow as membership grows;
- potential to address a wider range of topics;

Cons

- a larger body with a broader membership could lose focus and effectiveness in dealing with maritime and peripheral area issues.

4.5 Option 2

Disbanding of the CPMR as a core body, with a greater emphasis placed on the geographic Commissions such as the North Sea, Baltic, Mediterranean and Atlantic Commissions. This model would see a focus of activity on the geographic limits of the particular Commission.

Pros – there are no pros identified. This option is not recommended.

Cons:

- The loss of influence for maritime and peripheral areas in EU policy;

- The European Commission increasingly uses network organisations, such as the CPMR to gain opinions from the constituent sectors around the Union. This is more easily managed than consulting several hundred regions or organisations.

4.6 Option 3

A potentially smaller CPMR with its membership focused on the peripheral maritime regions only.

Pros

- this could be more effective on the issues which impact on maritime and peripheral regions;
- Membership may actually grow under this option as peripheral regions see greater relevance of the organisation in addressing the needs of peripheral and maritime regions;
- Maintenance of influence with the European institutions as the organisation will be seen as being the voice of a major geographic section of the Union.

Cons

- potentially a smaller voice with less influence in the EU.

- 4.7 Option 3 currently appears to provide a stronger voice for the Highlands, but the formal submission of the Council's position on this is not required at present. It is recommended that these views are included during the debate on the future of the CPMR at the forthcoming General Assembly meeting from 1st to 3rd October 2008 and that the outcomes from this debate be brought back to the Council for further consideration.

5. **Financial Implications.**

- 5.1 There are financial implications arising from the project applications seeking grant from the Structural Fund programmes. Proposals are presented to Committee only where matching funding has been identified from relevant service budgets. For the four projects seeking Council approval the total Council contribution is £869,680. Total partner or initiative funding is £35,000. The total funding sought from the EU programmes is £404,680. With a total eligible cost for all projects at £1,293,360 the Council's contribution accounts for 67.24% of total costs. For individual projects the Council's contribution varies from 50% to 75%. Successful applications will attract additional funding to the Highlands and assist with service delivery and ease budgetary pressures within the Council.
- 5.2 Network activity is currently covered by the European budget lines. Costs of member engagement with European networks are covered by member expenses. The costs of participation will be met from these existing budgets.

6. Recommendation:

6.1 The Committee is recommended to :

1. Note that the Council will submit a strategic bid on behalf of the Community planning Partnership for structural funds from 2009 onwards and to **approve** the Council projects for ESF and ERDF funding in October, as set out in Appendix 1.
2. Note the award of LEADER and Convergence funding of £14.26m to the Highland Community Planning Partnership and to **agree** to progress with a shadow round of bids based on the interim area allocations agreed at the June meeting of this Committee with a further report brought back on the full area allocations and the Strategic, trans national and regional awards.
3. **Agree** the following elected member representation on European networks: Councillor Michael Foxley (CPMR); Councillor Isobel McCallum (NSC and Euromontana); Councillor John Lang (substitute for Euromontana); with Councillor Caroline Wilson, Councillor William Ross, Councillor Richard Green and Councillor Martin Rattery also substituting for attendance at network events.
4. **Approve** the response to the consultation on the Scottish Government's Action Plan on European Engagement as set out in Appendix 2 and confirm the Council's position on the Future of the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions at the event in October, as set out in Appendix 3 and section 4.7.

Signature:

Designation: Head of Policy and Performance

Author: Gordon Summers, Principal European Officer (Tel No 01463 - 702508) and
Carron McDiarmid (Tel 01463 702852)

Date: 18 September 2008.

Proposed projects for Third Bidding Round – October 2008

Title	Locally Significant roads (2)		
Programme/Priority	ERDF		
Description			
<i>Objectives</i>	To Improve locally significant roads that provide access and connectivity to fragile rural Communities. This project is a second phase of ERDF funding and seeks to extend the improvements on each of the roads in the first phase (2008) to reach further fragile communities and improve access. Roads identified are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A896 Kinlochewe to Strathcarron • A855 Portree to Uig via Staffin • B8007 Salen to Kilchoan 		
<i>Target groups</i>	Fragile Rural Communities		
<i>Geographical Coverage</i>	Highland		
Partnership	The highland Council		
Funding			
THC Match Funding	£	750,000	
Other Match Funding			
Total Project cost	£	1,000,000	
Total eligible	£	1,000,000	
Grant rate %		25%	
Grant request	£	250,000	

Title	ESOL support for migrant workers and their families		
Programme/Priority			
Description			
<i>Objectives</i>	This ESOL project will build on its earlier work and expand both the infrastructure and delivery of ESOL provision in the Highlands during 2009. The project provides and facilitates a range of ESOL English language classes, Tutor training, resources development and activity coordination. The project aims to assist 440 individuals over the next year.		
<i>Target groups</i>	Migrant workers and their families		
<i>Geographical Coverage</i>	Highland council Area		
Partnership	Highland Council, Highlands and Islands Enterprise		
Funding			
THC Match Funding	£	46,680	
Other Match Funding	£	25,000	
Total Project cost	£	143,360	
Total eligible	£	143,360	
Grant rate %		50%	
Grant request	£	71,680	

Title	Community Based Language Assistants 2009		
Programme/Priority	ESF		
Description			
<i>Objectives</i>	Following on from the successful 2008 project, this next phase seeks to continue to provide support to new families of migrant workers from EU new Member States who have little or no English language, with the aim of helping them settle into the region. The work is mainly about awareness raising of local amenities and services and facilitating access to these. The assistants work with families and groups of people who are new to the language and culture of Scotland. This phase aims to assist 150 participants over the year.		
<i>Target groups</i>	Migrant workers and their families		
<i>Geographical Coverage</i>	Highland		
Partnership	The Highland Council		
Funding			
THC Match Funding	£ 50,000		
Other Match Funding	NA		
Total Project cost	£ 100,000		
Total eligible	£ 100,000		
Grant rate %	50%		
Grant request	£ 50,000		

Title	Deaf Communication project – Training Hub Initiative 2009		
Programme/Priority	ESF		
Description			
<i>Objectives</i>	Provision of job related training to the D/deaf, hard of hearing and deaf/blind communities. Continuation of training of British Sign Language and Deaf Awareness Tutors and extension of project to cater for D/deaf people wishing to pursue alternative paths to jobs/job-readiness. The project intends to assist and additional 180 participants over a one year period.		
<i>Target groups</i>	Deaf, hard or hearing and deaf/blind people		
<i>Geographical Coverage</i>	Highland council Area		
Partnership	Highland council, NHS Highland		
Funding			
THC Match Funding	£ 23,000		
Other Match Funding	£ 10,000		
Total Project cost	£ 66,000		
Total eligible	£ 50,000		
Grant rate %	50%		
Grant request	£ 33,000		

Highland Council Response to the Draft Scottish Government Action Plan on European Engagement

1. Introduction

The Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Scottish Government European Action Plan and we hope that our views and comments will be considered positively and fed into the finalisation of the document.

More importantly the Council looks forward to closer collaboration with the Scottish Government via the 'Team Scotland' approach in developing a more co-ordinated approach to engagement with Europe for the benefit of the Highlands, the wider Highlands & Islands region and Scotland

2. Summary

In summarising the key points arising from the Scottish Government EU Action Plan the Council would like to emphasise the following points of importance to our partnership:

- the Council agrees with the Scottish Government's five 'Long-term Objectives' as outlined in the Draft Action Plan but we would like to emphasise the importance of the debate on Territorial Cohesion in relation to the EU Budget Review clearly noted in the Action Plan given its significance to the Highlands and Islands.
- the Scottish Government should be consider pursuing a more flexible and simplified state aid regime as one of its 'Long-term Objectives'. Indeed flexibility of E.U. related procedures should be added to the list of objectives as current practices are proving to be a major disincentive to potential applicants for European funds.
- there is agreement on the Scottish Government's 'Current EU Priorities' (published on 11 March 2008) and supports the intention to review these on a 6 monthly basis. On this, the Council wishes to urge the Government to engage fully with stakeholders on such reviews.
- the intention of the Scottish Government to pursue a 'Team Scotland' approach to develop 'a stronger voice for Scotland in Europe' is noted. The Council fully recognises the potential benefits of such an approach as it can deliver mutual benefits and added value to the Highlands in its dealings with Europe, such an approach must recognise also the aspirations of the Highlands to be taken into account, with recognition of the need for regional representation with the EU on specifically Highland or Highlands and Islands matters.

- The Council is disappointed at the limited recognition given to local authorities within the Draft Action Plan. It is anticipated that the role of local government as a key stakeholder in European affairs will be recognised in the final draft and steps taken to engage with Councils in delivering on the Government's priorities and in any reviews.

3. Detailed Response and Points of Interest

The Council supports the Scottish Government's proposed twofold approach to engaging with Europe and sees merit in focusing activities on 'Long-term Objectives' and 'Current Priorities'. Of particular note is the Government's commitment to pursuing a 'bottom-up' proactive approach to its engagement with Europe. However, it would be helpful if there was more detail contained within the Action Plan about how this 'bottom-up' approach will be achieved and what form this engagement with stakeholders will take and the role accorded to existing vehicles such as EMILE, CoSLA and the European and External Affairs Committee.

Long-term Objectives

Highland agrees with the objectives selected by the Scottish Government, as they largely reflect the key priorities of and the opportunities present in the region. Reflecting this, the following detailed comments are made:

Fisheries and Aquaculture

The fisheries and aquaculture sectors are of vital importance to Highland and provide employment in many rural areas. Indeed, the fisheries and aquaculture sectors are second only to tourism in annual turnover in the region and there is huge potential for sustainable economic growth. The Council supports the Scottish Government's activities outlined in the Action Plan but is disappointed that the importance of the sector as a feed for the key food and drinks sector is not fully recognised. Additionally, the Council urges greater involvement of local stakeholders in local management and ownership of the marine resource.

EU Budget Review

The review of the E.U. budget will be key topic of debate in the coming two three years and the Council would encourage the Government to set out what it wishes to achieve from the process for Scotland. It is anticipated that there will continue to be pressures on the budget and the ongoing needs of the new members will, rightly, dominate any discussions regarding regional funding. However the Government should not lose sight of the Cohesion debate and the clear benefits that such a policy approach could give to the more remote and rural parts of the country. In support of this, there will be need for a fundamental change in methodology of disbursing limited structural funds to a model reflecting opportunity in light of market failure as opposed to need measured by GDP.

Scotland has a wealth of what is termed positive externalities that can be developed for the benefit of local communities, Scotland and the Union as a whole.

The importance of the territorial cohesion debate will be highlighted in the response from the Highlands & Islands European Partnership (HIEP) and partners look forward to engaging with the Government as to how the development of the regions assets, in terms of language, culture, landscape, bio-diversity, wilderness, natural terrestrial and marine resources renewables etc can be developed to our mutual benefit.

Agriculture

The proposal for the government to engage with stakeholders on the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is welcomed.

The Council fully recognises that agricultural production allied to the management of the land is central to maintaining sustainable rural communities. Effective land management is important to the deriving benefit from positive externalities such as landscape, bio-diversity, water and clean air which lies at the heart of the Highland tourism product.

Primary production, particularly where such production is organic, GM free and benefits from a widely held 'green' perception is a vital input to the food and drink sector which has been identified as a growth sector by the Government. The Council would urge that greater recognition be made of the potential of the primary sector in promoting the greater use of local food as part of delivering on wealthier, fairer and healthier aspects of its strategic objectives.

In this connection it is disappointing that these links have not been recognised in the Action Plan

Finally, the Council wishes to express its support for the establishment of the Rural Development Council which we see as an important forum to debate and develop the Scottish Government's thinking on matters like the CAP reforms and the important issue contained within these reforms - the drive to strengthen rural development.

Justice and Home Affairs

Highland endorses the position outlined in the Action Plan but would be keen to highlight the importance of local government as a key stakeholder in this area particularly in those areas that fall within the remit of local government.

EU Energy Policy

Understandably EU Energy Policy is an issue of significant importance to the Highlands. This is based on the realised and potential capability to harness renewable energy and develop wider energy research and development.

In particular, there is huge potential to further develop and build on the existing marine and wind renewables industry within the region but we recognise that in order to maximise this potential significant investment in infrastructure (e.g. transmission cables and lines and grid connections) will be required to make the marine renewables industry a viable industry.

Of equal importance however is the Council's opinion that greater emphasis should be placed on community based renewables projects and we would cite the example of the UK's first community owned, grid connected wind farm on the Island of Gigha as an excellent example of the benefits that community based renewables projects can deliver.

Furthermore, we would argue that in working to deliver on the EU's Energy Policy greater consideration should be given to the development of a mixed energy approach which should ensure that the development of bio-mass production for either fuel or energy is not at the expense of food production

The Council is however disappointed to see no promotion of the benefits that can be derived from energy conservation measures as a means of reducing the need for energy and of the need to integrate energy policy into transport policies at the European level.

In addition to the 'Long-term Objectives' outlined in the Action Plan, the Council would like to propose that the Scottish Government consider the inclusion of State Aids as a 'Long-term Objective' and do so on the following grounds:

The EU Action Plan specifies 3 aims, one of which is "creating the conditions for talented people to live, learn, work and remain in Scotland..." . Therefore the Council would urge that having a more flexible state aid regime would go a long way to addressing this aim through encouraging enterprise and therefore assisting in population retention in Scotland, particularly in the more remote and rural areas of the Highlands. The current 'one size fits all' state aid regulations do not take into account the needs of rural, peripheral areas, where there are limited employment and diversification opportunities. EU State aid policies need to be adapted to help address the specific needs of rural and fragile areas to help them support and progress their economies. To this end, the Scottish Government is encouraged to include State Aids as one of its 'Long-term Objectives'.

Current EU Priorities

Highland Council agrees with the Current EU Priorities (published on 11 March 2008) being pursued by the Scottish Government and supports a 'bottom up' approach to reviewing these priorities on a six monthly basis. The following bodies are viewed as being suitable vehicles for stakeholder engagement:

- The European and External Relations Committee of the Scottish Parliament,
- COSL A,
- EMILE,
- Highlands & Islands European Partnership (HIEP) (as well as other regional partnership centred on European affairs),
- Scotland Europa, and;
- Individual local authorities or organisations as appropriate.

It is also recognised that a 'Team Scotland' approach can bring a stronger voice to bear on dealings with the European institutions.

However, whilst the benefits of a 'Team Scotland' approach is noted and welcomed, the Council wishes to emphasise that a 'Team Scotland' approach should not and must not preclude the ability of a region or organisation to engage directly with Europe on matters of significant interest to them. Clearly this is of significant importance to Highland given the unique characteristics, of the Highlands and Islands when compared to the rest of Scotland.

Finally the Government is encouraged to give more consideration to the influence that stakeholders such as the Highland Council can bring to bear in promoting Scotland's interests at a European level through its membership of networks such as the Conference of Peripheral and Maritime Regions (CPMR) and Euromontana.

Improvement of Transposition Process in Scotland

The improvement and streamlining of the transposition of EU legislation in to Scots law is to be welcomed as is the desire to engage fully with relevant stakeholders during the transposition process. Key to the success of this and in ensuring the development of effective legislation is the early engagement with the European legislative process in partnership with those stakeholders who will ultimately be charged with implementation.

The Key Role of Stakeholders in EU Affairs

The Council notes with interest the Government's intention to implement a 'Team Scotland' approach in developing a 'stronger voice for Scotland in Europe' and welcomes the proposal to work with and to consult stakeholders when formulating European objectives and priorities.

However, the Council wishes to raise the following points which it trusts will be considered fully in the development of the Action Plan:

The continued importance for regional representation with Europe

There are clear benefits to be derived from a Team Scotland approach this is to be supported in the delivery of mutual benefits and added value to the different regions (and sectoral interests) of Scotland. However, the Team Scotland approach should not come at the expense of direct regional (or sectoral) engagement with the EU. This is of vital importance to the Highlands given the unique characteristics of the region in European terms. Highland Council, via the HIEP has been represented in Brussels for 20 years and the partnership has a

proven track record in engaging with Europe to secure a strong position for the Highlands and Islands. The Council and the wider partnership is keen to maintain these links and wish to ensure that a Team Scotland approach does not preclude HIEP from engaging directly with Europe on matters of importance to the Highlands and Islands nor should it undermine our ability to position the Highlands and Islands in Europe.

The importance of local authorities as key stakeholders

The Council is disappointed at the limited recognition of local authorities within the Action Plan. European matters are of significant interest to local government and this interest is centred on the following aspects:

- The role local authorities play in implementing European legislation.
- In view of this implementation role, the work local authorities (individually and collectively) undertake to influence European policy.
- The role local authorities play in European funding: as part of the decision making process of Structural Funds distribution, as programme managers for funds such as the LEADER Programme and as applicant themselves to European funds.
- Local authorities and the elected members who lead local authorities represent the issues and concerns of people at a local level and this crucial role in the democratic process should not be overlooked by the Scottish Government nor should a 'Team Scotland' approach inhibit the ability of local authorities (individually or collectively) to engage directly with the EU.

Furthermore, as alluded to previously local authorities are often members of influential pan European networks which pursue specific interests within the EU. The Council believes that the Scottish Government could benefit from working with local authorities to utilise the influence and benefits these networks can bring when seeking to position Scotland in Europe. Very much in the spirit of the 'Team Scotland' approach.

Therefore the Council suggests that greater recognition is given to the important role that local authorities play in European affairs and that its role as a key stakeholder in developing the Scottish Government's thinking is recognised clearly within the Action Plan.

Highlands & Islands European Partnership (HIEP) in Scotland House

The HIEP partners would like to highlight to the Scottish Government that it is in fact the Highlands and Islands European Partnership that has an office in Scotland House, Brussels rather than Highlands and Islands Enterprise. We trust this oversight will be amended in the final version of the Action Plan.

Bilateral Work with European Partners

Support is given to the importance the Scottish Government places on bilateral working with European Partners. There are clear benefits to be derived from such partnerships and the Council welcomes the recognition given to collaborative in the Action Plan.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The Council welcomes Scottish Government's commitment to transparency and openness in its European engagement and supports the proposal to review its achievements on an annual basis. The Government's commitment to involving 'particular groups and partners' in the annual review process is welcomed and offers, here, to assist in this process.



CONFERENCE DES REGIONS PERIPHERIQUES MARITIMES D'EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS OF EUROPE

6, rue Saint-Martin 35700 RENNES - F
Tel. : + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50 - Fax : + 33 (0)2 99 35 09 19
e.mail : secretariat@crpm.org - web : www.crpm.org

INQUIRY INTO THE FUTURE OF THE CPMR - SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONNAIRE -

CONTENTS

- I - SCENARIOS	2
1. FOREWORD.....	2
2. SCENARIO I - CHAOTIC GLOBALISATION	2
3. SCENARIO II - A CLOSED ECONOMY IN A "FORTRESS EUROPE"	3
4. SCENARIO III - THE "ENLIGHTENMENT": WHEN EUROPEAN ETHICS LEAD TO A MORE HUMANE GLOBALISATION.....	4
- II- QUESTIONNAIRE	6

The deadline for completing this questionnaire is 10 September 2008.

Please send it by email : secretariat@crpm.org

or by fax : +33 (0)2 99 35 09 19 or by post

(Please send one reply by Region)

This questionnaire is being sent to the Political Leader of each CPMR Member Region (+ copy to the main CPMR contact persons) and Members of the CPMR Political Bureau.

We will not be able to take into account any replies which we receive after this date.



CONFERENCE DES REGIONS PERIPHERIQUES MARITIMES D'EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS OF EUROPE

6, rue Saint-Martin 35700 RENNES - F
Tel. : + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50 - Fax : + 33 (0)2 99 35 09 19
e.mail : secretariat@crpm.org - web : www.crpm.org

- I -

SCENARIOS

1. FOREWORD

The purpose of these three scenarios is to prepare the CPMR members to complete the following questionnaire, where they will be asked to express their views concerning the future of our organisation in the coming years.

Let it be clear that these scenarios do not profess in any way to be an accurate prospective exercise. They have purposely been written in a provocative style for their main objective is precisely to provoke thoughts and reactions. What would happen to Europe, to its peripheral and maritime Regions, and to the CPMR itself, if certain existing trends were pushed to their logical limits? And is there an alternative solution?

We trust that the reader will appreciate that the purpose of these scenarios is not to cause controversy, but to stimulate intellectual debate and give a necessary depth of vision to the ongoing enquiry.

2. SCENARIO I - CHAOTIC GLOBALISATION

In 2020, the EU's political ambitions have been considerably downsized. The blocking of any evolution of the Treaty since the French, Dutch and later Irish referendums in the first decade of the century; the rise to power of ultra-liberal governments in a number of Member States; the determined efforts of "net contributors" to reduce the EU's budget, and henceforth its means of action, have all gradually changed the nature of the European Union.

The EU, which is now institutionally operating on a "two-speed" basis, is no longer a political project, but essentially a free-trade zone, where national governments don't even pretend to implement collective preferences within their own territories and simply act as market managers.

The EU's economy rests upon a limited number of "growth centres", huge megalopolis gathering the bulk of Europe's wealth, information and knowledge - even though the Union no longer pretends to be the world's leading knowledge-based society, since many of its key research activities have been transferred to the USA, China, India and Japan. The situation is even less brilliant in the rest of its territory, which is confronted with the social and economic consequences of the gradual dismantling of all trade barriers. The old areas of industrial production, and even some sectors in the service industry, have been devastated by an accelerated transfer process. The farming areas have been reduced by half, with only the most competitive industrial farms surviving. The peripheral areas are increasingly pushed towards tourism as an only solution, and many face severe problems of depopulation.

Generally speaking, the EU's population is getting considerably older, but also poorer with the collapse of State-run national health and pension systems; whilst average wages are pushed downwards by the threat of relocation and the use of cheap immigrant labour. The instruments available to the EU to implement some sort of cohesion within its territory have been considerably restricted due to a lack of political will, legislative tools and financial means. Regional and agricultural policies are ghosts of their former selves, limited mostly to financing cooperation or marketing schemes.

The private sector, led mostly by large multinational conglomerates, has taken over a large number of domains previously run by public authorities (health, education, various public services...), and operates according to their own wishes, in the total absence of public obligations and control. The level of intervention by the EU or by national authorities is kept to a strict minimum due to fear of it hindering Europe's competitiveness in a global market, or breaking WTO rules. R&D is now the EU's main budgetary line, but this has very limited impact at territorial level; the use of soft networking tools with small budgets being a poor substitute for the near-defunct regional policy. As for climate change policy, (once the Union's great ambition), although lip-service continues to be paid to it, it is only implemented in a very lax way by the big economic players since no international agreement has been reached on the issue. Meanwhile, considerable fortunes are made by the financial sector in the highly speculative trade of greenhouse gas allowances, the costs of which are passed on to the individual users.

In this fiercely competitive context, the alliances which are shaped on a global level tend to echo the relationships established in the past. Those Member States who have the possibility to do so look for allies or partners primarily with their past colonies, or with other countries with whom they have linguistic or cultural affinities.

As for the regional and local authorities, their bigger networks tend to be those bringing together large cities around themes related to the world economy. The CPMR has fought a long, but hopeless rearguard action to preserve what can be saved of the long forgotten goals of economic, social and territorial cohesion. Now however, all European policies (transport, energy, research and innovation, competition...) aim only to strengthen even more the existing "growth centres" in Europe. One way or another, the CPMR has had to refocus its activities accordingly. The organisation also remains very active in exchanging information and know-how between its members, even more so as territorial cooperation is the final remnant of the old regional policy. In doing so, it acts increasingly in partnership with the private sector, and especially in those areas related to the maritime economy – a clear sign of the demise of public policies.

However, a consequence of the rampant global economy is that social and territorial tensions are rising within the EU (the so-called "Grey riots" of 2018, when thousands of impoverished old age pensioners stormed the EU Commission's headquarters in Berlaymont by surprise, are still fresh in everyone's memory). Faced with the growing unrest of their population, a number of less-developed territories have clearly expressed their desire to leave the Community, just as Greenland did in 1985. This is a cause for concern for the CPMR, which faces a potential rift between its members who have generally gained from the globalisation process, and those who have lost out. The 2021 annual conference will have to address this thorny issue.

3. SCENARIO II – A CLOSED ECONOMY IN A "FORTRESS EUROPE"

In 2010, the dissatisfaction of EU citizens both with the continuing enlargement and with the globalisation process has resulted in political crisis of increasing gravity, as well as in the rise to power of protectionist (if not nationalist or ultra-nationalist) governments in many Member States and in the European Parliament. This has brought a wind of change to EU politics, to the dismay of the more liberal Member States who are threatening to opt-out. European public opinion does not object to the EU *per se*, but to its continuous enlargement, to the gradual dismantling of its trade barriers, and to unmanageable migratory flows. If the EU is to survive, it has to protect its citizens from cheap imports from third countries which have no respect for social or environmental constraints, to safeguard them from the devastating social impact of relocation, and to guarantee them the highest possible standards of income, health, education and services. And if this means re-establishing borders – be they for trade or for people – so be it.

Confronted with a crisis of growing magnitude, the EU has gradually evolved towards a "Fortress Europe" attitude. In an atmosphere of worsening international relations, the Union has ended its enlargement policy, strengthened its border control, blocked any further process of trade liberalisation in international bodies such as the WTO, and even unilaterally opted out of some of the most socially damaging agreements – causing furore and dismay on the diplomatic scene. The necessity to strictly implement this protectionist policy and to foster a strong common response to the challenges posed by the outside world, has strengthened the political role of the EU's institutions, as well as the Community's budget. Confronted with a multiplicity of threats, the Community has seen its founding objectives of peace and democracy gradually

superseded by defence and home security. In spite of the opposition from some Member States, those areas are now covered by a specific Treaty, and have become key EU policies.

This evolution has had mixed consequences for peripheral maritime Regions. On one hand this context is rather favourable to those which enjoy a revival of their traditional industries, or an increasing demand for their natural resources. The EU's decision to curtail (as far as possible) imports of food and raw material from third countries, and to rely more on its own resources, has benefited the farming and fishing industries, as well as forestry, mining, etc. In particular, cutting down dependency on external energy sources has given a boost both to nuclear and to renewable energy, the latter with the greatest benefit for peripheral areas with large onshore and offshore potential. For similar reasons, processing activities have been retained either because of their strategic role, or because of the punishing penalties imposed upon relocation. This need to exploit Europe's own resources to the full has imposed a territorial approach to EU policies. For example, TEN-Energy and TEN-T, previously notoriously underfunded, have become top priorities, and massive public and private investments have been made in R&D. Increasing international tensions have also resulted in higher military expenditure, and in the revival of many defence industries or military installations – many of which are located in peripheral maritime areas.

The situation is not so brilliant for those Regions who have retained competitive industries which were highly dependant on exports to third countries, and which have witnessed a sizeable reduction in their market, with serious social and economic consequences. This has in turn affected the amount of fiscal resources made available to the EU and to the national authorities, at a time when they are confronted with growing financial demands to answer social, infrastructural or military needs. The undesirable effects have been crippling tax increases, and a growing rate of inflation. Another aspect is the shortage of manpower due to the ageing population, which cannot be compensated by immigration due to hostile public opinion. The minimum retiring age in the EU has been raised to 70. Another worrying trend is the departure of Europe's brightest brains to other continents, a phenomenon which is hampering the Union's R&D potential.

This context has reassured the CPMR's traditional line of approach, which has been to concentrate strictly on "core" activities such as the maritime dimension, defence of territorial cohesion, or securing support for less-favoured areas, even if its positions have been adapted to take the new economic and political parameters into account. On the political front, the need to achieve a certain degree of internal consensus within the Community has been favourable to a deeper institutional involvement of the regional levels of government. The role of the Committee of the Regions has been reinforced accordingly.

But there are serious downsides. Those maritime areas which host industries depending on the world market, or those heavily involved in intercontinental shipping activities, are severely affected both economically and socially by the "Fortress Europe" scenario. Relationships with neighbouring countries have also suffered badly, which has hampered the efforts of the many CPMR Regions which are located on the Union's borders to develop exchanges with their immediate neighbours. Paradoxically this has reinforced their own peripherality. Last but not least, will this "war economy", which is most expensive to run, really be sustainable for long? Between supporting, or rejecting, the "Fortress Europe" model, the 2021 CPMR annual conference will have difficult choices to make.

4. SCENARIO III - THE "ENLIGHTENMENT": WHEN EUROPEAN ETHICS LEAD TO A MORE HUMANE GLOBALISATION

In 2020, after years of crisis, a satisfactory balance has been found for Europe. The lessons of the failed referendums of the early 2000's have been learnt, and the EU has developed a new approach. Better forms of governance, relying strongly on subsidiarity, and a closer relationship with the citizens through their local and regional authorities, have been devised. The failure of dealing only with sector-based policies (historically in-built in the very structure of the European Commission) has been recognised, and a cross-sector approach is now the norm. Transport, for example, is not dealt with in isolation anymore, but in close coordination with environmental, energy and regional policy. Competitiveness models integrating the move towards the knowledge society have been further developed and adapted to the specific characteristics of the Regions. The necessity to maintain an adequate level of solidarity within the EU, between its citizens, or between its territories has been recognised as instrumental to its well-being, and to its lasting political stability.

All this has considerably boosted the territorial cohesion goal advocated by the Lisbon Treaty, and policies with a strong territorial impact (regional development, farming, fisheries, transport, competition, environment...) have been redesigned accordingly. Quite significantly, the “one size fits all” approach, which has prevailed for so long in EU legislation and policies, and frequently been a cause of their unpopularity, is a thing of the past. This has defused many conflicts, especially in peripheral areas.

If the EU has managed to find its internal balance, it is also due to some form of equilibrium which has been reached with the outside world. Trade agreements have been skilfully negotiated to combine a satisfactory opening of the Community’s economy with sufficient safeguards to ensure the well-being of its citizens, and the worst excesses of the global economy have been curbed. This would not have been achieved if Europe had not spoken with a single voice, with a determined and coherent foreign policy; but also if its hand had not been strengthened by its enlargement and its reinforced relationship with neighbouring countries, be they in Eastern Europe or across the Mediterranean. As President Rachida Grigoryan (who now chairs the European Commission), declared to the European Parliament, “The fact that the EU is now the driving force of a large block of States ranging from Ukraine to Morocco is an essential factor to make its views prevail in international agreements”.

Moreover, the EU’s strategy does not rest purely on diplomatic muscle, but on occupying the moral high ground by exporting its own ethical values: social justice, environmental sustainability, balanced development, and respect towards cultures and identities. By advocating that “Globalisation has to adapt to people, not people to globalisation”, and making the relevant structural changes and investments that has made this slogan a reality, the EU has expressed a viewpoint which strikes a chord in other continents.

Thus, Europe has managed to reconcile what was deemed to be irreconcilable: the positive impact of world trade and international relations with the safeguard of its basic interests, more political efficiency with better governance, and the competitiveness of its more powerful components with the solidarity of the weaker ones. This situation is illustrated through the energy and climate change policy, which has become both a flagship of EU diplomacy across the world, a productive source of cooperation with neighbouring countries, and a factor of territorial cohesion in Europe itself. This context is, for obvious reasons, clearly favourable to peripheral maritime Regions, irrespective of their size, wealth or location.

In this scenario, the CPMR’s field of activity has substantially broadened, even if the organisation remains strongly attached to its “core” territorial approach, and in particular to ensuring that both maritime and peripheral dimensions are properly taken care of in key EU policies. With “innovation”, “identity” and “multi-level governance” being the buzzwords, a structure such as the CPMR, with its long experience and its wide-ranging network of regional authorities, is in a good position to take the right initiatives, in the right places and at the right time.

However the CPMR’s role does not stop at the Union’s border, as the controlled opening of the EU to the world has provided European Regions with new windows of opportunity. Not only has the organisation become increasingly active in fostering reinforced cooperation between Europe’s periphery and neighbouring countries, but it has also acted as a facilitator to support assistance projects in less-developed countries. All this has led the CPMR, now a key player in worldwide regional networks, to play a diplomatic role of some sort, heralding in other parts of the world, the European model of governance and highlighting its successes in the field of economic, social and territorial cohesion. This, it is hoped, will help put pressure on the UN and other world institutions to support (in a sustainable manner) a more humane form of globalisation.

However, the scenario of an “Enlightened Europe”, exporting its ethical values across the world as an alternative to the unbridled excesses of liberalisation meets an awesome difficulty: time. In the 18th century, it took decades, if not generations, for the philosophers of the enlightenment, the fathers of the American Bill of Rights, or the Human Rights Declaration, to make their views prevail. By contrast, economic trends are much more rapid and formidable, if not brutal - especially in this very fast moving 21st century. So, assuming that its message will be heard, will an “Enlightened Europe” be given enough time to convince the world to share its ethics, or will raw market forces eventually prevail? The 2021 CPMR annual conference, which will be attended by 27 observers of regional authorities from four continents, will have to discuss the matter, and reassess the organisation policy accordingly.



CONFERENCE DES REGIONS PERIPHERIQUES MARITIMES D'EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS OF EUROPE

6, rue Saint-Martin 35700 RENNES - F
Tel. : + 33 (0)2 99 35 40 50 - Fax : + 33 (0)2 99 35 09 19
e.mail : secretariat@crpm.org - web : www.crpm.org

- II -

QUESTIONNAIRE

The deadline for completing this questionnaire is **10 September 2008**.

Please send it by email : secretariat@crpm.org

or by fax : +33 (0)2 99 35 09 19 or by post

(Please send one reply by Region)

This questionnaire is being sent to the Political Leader of each CPMR Member Region (+ copy to the main CPMR contact persons) and Members of the CPMR Political Bureau.

We will not be able to take into account any replies which we receive after this date.

NAME OF YOUR REGION: THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL.SCOTLAND

Geographical Commission:

- Baltic Sea
- North Sea
- Atlantic Arc
- Inter-Mediterranean
- Balkan & Black Sea
- Islands

Name and title of the person completing the questionnaire: GORDON SUMMERS, PRINCIPAL EUROPEAN OFFICER

1 - In the CPMR, do you feel especially concerned by issues relating to:

1.1 - Maritime dimension?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.2 - Peripherality?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.3 - How relevant do you think an organisation like the CPMR is likely to be in the future?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2 - Which of the following themes that you consider to be of great importance for your Region over the next ten years need to be addressed by the CPMR?

2.1 - Maximum of 5 themes in each column

	0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
a) Regional policy & territorial cohesion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Tourism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Coastal management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Energy & climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other environmental issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Agricultural Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Knowledge economy, innovation & R&D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k) Immigration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Economic globalisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) Governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n) Interregional cooperation <u>within</u> the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o) Cooperation with regions and countries <u>neighbouring</u> the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p) Cooperation <u>beyond</u> Europe and the neighbouring countries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q) Other themes depending on current situation and the political agenda	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Others: RURAL DEVELOPMENT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO HIGHLAND. THIS ISSUE TENDS TO BE FORGOTTEN AS IT IS WRAPPED UP INTO OTHER POLICY AREAS SUCH AS

REGIONAL POLICY, COHESION, AGRICULTURE ETC. HOWEVER, IT IS THE OPINION OF THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL THAT THE RURAL AREAS SHOULD BE VIEWED AS PRIORITY FOR THE CPMR.....

2.2 - Do you think any of the above issues should be handled as part of a worldwide global agenda?

0 - None at all	1 - A few	2 - A lot	3 - All of the issues
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments: THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL RECOGNISES THAT EUROPE IS NOT ISLOTAED IN THE WORLD AND THAT EUOPEAN POLICY IS INFLUENCED BY GLOBAL EVENTS. IN RECOGNISING THIS FACT THE COUNCIL CAN SEE THE NEED TO SEEK TO INFLUENCE GLOBAL DECISION MAKING PROCESSES. HOWEVER THE COUNCIL IS ALSO OF THE OPINION THAT THE FOCUS OF THE CPMR SHOULD BE ON INFLUENCING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION. GIVEN THE POLICY AREAS LISTED AT 2.1 ABOVE IS TESTIMONY OF THE BROAD RANGE OF SUBJECTS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE UNION FOR THE BENEFIT OF CPMR MEMBERS.....

3 - What types of activities do you think the CPMR should emphasise?

3.1 - Lobbying EU Institutions to influence EU legislation, policies and financial orientations according to the interests of the CPMR Regions:

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.2 - Providing its members with synoptic, well-informed and focused information on issues and policies of interest to CPMR Member Regions:

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.3 - Fostering interregional cooperation between its Member Regions through European programmes (Interreg, FP7, CIP...):

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.4 - Fostering cooperation between its own Member Regions and other Regions, bodies and institutions within Europe?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.5 - Fostering cooperation between its own Member Regions and other regions, bodies and institutions neighbouring Europe?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.6 - Fostering worldwide cooperation between its own Member Regions and other regions, bodies and institutions?

0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Others: THE COMMENTS SET OUT AT 2.2 ABOVE APPLIES HERE. THE FOCUS OF ACTIVITY SHOULD BE WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION. HOWEVER PRIORITIES NEED TO BE REASSESSED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

.....

4 - In the functioning of CPMR, what do you think should be the main role...:

4.1 ...of the General Secretariat?

	0 - Not at all	1- A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
a) Represent the collective views of the organisation to outside bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Coordinate lobbying efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Provide strategic information to members and act as a "think tank"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Take initiatives and provide support in the field of interregional cooperation projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Directly lead cooperation projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Develop contacts and work in cooperation with other organisations within the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Develop contacts and work in cooperation with other organisations outside the EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other options: ON THE BASIS OF A CONTINUING SCENARIO OF GEOGRAPHIC COMMISSION WITHIN THE CPMR, THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT SHOULD ACT AS A HUB AND FOCUS ON FACILITATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPINIONS AND POSITIONS ON POLICY AREAS AND IN PROMOTING THESE WITH THE BODIES WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION THAT GENERATE AND PRODUCE POLICY AND RELATED INITIATIVES.

4.2 ...of the Geographical Commissions?

	0 - Not at all	1- A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
a) Represent the collective views of the organisation to outside bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Coordinate lobbying efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Provide strategic information to members and act as a "think tank"	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Take initiatives and provide support in the field of interregional cooperation projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Directly lead cooperation projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Develop contacts and work in cooperation with other organisations within the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Develop contacts and work in cooperation with other organisations outside the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other options:

.....

5 - How much do you agree with each of these proposals?

5.1 - Functioning of the CPMR

	0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Totally
a) As members, we feel sufficiently well informed of the work and actions undertaken by the CPMR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) The sharing of roles between the General Secretariat and the Geographical Commissions is well-balanced	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) The role of the Geographical Commissions should be strengthened	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) The role of the General Secretariat should be strengthened	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) The Executive Secretaries of the Geographical Commissions should be more integrated in the work of the General Secretariat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) The Executive Secretaries of the Geographical Commissions should work more in cooperation with each other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5.2 - The CPMR and other European organisations

	0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Totally
a) The CPMR should consider merging with other regional organisation(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) The CPMR should remain a totally independent organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) The CPMR should remain independent but have specific fields of strengthened cooperation with other organisations on a case-by-case, pragmatic basis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) The CPMR should strengthen cooperation and exchanges with the private sector, especially in areas related to the maritime economy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other observations you may wish to add:

THE COUNCIL IS OF THE OPINION THAT WHILST THE CPMR RETAINS ITS POSITION AS AN INFLUENTIAL LOBBYING BODY WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION, REPRESENTING THE VIEWS OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS IT SHOULD MAINTAIN ITS INDEPENDENCE. HOWEVER LOBBYING ENVIRONMENTS CHANGE THROUGH TIME AND IF THE INTERESTS OF MEMBERS WOULD BE BETTER SERVED BY A MERGER, THEN THIS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED. HOWEVER SUCH A MAJOR SHIFT WOULD REQUIRE CAREFUL MEMBER CONSIDERATION. SUCH A MOVE WOULD ONLY BE SUPPORTED BY THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL IF FUTURE BENEFITS OUTWEIGHED THE SITUATION PREVAILING AT THE TIME IN TERMS OF ABILITY TO INFLUENCE POSITIONS OF ANY NEW BODY AND ACERTAINTY THAT ANY BODY WOULD REFLECT THE COLLECTIVE VIEW OF MEMBERS IN LOBBYING ACTIVITY.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6 - The CPMR's membership and name

	0 - Not at all	1 - A little	2 - A lot	3 - Essential
VI.1 - Do you think that, as a regional organisation, the CPMR should reduce its membership according to stricter criteria related to the maritime dimension and peripherality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI.2 - Or on the other hand, do you think that the CPMR should extend its membership?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In the case of extending membership, should this be:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Strictly to maritime Regions only?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Also to regions which may not be maritime, but consider themselves as "peripheral"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) To any Region sharing the CPMR's goals?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI.3 - Do you think that the name "CPMR" is still relevant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If not, what would you suggest? THE VIEW OF HIGHLAND COUNCIL IS THAT THE ORGANISATION SHOULD REINFORCE ITS FOCUS ON THE PERIPHERALLY MARITIME REGIONS OF THE UNION

.....
