

Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and Instrument for financial support for police cooperation, preventing and combating crime, and crisis management: general provisions

2011/0367(COD) - 12/06/2018

In accordance with Regulation (EU) No 514/2014, the Commission presents the results of the interim evaluation of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and the Internal Security Fund.

The report covers:

- the abovementioned Regulation 514/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down general provisions on the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and on the instrument for financial support for police;
- the [Specific Regulation No 513/2014](#) establishing as part of the Internal Security Fund the instrument for police cooperation, preventing and combating crime and crisis management (ISF-P);
- the [Specific Regulation 515/2014](#) establishing as part of the Internal Security Fund the instrument for external borders and visa (ISF-BV); and
- the [Specific Regulation \(EU\) No 516/2014](#) establishing the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF).

The evaluation covers the period between 1 January 2014 and 30 June 2017 and reports on all national programmes, Union actions and emergency assistance financed under the funds.

Main findings:

Simplification: the single set of procedures laid down in the Regulation for all areas covered by the funds and for both AMIF and ISF was found to have led to simplification. The simplified **cost option** was used in only a few Member States who acknowledged its efficiency in reducing the administrative burden. Despite the improved simplification, national rules and procedures applicable under the national programmes appeared to have led to a **moderate amount of administrative burden**. As regards direct management, procedures were shown to be appropriate, clear, and transparent, without creating additional burden for Member States or beneficiaries.

Monitoring, reporting and verification measures are still perceived as **burdensome** and Member States have asked for **further guidance** on complying with EU requirements. The reporting requirements and the irrelevance of some common indicators were also reported as adding to the administrative burden.

Efficiency: overall the evaluation indicated that the results of the funds were achieved at reasonable costs in terms of both human and financial resources. However, most Member States face **problems** with the EU guidance, common indicators and the reporting/monitoring calendar. Despite simplification improvements, the perceived administrative burden can be considered as a factor that undermines efficiency. Overall, the emergency assistance actions and the Union actions as well as indirect management actions have achieved their objectives at a reasonable cost in terms of financial and human resources.

Relevance: the funds, their priorities and objectives as set out in the Specific Regulations, as well as within the annual work were shown to be still relevant. Due to the migratory and security crises, it is worth noting that **significant budget reinforcements** were needed, with the available budget of EUR 6.9 billion for the 2014-2020 programming period being raised to EUR 10.8 billion. The emergency assistance (at a higher scale than originally intended) has helped ensure the funds' relevance. However, **more flexibility** is needed as far as the implementation of the national programmes is concerned, the main issue being the fragmentation of actions under multiple national objectives that prevented the pooling of resources around key priorities and made it difficult to implement cross-objective projects.

Coherence: most Member States have adopted different coordinating mechanisms at the implementation stage to ensure the funds are coherent and are complementary to similar interventions carried out under other EU funds. As regards direct management, both emergency assistance and the Union actions show coherence with and complementarity to actions supported by other EU funds or actions supported by EU Agencies.

EU Added value: the report states that the funds have generated significant EU added value by (i) supporting actions with a transnational dimension, (ii) burden-sharing between Member States, (iii) boosting national capacities, (iv) optimising procedures related to migration management, (v) ensuring synergies, (vi) increased cooperation among actors dealing with visa processing, (vii) sharing of information and best practices, (viii) cross-border projects, (ix) trust among law enforcement authorities, and (x) staff training.

The Commission recommends that the **structure of the funds' mechanisms** (i.e. national programmes aiming to build long-term capacities, emergency assistance aiming to alleviate immediate pressure, and Union actions designed to support each other) should be maintained and used as a model for the future programming period. It also recommends;

- the national programmes should be more focused to enable Member States to prioritise some objectives that could lead to better results;
- the fragmentation of national programmes under several objectives with minimum percentages of funding should be reconsidered in order to increase flexibility;
- an emergency instrument should be maintained and its ability further strengthened;
- the common monitoring and evaluation framework should include better defined indicators with baseline and target values, and simplified processes, guidance and calendars.
- a system to distribute funds should be adaptable in order to respond appropriately to changing needs.