

Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) 2014-2020

2011/0366(COD) - 12/06/2018

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

The report covers:

- [Regulation \(EU\) No 514/2014](#) (horizontal provisions) as well as:
- the [Specific Regulation \(EU\) 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 \(EU\) No 515/2014](#) establishing as part of the Internal Security Fund the instrument for external borders and visa (ISF-BV); and
- this 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.

This summary concerns AMIF.

Recalling that AMIF was designed to promote the efficient management of **migration flows**, the report notes that migration conditions changed drastically during the implementation period under review, due to the sudden and unexpected increase in migratory pressure on the EU's southern and south-eastern external borders.

Budget: the total resources for AMIF's implementation period 2014-2020 were initially estimated at EUR 3 137 million, but due to the migration crisis, this **increased to EUR 6 888 million** of programmed commitments to support relocation and resettlement, integration and return and to prepare the implementation of the [revision of the Dublin Regulation](#). The overall level of payments is at 25 % (EUR 1 068 million) of the global allocations, while the implementation rate amounts to 48 % (EUR 2 022 million).

Current resources are as follows:

- EUR 5 391 million or 78 % programmed for the national programmes;
- EUR 462 million or 7 % for the Union actions other than emergency assistance;
- EUR 1 029 or 15 % for emergency assistance.

Main findings:

Relevance: AMIF corrected the shortcomings of the [SOLID programme](#) in terms of **aligning priorities with needs**, but the report notes that Member States faced changing needs during the implementation period that possibly call for the allocation arrangements to be adapted for instance, by adapting the

allocation key and a stronger mid-term review. AMIF proved to be an important instrument in handling the difficult situation, by providing both short-term emergency support to and more long-term capacity building of the asylum, integration and return.

Effectiveness: with regard to AMIF's objectives, the report notes the following:

- AMIF has played an important role in **improving asylum systems and strengthening reception capacity** in Member States. It recalls that between 2013 and 2017, the number of people in target groups provided with Fund assistance increased from 18 944 to 184 122. In addition, the number of people trained by the Fund increased from less than 1 000 in 2015 to 7 031 in 2017. The number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors rose from a low 183 places in 2014 to 17 070 places in 2017;
- by the end of 2017, almost 26 000 people have been **resettled** under both the EU resettlement scheme and the EU – Turkey statement on legal admission (out of 74 000 in total). However, the Fund has only made a limited contribution towards implementing national resettlement programmes;
- on **integration issues**, the Commission notes that **short-term integration measures** (introductory courses on civic orientation, languages, etc.) have been prioritised over long-term measures (pre-vocational training, further education, etc.), which makes sustainability an issue;
- only limited progress has been made on **legal migration**, likely due to the contextual factors;
- with respect to **return strategies**, both the voluntary and forced return supported by the fund have steadily increased. The number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund increased from 5 904 in 2014 to 39 888 in 2015, falling to 36 735 in 2017; the number of people who returned voluntarily assisted by the Fund increased tenfold, and the number of removals co-financed by the Fund increased from a low 10 in 2013 to a peak of 6 065 in 2016;
- AMIF **emergency assistance** has been an essential instrument in supporting Member States in the 2015 migratory crisis and its follow-up.

Coherence: whilst the Commission is satisfied with measures were taken during the fund's design, planning and programming stages to ensure coherence, it notes that there is room for improved communication in relation to internal coherence (among AMIF instruments) because beneficiaries are not very aware of Union and emergency assistance actions.

EU added value: the main EU level benefit arises from the **transnational dimension** of certain actions (specific actions, Union actions and the European Migration Network) as well as EU level burden-sharing, supported by emergency assistance and the relocation mechanism under national programmes. AMIF brought significant EU added value in terms of **ensuring the effective management of migratory flows at EU level** and optimising procedures related to migration management. In terms of sustainability, the report notes that integration and asylum outcomes are likely to last if they address longer-term needs, while return outcomes are more sustainable if they are based on voluntary return schemes and are supported by efforts for reintegration.

The report goes on to make a number of **general remarks about all three funds**. It notes that due to the migratory and security crises, 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. It also notes that **more flexibility is needed** as far as the implementation of the national programmes is concerned. The main issue was found around 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.

The Commission recommends that an emergency instrument should be maintained and its ability further strengthened so it can respond rapidly and efficiently to changing circumstances.