

Brussels, 19 September 2018  
(OR. en)

12272/18

---

---

**Interinstitutional Files:**

2018/0248(COD)

2018/0249(COD)

2018/0250(COD)

---

---

**LIMITE**

**JAI 896**

**FRONT 295**

**ASIM 109**

**MIGR 128**

**CADREFIN 207**

**VISA 236**

**SIRIS 118**

**ENFOPOL 457**

**CT 147**

**COMIX 499**

**CODEC 1497**

**NOTE**

---

From: Presidency

---

To: Delegations

---

Subject: Presidency questionnaire

---

In view of the meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Party on JHA Financial Instruments on 1st October 2018, delegations will find attached a Presidency questionnaire on the external dimension of migration and the Home Affairs Funds in the MFF post-2020.

## **Presidency questionnaire on the external dimension of migration and the Home Affairs Funds in the MFF post-2020**

### **Introduction**

On 13 June, the Commission issued the sectoral proposals in the area of Home Affairs<sup>1</sup> for the next programming period 2021-2027. Asylum, migration and security are transnational in nature and require a coordinated response by the Union. The proposals are part of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) package.

The European Council conclusions of 28 June 2018<sup>2</sup> included an explicit reference to the three Home Affairs proposals: *'In the context of the next Multiannual Financial Framework, the European Council underlines the need for flexible instruments, allowing for fast disbursement, to combat illegal migration. The internal security, integrated border management, asylum and migration funds should therefore include dedicated, significant components for external migration management.'*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Asylum and Migration Fund (AMF), the Integrated Border Management Fund (IBM) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF).

<sup>2</sup> Doc. EUCO 9/19.

At the Strategic Committee on Immigration, Frontiers and Asylum (SCIFA) on 9 July 2018, the Austrian Presidency indicated that it would put forward concrete drafting proposals in order to reinforce the external dimension of migration in the three funds /instruments, and that the exchange of views and technical work would take place in the Ad hoc Working Party on JHA Financial Instruments.

## **1) Objective and scope**

The aim of this paper is to structure the discussions in the Working Party on how the European Council conclusions can be implemented in three proposals (AMF, BMVI, ISF)<sup>3</sup> in the most expedient way. It includes a questionnaire to delegations that will allow the Presidency to formulate drafting proposals.

Given the links with other Union instruments, the Presidency restates the need for coordination, as far as the external dimension of migration is concerned, between the Home Affairs Funds and other EU funds/instruments in order to ensure coherence, complementary and synergies.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Ad hoc Working Party deals with the AMF, the ISF and the Border Management and Visa Instrument (BMVI), which is one of the two components of the IBM.

## 2) Commission proposals for the MFF post-2020

The Commission proposes an important reinforcement of the EU budget in the policy areas of 'Migration and Borders' and 'Security' in the next MFF and a more prominent role for the JHA decentralised agencies (see table below).

### **Expenditure on asylum, migration and security (comparison between MFFs)**

MFF 2014-2020		MFF 2021-2027	
Programme / Expenditure	EUR million *	Programme / Expenditure	EUR million
Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund	3 137	Asylum and Migration Fund	10 415
Internal Security Fund - Borders	2 760	Border Management and Visa Instrument	8 018
Internal Security Fund - Police	1 004	Internal Security Fund	2 500
Decentralised agencies (incl. migration, borders and security)	2 360	Decentralised agencies (incl. migration, borders and security)	14 006
<b>Total</b>	<b>9 261</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>34 939</b>

\* Funds initially earmarked for asylum, migration and security in current prices.

The Commission proposes that new funds could be disbursed together with Member States' (programmes) under shared management or through a thematic facility under direct, indirect and shared management. This thematic facility could top up national programmes without the need to completely revise them and includes emergency assistance, Union and specific actions.

The new funds aim at supporting the internal objectives of the Union, including the possibility of providing support outside of the Union (the so-called external dimension). According to the impact assessment, the Home Affairs funds would complement the financial assistance provided through the external instruments rather than supporting actions which are development-oriented.

The participation of international organisations and legal entities established in third countries (the latter on an exceptional basis) is permitted in the three proposals. Therefore, both programmes and the thematic facility could in principle be used in actions in third countries for the purpose of stemming irregular migration.

Although there are several references to the external dimension of migration in the proposals, the support for this kind of action could be stressed, also including references, where appropriate, to new concepts such as disembarkation platforms in third countries.

### **3) Questionnaire**

The Presidency intends to structure the debate in the Working Party around two main issues: coherence with other EU funds/ instruments and the implementation of the dedicated component for the management of external migration in the three proposals.

Delegations are invited to reflect on the following questions ahead of the Working Party meeting.

**1) Coherence and complementarity**

- *Do you agree that actions to stem irregular migration should be funded by external action instruments and by Home Affairs instruments?*
- *How can complementarity and synergies between the different funds/ financial instruments be ensured?*
- *Which actions dealing with the external dimension of migration could be financed by AMF, BMVI and ISF? (Please elaborate on each of the funds / instrument).*

**2) Implementation of the dedicated components**

- *Should the dedicated components be integrated in the thematic facility? Or should they coexist alongside the programmes and the thematic facility?*
- *Should the dedicated components be financed within the financial envelopes proposed for each fund /instrument?*
- *What kind of entities should be eligible?*
- *How can flexibility and a fast disbursement of funds in the event of crises or emergencies be ensured?*

---