



18.11.2015

## **WORKING DOCUMENT**

on EU internal and external funding related to its migration and asylum policy

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

Co-Rapporteurs: Roberta Metsola, Kashetu Kyenge

Shadow Rapporteurs: Barbara Spinelli, Ignazio Corrao

## Contents

I. Overview of relevant EU funding for migration, both internally and externally .....	3
a. Funding to Member States.....	3
b. Funding to third countries .....	5
II. Main issues .....	6
III. Recommendations .....	9
a. Allocation of funds and priority setting.....	9
b. Implementation of funds .....	11
c. Funding modalities .....	12
ANNEX I: EU thematic funding by migration priority .....	14
ANNEX II: Geographic eligibility of relevant EU funds/instruments.....	16

## **I. Overview of relevant EU funding for migration, both internally and externally**

Articles 78 and 79 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) set as goals for the EU the development of common immigration and asylum policies to ensure the efficient management of migration flows and to offer appropriate status to any third-country national requiring international protection.

To help achieve those objectives funding has been entrusted to a number of programmes through which the EU provides both its Member States and non-EU countries ('third countries') with financial resources to support their efforts in the areas of regular and legal migration, irregular migration, return, asylum, visa policy, border management and integration. Emergency funds and development aid are also used in the areas of migration and asylum.

These programmes are spread across different budget lines in the EU budget and are managed by several Directorates General of the European Commission ('DGs') as well as by other EU bodies such as the European External Action Service ('EEAS'), depending on their areas of competence. Alongside the EEAS, the service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), was also set up to take over responsibility for operational expenditure. The fragmentation of budget lines and responsibilities creates a management structure that could make it difficult to provide a comprehensive overview on how the different funds available in the area of migration and asylum are allocated and ultimately used. Furthermore, such fragmentation makes it harder to quantify exactly how much overall the EU spends on migration policy. The tables annexed to this working document represent an attempt to provide an overview of the available EU thematic funds and instruments and their geographical scope.

The Commission has already proposed amendments to its 2015 and 2016 budgets, boosting the resources devoted to the refugee crisis by €1.7 billion.

Member States committed to deploying national funding to match. However, a large number of Member States still need to match EU funding:

- for the UNHCR, World Food Programme and other relevant organisations (€500 million),
  - the EU Regional Trust Fund for Syria (€500 million)
- the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (€1.8 billion)

### **a. Funding to Member States**

For the period 2014-2020, the main EU financial instruments in the Home Affairs' field are the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund ('AMIF') and the Internal Security Fund ('ISF') – which comprises an instrument on borders and visa and one on police cooperation – both managed by DG Home Affairs (HOME)<sup>1</sup> and under which €6.8 billion has been allocated for

---

<sup>1</sup> AMIF and ISIF are established and governed by four regulations - Regulation (EU) No 514/2014 laying down general provisions on the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and on the instrument for financial support for police cooperation, preventing and combating crime, and crisis management; Regulation (EU) establishing the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, amending Council Decision 2008/381/EC and repealing Decisions No 573/2007/EC and No 575/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Decision 2007/435/EC; Regulation (EU) No 515/2014 establishing, as part of the Internal Security Fund, the instrument

the seven-year period and of which €4.33 billion is allocated directly to Member States.<sup>2</sup>

AMIF and ISF have replaced the General Programme for Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows ('SOLID funds') that covered the 2007-2013 funding period. The Solid Funds comprised four instruments, the External Borders Funds, the Return Fund, the European Refugee Fund and the European Fund for Integration of Third-Country Nationals which each had their own legal basis and financial allocation. The Commission and the Member States are implementing AMIF and ISF jointly under so-called "shared management". The bulk of the funds go directly to the Member States, for example, only around 12% of the AMIF is managed directly by the European Commission or by entities other than Member States, such as EU Agencies (direct and indirect management).

AMIF supports actions addressing all aspects of migration and has four common specific objectives: (i) to strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension; (ii) to support legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and to promote the effective integration of third-country nationals; (iii) to enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States which contribute to combating irregular immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit, and (iv) to enhance solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation.

The ISF Borders & Visa instrument has two specific objectives: (i) supporting a common visa policy to facilitate legitimate travel, provide a high quality of service to visa applicants, ensure equal treatment of third-country nationals and tackle irregular immigration and (ii) supporting integrated border management, including promoting further harmonisation of border management-related measures in accordance with common Union standards. The ISF Police instrument also has two specific objectives: (i) crime prevention, combating cross-border, serious and organised crime including terrorism; (ii) enhancing the capacity of Member States and the Union for managing effectively security-related risks and crises, and preparing for and protecting people and critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks and other security-related incidents.

Other programmes such as Horizon 2020, the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme ('REC'), the European Social Fund ('ESF'), the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived ('FEAD') and the European Regional Development Fund ('ERDF') managed respectively by DG Research (RTD), DG Justice (JUST), DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion (ESF & FEAD) and DG for Regional Policy, also provide funding for activities related to migration. In particular in the face of current migration trends into the EU, the Commission has been seeking to maximise the use of these funds to provide Member States with funding to support the integration of refugees arriving into Member States' societies.

---

for financial support for external borders and visa; and Regulation (EU) No 513/2014 establishing, as part of the Internal Security Fund, the instrument for financial support for police cooperation, preventing and combating crime, and crisis management.

<sup>2</sup> According to Annex I of the AMIF Regulation; Annex I of the ISF Borders Regulation and Annex III of the ISF Police Regulation.

## **b. Funding to third countries**

The EU has set up partnerships with third countries addressing issues related to migration and mobility, based on priority objectives and embedded in the EU's overall external action policy, which includes development cooperation. Since 2005, the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility ('GAMM') is the overarching framework for the EU's external migration and asylum policy. The framework is intended to define how the EU conducts its policy dialogues and cooperation with third countries on migration-related issues.

The GAMM is implemented through several political instruments (bilateral and regional policy dialogues and action plans), legal instruments (such as visa facilitation and readmission agreements), operational support, capacity building, and programme and project support made available to third countries and other stakeholders, including civil society organisations. However, the EU and its Member States must take care in their support for third countries taking into account the record of those countries in breaching the human rights of migrants.

The main funding instrument is the Development Cooperation Instrument ('DCI') that includes the only EU global thematic funding for migration available under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme, and managed by DG International Cooperation and Development ('DEVCO'). However, as is the case for the funds allocated directly to Member States, other Commission DGs and EU bodies are involved in managing the DCI. Accordingly, the EU assistance to the EU's neighbourhood countries is provided by DG Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations ('NEAR') through the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance ('IPA II'), humanitarian aid is provided by DG Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection ('ECHO') and the EEAS manages the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace ('IcSP'). With AMIF and ISF also having an external dimension, this adds a new stakeholder to the external funding scene, namely DG Home.

Furthermore, on the basis of the GAMM, the EU is holding a broad dialogue with countries on the African continent on migration and mobility at bilateral, regional and continental levels. Through the DCI, the European Development Fund ('EDF') and the European Neighbourhood Instrument ('ENI'), the EU funds a significant number of external migration-related actions that support the implementation of various commitments taken under the different ongoing dialogue platforms such as the Rabat or the Khartoum Processes.

In the long-term we need to give greater impetus to solving the geo-political issues that affect the root causes of migration – war, poverty, corruption, hunger and a lack of opportunities means people will still feel forced to flee to Europe unless Europe looks at how to help rebuild those countries. That means that the Commission and Member States must put up the money to help build capacity in third-countries; such as facilitating investment and education; strengthening and enforcing asylum systems; helping to manage borders better, and reinforcing law/legal and judicial systems.

The Emergency Trust Fund for Africa agreed has added an additional dimension to the funding needed to build capacity in Africa. The rapporteurs welcome the €1.8billion euros being pledged to the fund and call on Member States to continue to contribute to the fund.

## II. Main issues

The presentation of the European Agenda on Migration on 13 May 2015 by the Commission outlined the new Commission's migration policy priorities, which now need to be translated into concrete legislative action and operational measures.

Aside from the immediate measures outlined, the Agenda on Migration sets out four pillars on which the Commission would like to base its migration policy, that is to say, reducing the incentives for irregular migration; border management – saving lives and securing borders; a strong common asylum policy, and a new policy on legal migration. Compared with the common specific objectives set out in AMIF, the Agenda on Migration includes border management under migration policy and has no specific pillar equivalent to the objective of enhancing solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States. The Parliament has welcomed the immediate measures proposed by the Commission in the Agenda on Migration including the emergency relocation mechanism, which is a tool for solidarity and responsibility sharing.

Certain elements of the European Agenda on Migration constitute a first step towards a comprehensive European approach. Greater efforts are still required in both the policy and operational terms, to have effective long-term migration governance within the EU and to help third countries. The EU should also move beyond emergency or crisis responses, towards funding medium and longer-term reforms that better address the persistent structural issues that lead to irregular migration.

EU migration and asylum policy is implemented through different policy instruments, each having its own objectives which are not necessarily interlinked, and there is insufficient coordination of funding between the multiple actors involved.

Despite the Commission's efforts to simplify EU funding mechanisms as part of the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework ('MFF'), the allocation of funds and tendering processes remains constrained by programming procedures and are subject to different approaches across the Commission's DGs. The new Financial Regulation and the related contracting templates add an additional layer of complexity for the Commission and Member States when they try to put the EU's policy priorities into practice through concrete projects and programmes.

In that regard:

- While ex-post evaluations are carried out, it is not always feasible to feed those evaluations into the next programming cycle as they are often completed after a fund or programme has ended and, to ensure continuity, the new fund or programme must be in place before the previous fund or programme ends. Moreover, no funding cut is possible during the implementation phase of projects.
- The Commission is currently attempting to do more to address migration priorities. However, up until now, the new funding made available through the EU budget represent MFF funding brought forward, with the result that the EU will be spending today what was intended to be spent tomorrow. This funding addresses some elements of the European Agenda on Migration that are supported by the AMIF, such as

relocation and resettlement, reception capacity in EU Member States, and Regional Development and Protection Programmes. Conversely, the thematic funding for migration available under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme has decreased from EUR 384 million in the 2007-2013 period to EUR 357 million for the 2014-2020 MFF. In addition, the European Union is constrained by the limited dedicated funds available in third countries, the Commission's internal processes which mean that it has already approved indicative programmes for the majority of funds available for the 2014-2017 period, and different policy guidelines on principles for action in the fields of migration, development and humanitarian aid.

- The inclusion in Article 4 of the AMIF Regulation of a mandatory partnership principle between Member States and relevant international organisations, including civil society organisations, is to be welcomed. However, it appears that a number of Member States, in the preparation of their national programmes, have not consulted civil society and other actors, or have done so in a limited manner. In addition, most Member States have not shared their multi-annual draft programmes with civil society organisations during their preparation despite the requirement in Article 12(3) of the AMIF Regulation that, “[t]he Member State shall involve the partnership in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national programmes.” Similarly, European civil society organisations have called for the implementation of a partnership principle at the European level.”
- With specific regard to AMIF, some Member States have yet to designate their responsible authorities to manage the national allocation and, as of end of October 2015, nine Member States national programmes were still not approved by the Commission.<sup>3</sup>
- Recent Commission budgetary proposals in the field of migration, most notably, Amending Budget No 7 for 2015 and Amending letter No 2 to the draft General Budget for 2016<sup>4</sup>, including the use of the flexibility instrument, should be welcomed for their breadth and scope, but medium and long-term funding remains a concern. The increase in the amounts proposed for budget lines under AMIF for 2016 have not been accompanied by a proposed revision of the global resources available under that fund for 2014-2020. Left as is, the result will be that funding under AMIF will have dried up long before 2020.
- EU funds are being used to address the issue of irregular migration, both internally and externally, by increasing financing for returns and by encouraging third countries to strengthen their border management. Substantial funding has been channeled to the strengthen border management and to develop new IT systems for border management.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Annex I to Commission Communication on Managing the Refugee Crisis: State of Play of Implementation of Priority Actions under the European Agenda on Migration COM(2015) 510.

<sup>4</sup> Draft Amending Budget No 7 to the General Budget 2015: Managing the refugee crisis: immediate budgetary measures under the European Agenda on Migration COM(2015) 485; Amending letter No 2 to draft General Budget 2016 ... Managing the refugee crisis: immediate budgetary measures under the European Agenda on Migration COM(2015) 513.

- Search and Rescue capacities should be strengthened and EU governments must deploy more resources in the context of an EU-wide multi-national humanitarian operation dedicated to finding, rescuing and assisting refugees and migrants in peril. In that regard, private shipmasters and NGOs should not be required to fulfill the role of the Member States and the EU.
- Securing operational funding is a key challenge for NGOs, as most funding is project-related. Volunteer and NGO initiatives dedicated to providing assistance to migrants should be promoted and, where appropriate, funded by the European Commission and Member States.
- The implementation of rights-based provisions in current EU directives should be backed up further by EU funding. Funding should also be made available to tackle exploitation and abuse of undocumented migrants based on the Employers Sanctions Directive.
- Where relevant for civil society organisations seeking to respond to tenders for EU funding, more user-friendly and widespread information on the funds available at Member State level would be very helpful.
- The management of the EU funds for migration is mainly decentralised. That means that Member States are ultimately responsible for the financial management of their multiannual and annual programmes implemented under those funds. Member States have put in place decentralised management and control systems to oversee the implementation of the funds. All Member States are required to delegate the audit activities to professional external audit bodies or national audit institutions. The increase in the number of actors involved in projects through subcontracting has led to investigations into fraud in some Member States. The possibility that a responsible authority could be the body both awarding and executing a project has proven problematic.
- More information and transparency regarding funding of current CSDP operations is needed. The European Parliament should be kept fully informed of all funding and assets provided for "Operation Sophia" that aims "at disrupting the business model of human smuggling and trafficking networks in the Mediterranean and to prevent the further loss of life at sea".
- The need for transparency extends to budget lines. In this respect thought should be given to having separate budget lines for each of the common specific objectives of AMIF.

### III. Recommendations

#### a. Allocation of funds and priority setting

In order to match the EU's responsibility towards refugees and migrants with an adequate response, the following should be considered:

- **Target and concentrate financial resources on well-identified policy areas:** while the Home Affairs Budget for the period 2014 to 2020 has increased, resources should be increased further to match the challenges that need to be addressed. It is important that the Member States and the Commission concentrate resources on actions and countries with a view to maximising the impact of those funds, and in line with well-defined and costed priorities. Funds need to support activities with clear EU added value and Member States should not substitute EU funding for national expenditure. Adequate funding is required to ensure proactive search and rescue; resettlement; relocation, safe and rights-based returns and that access to adequate social services is available at national level.
- **Member States and the European Commission should seek, where appropriate and possible, to fund projects managed by civil society organisations working in the areas of migration, integration and asylum and providing the services mentioned above.**
- **Under the MFF Review scheduled for the end of 2016, substantial additional, fresh resources need to be provided under Heading 3, and in particular for AMIF,** so that adequate funding is available on the basis of migration trends and the attendant financial requirements for EU and Member States' asylum, migration and integration policies.
- **Member States must take full advantage of the possibilities offered by funds which are not directly related to migration policy but which can be used to fund actions in that area (for example, integration actions), for example the ESF, the FEAD, Horizon 2020, the ERFD and REC.** In addition, the European Investment Bank must be given clear guidance to offer beneficial terms for refugee-related projects in Member States.
- **Increase funding allocations for a multi-dimensional, multi-year response:** Additional funds are needed to address migration priorities within the programmes managed by DGs HOME, DEVCO and NEAR. Increasing the budget of the intra-EU oriented AMIF must be complemented with support to medium and longer-term actions led by DGs DEVCO and NEAR in the EU's partner countries. DG ECHO must be reinforced alongside increased cooperation with development actors to better address the development dimensions of forced migration and contribute to securing livelihood opportunities.
- No conditionality should be attached to humanitarian assistance; however EU development assistance may be subject to appropriate conditions.
- **Ensure proportionality:** the allocation of funds should be based on future needs and on long term migration trends trends. The different situations in Member States based

on the latest available statistical data relating to the migration and refugee flow should be taken into consideration when determining the criteria for allocation of funds between Member States. Although fixed allocations per country do not encourage sharing of responsibility, proportionally allocated resources benefit countries with large absolute numbers over countries with much greater relative numbers (e.g. relative to population or size of GDP).

- **Fully protect and ensure the human rights of migrants:** the reduction of the number of funds in the area of Home Affairs to a two-pillar structure is to be welcomed as it allows for more flexibility. However, it must be ensured that the allocation of resources within the two Home Affairs Funds in respect of their various policy areas fully takes account of the EU and Member States' commitments to protect human rights. EU funding should be used to proactively support a rights-based approach to migration, which includes non-discriminatory service provision and activities.
- **Funding provided for the new 'hotspot' approach, and coordination of returns of those migrants not entitled to international protection, must be monitored. Civil society organisations should not be hindered in reporting on any breaches of fundamental or procedural rights of migrants.**
- **Ensure civil society involvement in the development of Union actions and national programmes:** civil society, including NGOs, plays a significant role in safeguarding, promoting and implementing migrants' rights. Hence, they should be supported. Therefore, in accordance with Article 4 of AMIF, the partnership principle for civil society organisations at both national and EU levels should be enhanced, securing their involvement in preparation, planning, monitoring, implementation and evaluation of funding as required under the AMIF regulation. At the EU level, thought could be given to regular consultation between the Commission and relevant civil society partners working on asylum, migration and integration issues.
- **Ensure that funding priorities reflect the needs of the EU's partner countries:** Funding for projects and programmes outside the EU must consider the needs of partner countries and the migrants themselves. Partner countries have their own migration challenges as countries of origin and destination or as host to displaced populations for which adequate support is needed.
- **Strive for a greater funding balance across the thematic areas of intervention in EU partner countries:** In line with the GAMM, the four thematic pillars of addressing legal migration and mobility, irregular migration and trafficking in human beings, international protection, and the development impact of migration should be of equal importance in EU external policy and funding. This key principle of the GAMM is, however, under increasing pressure as policymakers turn their attention to the irregular migration pillar at the expense of the other pillars.
- **Invest further in developing legal migration channels and supporting integration of migrants in the EU:** The EU 2020 Strategy has identified the need for a comprehensive labour migration policy and better integration of migrants in order to meet the Union's goals for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

## b. Implementation of funds

- **Strengthen coordination and funding coherence:** While coordination on migration policy and funding between the relevant EU services has improved in recent years, diverging mandates and approaches between migration, development and humanitarian actors within and outside of the EU bodies remain a challenge. Furthermore, the multiplicity of development programmes that can potentially finance migration projects at thematic, regional and bilateral levels requires more attention to avoid overlaps, to maximise synergies and to support the mainstreaming of migration in development planning. Improved coordination mechanisms and increased resources are therefore needed to map out priorities and the most appropriate funding sources within the EU bodies, key bilateral donors, but also within the EU Member States themselves. The Commission should further engage in discussions with the Council and the Parliament in order to further streamline the EU's external migration policy with those of the Member States, so that increased coordination leads to improved policy results. Funding priorities on migration should take into account EU principles on governing funding in those areas, inter alia, the European Consensus on Development and the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid.
- **Provide a comprehensive overview of EU funding related to migration, both internally and externally:** the absence of such an overview is a clear obstacle to transparency, but also to knowledge transfer from one project to another or even from one policy area to another. One possible option that could be considered could be having a website comprising a database of all EU-funded projects. Projects including a dimension linked to migration should appear in such a database. There should be scope to define the categories in such a database so that they are well-defined and easily understandable to allow any external stakeholder to have an accurate idea of the specific activities of the project.
- **In the interests of transparency and to ensure adequate funding for all objectives of EU migration policy, thought should be given to having separate budget lines of the common specific objectives of AMIF, in the line with the position of the LIBE Committee in its opinion on the EU Budget for 2016.**
- **Ensure efficient transparency, monitoring and accountability mechanisms:** the positive impact of the EU migration funds rely on processes at national and EU level to ensure transparency, effective monitoring and accountability. Consideration should be given as to how to make monitoring and evaluation ongoing processes and not only ex-post processes. The role of the Court of Auditors should be strengthened in that regard. Qualitative and quantitative indicators should be established and be comparable in order to measure the impact of EU funds and help to assess whether those funds achieved their objectives. Quantified data should be systematically collected. The establishment of a strong and independent European Public Prosecutor's Office should help tackle fraud against the EU budget, including in the area of migration. . Such reports could also be made publicly available.

- **The role of the European Parliament should be strengthened** in monitoring the changing priorities and the implementation of the funds: Missions of the European Parliament should more regularly visit EU funded projects.

### c. Funding modalities

For the future allocation and tendering for contract of EU funding on migration, the following should be considered:

- **Increase flexibility of funding allocations within programming processes:** While there have been positive developments in responding more quickly to unforeseen events and priorities in the 2014-2020 framework, such as the new options for emergency assistance within DG HOME funds, it remains difficult to identify new resources for third countries for which multi-annual funding programmes have already been agreed. As a result, the more flexible IcSP is too often utilised to fill the gap from its own limited resources. Although the regulations establishing the instruments for external funding allow the Commission to propose a modification to its programmes on grounds of urgency, in practice, this seems rarely to take place and must be addressed.
- **Strive for a balance between engaging more strategically with expert international organisations through direct awards and securing funding for NGOs:** Diversification of implementing agencies for EU-funded projects should not be a goal in itself, but rather selection must be based on the mandate and expertise of the selected lead agency. The EU has already established formal cooperation arrangements through Framework Agreements and Strategic Cooperation Frameworks/Partnerships with a selection of recognised international organisations. Directly awarding projects to such organisations that have the global capacity, membership and field presence to implement large-scale and strategic actions provides the possibility of joint, longer term and multi-phase project planning. Furthermore, use of this funding modality should ensure that the selected applicant has passed a seven-pillar Commission review of its financial management system and that it has the necessary expertise and regional and national partnerships to lead complex initiatives in the field of migration. At the same time, direct awards should not preclude smaller structures, especially NGOs, from having access to EU funding. The European Commission and Member States should keep a balance between large-scale and small-scale projects.
- **Adapt the co-financing requirement:** the consequences of requiring matching funding should be taken into account when imposing an external co-financing requirement. EU Member States should seriously consider providing matching funds for supported activities led by small-scale civil society organisations.
- **Access to information and publicity around EU funds:** this is of outmost importance to ensure and enhance transparency, accountability and legal certainty in the use of EU funds for migration. Responsible authorities should ensure more transparency throughout the application process. Calls for proposals should be widely disseminated and easily accessible. At Member State level, local and regional technical bodies could play an active role in this dissemination and a support role in the application process.

- One of the options that could be worth exploring could be to make more information publicly available. This could possibly include: names and nature of all projects supported, the year of funding, the duration of the project, the amount of EU contribution, the policy priority it addresses, the overall number of applicants for the call, the evaluation criteria and the remaining amount of the EU contribution that has not been allocated.
- The management of migration in the European Union should not become a source of corruption in the implementation of the Common European Asylum System. In this regard, it should be ensured that public funds are managed in full transparency.
- **Re-assess the financial and legal conditions offered by Delegation Agreements for contracting projects:** The new EU financial regulation introduced the contracting concept of Delegation Agreements, as one method for a direct award. However, the current template has meant difficult negotiations and ongoing interpretation problems for the international organisations primarily affected by these new conditions.
- The circumstances in which a Delegation Agreement should be used instead of a Grant Agreement remain unclear. At the same time, joint approaches and partnerships are de-facto discouraged by the current version of Delegation Agreements, as a hierarchy is created between one delegate and sub-delegated organisations. In that context, the selection of the main beneficiary of funds contracted through a Delegation Agreement must be assessed with regard to their track record for managing large budgets and to avoid potential conflicts of interest in the subsequent selection and management of sub-delegated organisations.

## ANNEX I: EU thematic funding by migration priority

Migration priority	Fund/Instrument supporting projects <u>outside the EU</u>	Fund/instrument supporting projects <u>in the EU</u>
Asylum and international protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>
Climate change, environmental degradation and migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Humanitarian Aid</li> <li>- Global Climate Change Alliance</li> <li>- Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>No targeted programmes</i></li> </ul>
Counter-trafficking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Internal Security Fund (ISF)</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> </ul>
Emergencies and crisis management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Humanitarian Aid</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> <li>- EU Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian crisis ("Madad fund")</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> </ul>
Irregular migration and border management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> <li>- Internal Security Fund</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> <li>- Internal Security Fund (ISF)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- European neighbourhood and pre-accession instrument</li> </ul>	
Labour migration and integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> <li>- Programme for Employment and Social Innovation</li> <li>- EU Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- European Social Fund</li> <li>- Programme for Employment and Social Innovation</li> <li>- EU Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme</li> <li>- Horizon 2020</li> </ul>
Migrant rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme</li> </ul>
Migration and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>No targeted programmes</i></li> </ul>
Migration and health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> <li>- Health Programme</li> </ul>
Resettlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>
Return and reintegration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) – Global Public Goods and Challenges</li> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)</li> </ul>

## ANNEX II: Geographic eligibility of relevant EU funds/instruments

EU fund/instrument	Regions/countries covered
Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EU Member States except Denmark</li> <li>- Third countries (limited support)</li> </ul>
Internal Security Fund (ISF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EU Member States except with the exception of Denmark, the UK and Ireland</li> <li>- Ireland is eligible for police cooperation, organized crime and crisis management components only</li> <li>- Iceland, Norway and Switzerland (as relevant to the Schengen acquis)</li> <li>- Third countries (limited support)</li> </ul>
Development and Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geographic programmes: eligible countries in Latin America, Asia, Middle East, South Africa and Pan-Africa</li> <li>- Thematic programmes: all eligible countries for geographic programmes and all countries eligible under the EDF and ENI</li> </ul>
European Development Fund (EDF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Eligible: African, Caribbean and Pacific countries that have signed the Cotonou Agreement</li> </ul>
European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- European Neighbourhood countries: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Syria, Tunisia and Ukraine</li> </ul>
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EU Member States</li> <li>- Third countries (priority given to those in Europe and those eligible under the ENI or IPA II)</li> </ul>
Horizon 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EU Member States</li> <li>- Associated non-EU countries</li> <li>- Third countries</li> </ul>

	- Developed Third countries (no EU support)
Humanitarian Aid	- Third countries
Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA II)	- Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey
Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)	- Third countries
Partnership Instrument (PI)	- Non-EU developed and developing countries which are prominent in global affairs and with which the EU has a strategic interest in promoting link
Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI)	- EU Member States - European Economic Area (EEA) and European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries - IPA II countries that have concluded relevant agreements on participation in EU programmes (for programme axis – employment, social protection and inclusion, working conditions and Microfinance and Social Entrepreneurship) (limited support)
Right, Equality and Citizenship Programme	- EU Member States - European Economic Area (EEA) and European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries - IPA II countries that have concluded relevant agreements on participation in EU programmes (limited support) - ENI countries may participate at their own cost