

Priorities for addressing the internal dimension of migration in the MFF post-2020¹

The development of migration in the last years has drastically highlighted that existing EU-instruments in the MFF for addressing the **internal dimension of migration** fall short of the actual needs. As migratory flows to Europe are unlikely to cease in the coming years, the EU needs to equip itself with effective instruments for managing the arrival and integration of refugees and migrants as well as their repatriation, if applicable. The EU-internal dimension of migration in the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) should therefore be addressed along the following four axes:

1) Support the reception and integration of refugees and migrants as well as their repatriation, if applicable. Financial support for such measures should continue to be channeled via the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF). The allocation of AMIF funds to Member States should take account of the actual needs such as expressed by the number of asylum seekers that were received by a given Member State from 2015, the peak year of the migration crisis, onwards. However, to also allow for a more flexible adaptation to possibly changing needs, a share of AMIF funding should be reserved for a new allocation based on updated data at the mid-term of the financing period.

2) Resettlement and relocation: As a financial incentive, Member States resettling or relocating a person should be granted a lump-sum payment. The payment of the lump-sum should be subject to the condition that the person actually resides in the Member State in question for a longer period of time. These payments could be channeled via AMIF.

3) Address structural challenges of migration such as creating opportunities for the participation of refugees and legal migrants in the labor market and their integration into the labor market. Integration is a structural challenge that is to a large extent taken on by cities and regions. EU structural funds (ERDF, ESF) should thus provide significantly more funding to those regions and Member States that have received and integrated over the past years a high number of refugees. The allocation key for structural funds should therefore also take account of the number of refugees that have received a residence permit on humanitarian grounds and have taken actual residence in the respective Member State

4) Avoid overlaps by clearly defining the scope of each instrument. Each instrument should be geared towards distinct purposes. Between AMIF and EU structural funds, the specific objective and thus the type of measure should be clearly differentiated. For instance, both AMIF and structural funds could support measures in the field of integration. However, while structural funds could e.g.

¹ The following positions are restricted to a number of qualitative aspects in the above-mentioned areas and are without prejudice to future positioning by the Federal Government on the MFF in its entirety. In particular, decisions on financial endowments can only be taken in the context of the MFF in its entirety. The issue of the protection of the EU's external borders is not subject of this paper and will be addressed in a separate position.

support the integration and opportunities for participation in the labor market, communal childcare facilities or investments in urban education, AMIF could e.g. finance measures aiming at the integration into the host society or non-occupational language courses.

AMIF and structural funds should complement each other. As a consequence, the EU funding structure for addressing the internal dimension of migration would become more effective. Moreover, it would be more targeted towards those bearing the burdens of migration, in particular cities, regions and Member States that have taken on the genuinely European challenge of migration over the past years without commensurate EU funding.