



POLICY OPTION
BRIEF

March **2019**

Alexander Wolffhardt

INTEGRATION

High levels of EU support for migrant integration implemented by civil society and local authorities: Options for the 2021 to 2027 MFF



ReSOMA identifies the most pressing topics and needs relating to the migration, asylum and integration debate. Building on the identification of pivotal issues and controversies in the ReSOMA Discussion Briefs, **ReSOMA Policy Option Briefs** provide an overview of available evidence and new analysis of policy alternatives. They take stock of existing literature of policy solutions on asylum, migration and integration, highlight the alternatives that can fill key policy gaps and map their support among various stakeholders. They have been written under the supervision of Sergio Carrera (CEPS/EUI) and Thomas Huddleston (MPG).

Download this document and learn more about the Research Social Platform on Migration and Asylum at: www.resoma.eu

LINGUISTIC VERSION

Original: EN

Manuscript completed in March 2019

Unless otherwise indicated, the opinions expressed in this document are attributable only to the author and not to any institution with which he is associated, nor do they necessarily represent the official position of the European Commission.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given prior notice and sent a copy.

Contact: resoma@resoma.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the grant agreement 770730

High levels of EU support for migrant integration implemented by civil society and local authorities: Options for the 2021 to 2027 MFF*

1. INTRODUCTION

This ReSOMA Policy Options Brief addresses two key issues driving current efforts at improving EU support for integration in the upcoming 2021 to 2027 programme cycle. Next to ensuring sufficient overall funding in line with the needs in Member States, a crucial challenge is to widen the participation in the relevant EU funds of integration actors which are locally active and provide support on community level. Local/regional authorities and civil society organisations alike strive for amendments of the legal base of the AMF and ESF+ funds proposed by the European Commission in 2018, by proposing a range of proposals informed by these overarching goals. This brief introduces the policy options, presents the corresponding proposals advanced by EU-level stakeholder organisations and traces the patterns of debate and support that the proposals garner, with a special focus on the European Parliament and reflecting the state of play of negotiations as of March 2019. Chapters on the evidence base of the stakeholder proposals highlight major findings that underpin the proposals and point out the type of evidence used.

Another key issue in the ongoing debate about the place of migrant integration in the next EU funding cycle, ensuring that EU support focuses not only on short-term measures in the arrival context, is addressed in the forthcoming ReSOMA Policy Options Brief on comprehensive, longer-term integration policies.

1.1 Policy option adequate funding – to ensure sufficient spending on integration according to needs across all Member States

Advancing this policy option is informed by lacking, or patchy, public spending on migrant and refugee integration seen in many Member States. Across Europe, the attention given to integration policies varies dramatically. Comparably high levels of financial support provided in wealthier and/or long-standing destination countries contrast with much lower levels in more recent destination countries or Member States where public finances have been under strain. In most countries, however, policy gaps related to specific and sectoral challenges exist, together with a lack of national spending

*By Alexander Wolffhardt, [Migration Policy Group](#)

in such areas. In this overall context, EU funds represent a key mechanism to instigate and leverage higher spending on migrant and refugee integration according to actual needs. In addition, they provide an opportunity to strengthen the principle of early integration 'from day one', in line with the EU policy approach.

Proposals put forward by stakeholder organisations start from the fact that traditionally EU funding dedicated to integration has been comparatively low (i.e. mostly under AMIF in the current programme period). In addition, there is a sense that existing spending levels need to be defended and reinforced in view of recent EU priorities focused on migration management and -control. Proposals are also driven by growing reluctance in some Member States to create advantageous conditions for migrants and refugees in general, and the varying propensity of Member States to let migrants and refugees benefit from various EU programmes (structural funds, education programmes etc.). Pushing for adequate levels of EU integration funding is therefore not only about maintaining and expanding what is available from EU programmes, but also about making sure, through programme rules, that Member States eventually take up the potentially available means (cf. ReSoma Discussion Briefs on 'cities as providers of services' and 'maintaining mainstreaming', chapters 4 on key issues and controversies).

1.2 Policy option broader participation

– to ensure funds can be accessed by civil society and local/ regional authorities, and that these actors are fully involved in the funds' governance

Advancing this policy option is informed by the ambition of local actors, both public and societal, to autonomously pursue integration priorities in line with the needs on the ground. The local level is where success or failure of integration processes is determined, with key public services such as housing and early childhood education, but also policies to combat poverty or social exclusion widely in the hand of municipalities. Civil society, local and regional authorities are uniquely placed to offer early integration support, pursue community building among newcomers and citizens, and shape the social climate in which reception and integration take place. However, local integration actors often do not have enough leeway to fully exploit their potential due to various constraints that often are related to lack of funding. EU programmes, their funds as much as their concepts and objectives, can be crucial to galvanize effective and lasting integration strategies on local level, pursued by public bodies and NGOs. Cities, regions and civil society thus are key stakeholders and potential beneficiaries of EU funding instruments for the integration of migrants and refugees.

Proposals put forward by stakeholder organisations respond to a reality that by far does not live up to the actual role of civil society and local/regional authorities in migrant integration. While NGOs are widely recognised as main beneficiaries of EU funding in the integration area, their

participation in EU programmes is often hampered by specific funding rules developed by Member States for programmes implemented on national level (under 'shared management'). Other barriers to participation relate to EU rules, including on co-financing and administrative burdens that are problematic especially for smaller organisations. In what concerns municipalities, they have been grossly underrepresented as beneficiaries of recent EU integration funding in spite of their decisive role in handling the 2015/16

peak in arrivals. Moreover, they have experienced serious obstacles in accessing EU funds resulting from national implementation structures and -decisions. In the governance of the relevant programmes, the voice of local and regional authorities, civil society and social partners is underrepresented or even absent, leading to little involvement of these actors in programme planning, implementation and monitoring (cf. ReSoma Discussion Brief on 'cities as providers of services', chapter 4 on key issues and controversies).

2. PROPOSALS, THEIR DEBATE AND EVIDENCE BASE

2.1 Policy option adequate funding – proposals to ensure sufficient spending on integration according to needs across all Member States

The policy option aiming for sufficient levels of EU integration spending responds to the Commission proposals (EC 2018b,c) for the 2021 to 2027 Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) with regard to:

- the Asylum and Migration Fund (AMF) with a focus on early integration to replace AMIF,
- the proposed 'legal migration and integration' heading of Member State AMF programmes under shared management,
- future integration support from the AMF Thematic Facility managed by the Commission, the European Social Fund (as ESF+) to become a foremost EU funding source for longer-term integration,
- the proposed ESF+ specific objective on integration of third-country nationals under the ESF's social inclusion bracket, and
- the merging of today's FEAD/support for the most deprived into ESF+.

(cf. ReSoma Discussion Briefs on 'cities as providers of services' and 'sustaining mainstreaming of immigrant integration', chapters 3.2. on the post-2021 agenda and MFF proposals.)

2.1.1 Specific proposals put forward

Specific stakeholder proposals put forward as reaction to the Commission

proposals and relevant for this policy option (details cf. 3.1) are:

- At least 30% of national AMF programmes under shared management to be allocated to, and actually spend, on integration and legal migration actions;
- Allocation of AMF funds to MS solely based on numbers of third-country nationals who arrived (and not on returns), to match the needs in the asylum and integration areas;
- 50% of the AMF to be managed by the European Commission under the Thematic Facility, to increase the Commission's possibilities to address integration needs in Member States;
- The possibility to reabsorb AMF funds and spend them under the Thematic Facility in case a Member State underspends the funding allocated to its national programme;
- Explicit inclusion in the scope of AMF of the early identification of victims of violence and torture, and support to specialized civil society organisations through the Thematic Facility;
- Publication of the annual AMF performance reports as well as mid-term evaluations, to increase the transparency on how funds are used and facilitate monitoring;
- At least 30% of national ESF+ programmes under shared management to be spent on social inclusion and reducing poverty, including for integration of third-country nationals;
- Socio-economic integration of third-country nationals and of marginalised

communities as two separate specific objectives of ESF+, to ensure equal attention to the two target groups;

- At least 4% of national ESF+ programmes to be spend on the two specific objectives addressing social inclusion of the most deprived and material deprivation;
- European Social Charter and Sustainable Development Goals as additional references for ESF+, to ensure its scope includes asylum seekers and persons with an irregular status

2.1.2 Patterns of debate & support

Proposals on ensuring sufficient funding levels for integration are brought forward by basically all relevant EU-level stakeholder organisations, reflecting the concerns of their membership. On the level of Member States, the debate has different focal points depending on countries' peculiar situations. Generally, the policy option has the highest salience in countries which lack systematic integration spending in line with needs, or where migration-related policies find scarce political support (e.g. various East-Central European Member States). Discussions among stakeholders take a somewhat different course in Member States with high levels of national integration spending and where integration objectives tend to be more mainstreamed across policy fields. In countries such as Germany, the Netherlands or Sweden, key concerns are rather how to effectively use the comparably small EU budgets for piloting and scaling up of innovative measures, or how to focus the means to address specific gaps and use the funds to

leverage national spending in such deficiency areas.

Support in the European Parliament

In the European Parliament, as co-legislator of the future EU funds in the 2021 to 2027 MFF, a wide range of stakeholder positions have been taken up in the ongoing negotiations. The legislative resolution on the **AMF regulation** resulting from the plenary vote of 13 March 2019, based on the report of the Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) Committee, addresses most of the above-mentioned concerns and will be the Parliament's starting point in the upcoming negotiations with Council and Commission. Notably, it proposes to amend the integration objective of the fund, deleting the focus on early integration foreseen by the Commission, and stipulates to maintain the fund's hitherto name, 'Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)' (EP 2018 e.f, 2019a). With a view to proposals put forward by stakeholders, Parliament has settled on:

- A minimum allocation of 10% of funds to integration and legal migration each in national AMF programmes (however not including a requirement on actual minimum spending); together with a minimum allocation under the Thematic Facility of 10% each to integration and legal migration spending (details cf. 3.1.1);
- Deletion of provision that 40% of national AMF means are to be allocated to Member States according to criteria related countering irregular migration including returns, but still with the number of TCN who do not or no longer fulfil the conditions for entry

and stay and who are subject to a final return decision to be taken into account as a criterion (details cf. 3.1.2);

- Strengthened provisions concerning vulnerable groups, through adding protection measures for vulnerable persons to the measures implemented through the fund; and adding to the scope of AMF support the early identification of vulnerable persons, victims of violence and torture as well as the provision of psycho-social and rehabilitation services (details cf. 3.1.5);
- Increased transparency on how funds are used and facilitated monitoring of state of programme implementation; through publication of actions, beneficiaries and annual performance reports; submission of reports to Parliament and Council; and detailed provisions on mid-term and retrospective evaluation reports (details cf. 3.1.6).

Concerning the **ESF+ regulation**, the amendments adopted by the European Parliament on 16 January 2019, based on the report of the Employment and Social Affairs Committee, embodies Parliament's eventual stances on the proposals put forward by stakeholders (EP 2018c,d, 2019b):

- At least 27% of national ESF+ programmes under shared management to be spent on social inclusion and reducing poverty, including for integration of third-country nationals (details cf. 3.1.7);
- Socio-economic integration of third-country nationals to become a separate specific objective of ESF+ in

the social inclusion policy area (details cf. 3.1.8);

- At least 3% of national ESF+ programmes to be spend on the two specific objectives addressing social inclusion of the most deprived and/or material deprivation (details cf. 3.1.9);
- Sustainable Development Goals as additional reference for ESF+, to ensure its scope includes asylum seekers and persons with an irregular status (details cf. 3.1.10)

2.1.3 Evidence base of proposals

Stakeholder proposals and demands are mostly buttressed by data and evidence about past implementation of EU funds in Member States. Partly, reports are gathered by stakeholder organisations, utilising expertise available among their membership. Partly, evidence comes from consultancy research, often related to Commissions-sponsored networks and platforms in the context of specific programmes. Stakeholders can also draw on reports of other EU bodies such as the European Court of Auditors, or the Commission's own assessment and evaluation reports.

Notably, most of this evidence is focused on the input side of programme implementation, i.e. the financial volume available for integration measures. Concentrating on input factors in this way is caused by an underlying notion of policy effectiveness which assumes that more spending will lead to improved outcomes, but also by the fact that this type of evidence simply is much easier to come by. Concerns about the output quality of policies and measures implemented through EU means may

resonate in stakeholder proposals on improved monitoring and evaluation of the programmes, but long-term impact assessments of migrant integration policies are notoriously scarce in general, be they EU-funded or not (e.g. Bilgili 2015).

Use of the AMIF for integration purposes

Recent ECRE/UNHCR reports about the use of AMIF on national level (ECRE/UNHCR 2017, 2019) provide crucial evidence, pointing out the relevance of many stakeholder proposals for the ongoing AMF negotiations. Drawing on member organisation and local staff expertise as well as analysing national AMIF interim evaluation reports, the reports highlight the limited impact of the AMIF programmes under shared management in countries with no national integration strategy or defined policy approach; naming Cyprus, Bulgaria, Hungary and Slovakia as examples. At the same time, Hungary and Slovakia exemplify Member States where AMIF is the only remaining integration funding source. Eight Member States note in their interim reports that integration measures would be unlikely without AMIF due to lack of other funding sources. That countries can get away with not fully addressing integration needs under existing programme rules is evidenced by the United Kingdom (only measures for resettled persons), Czechia (lack of awareness measures), Austria and Hungary (vulnerable groups not addressed). Czechia and Austria are moreover quoted as countries where political priorities have influenced the content of AMIF calls. In seven Member States, including large countries such as Germany and Spain but also Greece and

Hungary, AMIF is found to substitute state financing under responsibilities stemming from the Common European Asylum System instead of complementing it (ECRE/UNHCR 2017: 27-31, 2019: 41).

Concerning the allocation of national AMIF funds to the integration priority, the same report finds that across European sub-regions more than 30% of means are allocated on integration actions, but with notable exceptions for Greece/Italy/Malta and UK/Ireland. Only in four countries respondents found the distribution of AMIF basic allocations across the priorities (i.e. asylum, integration, return) as in line with the predominant needs. The findings also suggest that minimum allocation to priorities as required under the 2014-20 AMIF does not necessarily produce spending in the same proportions. Drawing on data from the national AMIF interim evaluation reports, the second publication of the ECRE/UNHCR research into AMIF spending points out the wide variation in AMIF expenditure financing integration actions in Member States from 2014 to mid-2017. While in Czechia and Sweden more than 75% of AMIF expenditure went to the integration objective, in Hungary, Poland and Romania the share of expenditure on integration ranged between 50 and 75%. Between 25 and 50% of AMIF expenditure was dedicated to integration in Austria, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain. All other Member States spent less than a quarter of AMIF expenditure on integration in the first half of the current programme period, with Greece, Malta and the UK even nothing or on miniscule scale. EU-wide, 26,4% of national AMIF expenditure

went to the integration objective. These data, though, need to be seen against the background of low overall AMIF expenditure rates in this period, with the Czech, Greek, Maltese and Swedish programmes spent to less than 5% until mid 2017 (ECRE/UNHCR 2019: 17f). Based on this evidence, EU legislators are advised to maintain in the 2021-27 AMF the minimum allocation rule concerning the integration priority and moreover turn it into an actual spending requirement (ECRE/UNHCR 2017: 23).

With regard to the overall allocation key of future AMF funds to Member States, another recent joint ECRE/UNHCR report points out how the proposed indicator (number of returns) in practice would lead to financially rewarding Member States with a below-average recognition rate and correspondingly high return numbers (ECRE/UNHCR 2018b: 50). The calculation (based on 2015-17 figures) shows such an incentive structure for seven countries, providing the evidence to propose that return figures should be taken out of the allocation formula as they would only distort allocation of funds according to Member States' needs in the asylum and integration areas.

Lack of transparency in AMIF implementation

That weak provisions of the AMIF legal base lead to a lack of transparency of national spending practice is evidenced by both stakeholder research and insights of the European Court of Auditors. To what extent AMIF spending corresponds to the priorities of the national programmes is not known due to insufficient programme-level information rules and widespread Member State communication malpractice. Overall,

there is a lack of consistent public information on calls for projects, beneficiaries, projects and financing. ECRE/UNHCR has found that as of end 2017, only eight countries have hold information and training events open to participation by civil society actors, while another group of eight Member States has not even published any kind of guidance for project implementation. How AMIF funding is being used is not being published at all by eight countries, and only partly by 16 Member States. Information on the impact of AMIF actions is practically absent, also because the annual Commission implementation reports are not published (ECRE/UNHCR 2018b: 24-26).

Sluggish implementation, in spite of the needs and challenges associated with the 2015/16 peak in arrivals, is a peculiar problem of AMIF, with an average of only 16% expenditure committed across Member States by the end of 2017 and two countries not spending at all. The Commission's ad hoc requests of action plans to speed up implementation in Member States judged to be behind schedule (as done for Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Italy and Poland) are seemingly not enough to address the underlying problem (ECA 2018: 26, ECRE/UNHCR 2017: 27-31).

Use of the ESF for integration purposes

Under the ESF, supposed to become the major EU funding source for longer-term integration, dedicated integration spending has been difficult to track either. Until now, the lack of unambiguous output indicators has made it difficult to pinpoint the number of migrant/foreign-background beneficiaries disentangled from other

minorities and marginalised minorities (e.g. ECA 2018: 26); suggesting a more differentiated output/result indicator system for the upcoming 2012 to 2027 MFF. While 23 Member States have used the ESF to implement measures for the integration of migrants, only six governments report to a European Court of Auditors survey that the numbers of migrants supported by EU funds are fully known (ECA 2018: Annex III). Only where Member States have foreseen refugee- or migrant-specific sub-programmes in their national ESF programmes and report about implementation (e.g. Belgium, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain, cf. EAPN 2016), a clearer picture about use of ESF means for migrant integration exists.

Member State spending under the overall ESF bracket for social inclusion and poverty reduction is a key reference data insofar, as it has encompassed much of the support benefitting migrants. In future as well, the ESF+ specific objective on the socio-economic integration of third-country nationals will be situated in the social inclusion policy area of the fund's objectives. An analysis of the 2014-2020 ESF partnership agreements and operational programmes undertaken for the Commission has shown that 25.6% of the total ESF budget was allocated to the promotion of social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination (Thematic Objective 9). 20 Member States have allocated between 20% and 30% of their ESF budgets to TO9, with only Finland and Lithuania sticking to the minimum requirement of 20% foreseen in the 2014 to 2020 MFF. Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands and Malta allocated more than 30% of their ESF budget to social inclusion (Fondazione Brodolini, CEPS and COWI

2016, ESF Transnational Platform/AEIDL 2018a:6). This evidence of actual Member States preferences strongly suggests, for the upcoming funding cycle, a minimum allocation to the social inclusion and poverty reduction objectives above the current 20%; and has informed the stakeholder proposals on a minimum allocation of at least 30% of national programmes to the social inclusion policy area.

2.2 Policy option broader participation

– proposals to ensure funds can be accessed by civil society and local/regional authorities, and that these actors are fully involved in the funds' governance

The policy option aiming for broader involvement of the local/regional levels and civil society in the funds responds to the Commission proposals (EC 2018a,b,c) for the 2021 to 2027 MFF with regard to:

- support from the AMF Thematic Facility for integration actions implemented by LRA and CSO;
- increased EU co-financing of 90% for actions implemented by LRA and CSO under the fund's integration objective;
- AMF allocation rules to the asylum, integration and return objectives in Member States programmes;
- under the ESF+ European co-financing rates of 40 to 70% (reduced compared to the current MFF);
- the Partnership Principle in the Common Provisions Regulation (CPR) extending to AMF, ESF+ and ERDF;
- provisions in the AMF and ESF+ regulations on programming, monitoring, reporting and evaluation;

- CPR provisions on common programme rules as well as on combined, cumulative and complementary funding from different funds.

(cf. ReSoma Discussion Briefs on 'cities as providers of services' and 'sustaining mainstreaming of immigrant integration', chapters 3.2. on the post-2021 agenda and MFF proposals.)

2.2.1 Specific proposals put forward

Specific proposals put forward by integration stakeholder organisations as reaction to the Commission proposals or in the course of the ongoing legislative process, and relevant for this policy option, are (details cf. 3.2):

- A new EU funding instrument offering direct financial support to cities in return for receiving refugees and asylum seekers, linked to resettlement and/or EU relocation programmes;
- Reasonable minimum allocations for local authorities and civil society organisations across all priorities within national AMF programmes under shared management;
- A maximum EU co-financing rate of 80% for national AMF programmes and encouragement of matching national funds; additionally, the extension of the proposed 90% co-financing rate for integration actions led by civil society and local/regional authorities across all AMF objectives;
- Earmarking for local authorities and civil society of a significant part of funding from the AMF Thematic Facility, to support integration and

reception actions implemented locally;

- A strong and mandatory Partnership Principle in all relevant funds, to ensure meaningful multi-stakeholder and multi-level programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;
- An EU-level Partnership Principle, applied to the AMF Thematic Facility and with regular stakeholder consultations on the planning and implementation of activities;
- Inclusion of civil society stakeholders in the ESF+ Committee, to reflect their key role in the design and delivery of the fund, in line with the idea of an EU-level Partnership Principle.

2.2.2 Patterns of debate & support

Striving for more involvement in EU funds programming and implementation is a strong focus for all EU-level organisations representing civil society and sub-national levels of government. Again, on Member State level the debate is more nuanced. On the one hand, the pattern already observed regarding the debate on sufficient overall integration funding also holds true in this context: In countries where integration policies are generally less developed and which lack support structures for the inclusion of migrants and refugees, better and direct access for local/regional authorities and NGOs is a key issue. Municipalities and civil society in countries with higher levels of integration spending rather discuss the added value of EU funding for leveraging innovation and filling specific gaps. A common concern, though, across countries is the accessibility of the funds for small entities which lack the capacities and resources required for

successful participation in EU programmes, be it smaller cities or civic platforms and small-scale NGOs.

On the other hand, arguments around the partnership principle and the funds' governance are highly diverging, both across Member States and within countries. This discussion reflects different administrative cultures and variations in the general civil society-state relationship as much as diverging consultation practices in various policy fields, as the EU instruments are being implemented through different ministries and management structures. Reinforced transnational, cross-country cooperation and exchange among civil society and local/regional authorities concerning their involvement in programme planning, implementation and evaluation seems in order, given this multitude of issues with partnership-based programme implementation in Member States.

Support in the European Parliament

In the ongoing legislative process most of the stakeholder positions have been taken up by Members of the LIBE Committee. The EP's legislative resolution on the **AMF regulation** of March 2019 stipulates (EP 2018e,f, 2019a):

- Establishment and development of regional/local integration strategies as well as capacity building of integration services provided by local authorities added to the fund's scope of support; however, no provisions on minimum allocations of national AMF programmes to civil society organisations and local/regional authorities (details cf. 3.2.2)
- Encouragement of Member States to provide matching national co-

financing to EU-funding of at a maximum 75% of eligible expenditure (details cf. 3.2.3)

- A minimum allocation of between 5% of the AMF Thematic Facility to local and regional authorities implementing integration actions (details cf. 3.2.4)
- Enshrining of a strong partnership principle in the regulation in addition to the provisions of the Common Provisions Regulation, with partnerships to include local and regional authorities as well as NGOs, human rights institutions and equality bodies (details cf. 3.2.5)
- The Commission to regularly engage with civil society organisations in the development and implementation of work programmes of the Thematic Facility; and to consult concerning actions eligible for higher co-financing and the further development the monitoring and evaluation framework (details cf. 3.2.6)

With regard to the **ESF+ regulation**, the amendments adopted by the European Parliament also reflect key proposals put forward by stakeholders (EP 2018c,d, 2019b):

- Enshrining of a far-reaching partnership principle in the ESF+ regulation, asking for meaningful participation of social partners, civil society organisations, equality bodies, national human rights institutions and other relevant or representative organisations (details cf. 3.3.5)
- Appointment to the ESF+ Committee of Member State representatives of civil society, equality bodies or other independent human right institutions, as well as of a Union level civil society representative (details cf. 3.3.7)

2.2.3 Evidence base of proposals

A wide range of stakeholder literature exists assessing to what extent civil society and local/regional actors actually benefit from the EU programmes in the integration and migration field. To a large extent, these reports are based on survey work among member organisations and other actors involved in partnership consultations, complemented by analysis of programme documents. It is noteworthy that hard evidence on spending committed to local bodies and civil society organisations only is available through programme monitoring and evaluation reports put together by the Commission or Member States for the Commission, to the extent that they are being made public.

Limited civil society and local authority participation in current funding cycle

Concerning the role of civil society in implementing AMIF and as beneficiary of the fund, important insights are provided by the recent 'Follow the Money' reports (ECRE/UNHCR 2017, 2019). A key finding relates to significant variation across Europe. While in a number of Member States NGOs are even the main implementing agencies for AMIF funds, in some countries civil society receives only a small share of available means. Across all AMIF objectives (i.e. asylum, integration and return), national AMIF interim evaluation reports provide evidence that from 2014 to mid-2017 Austria, Belgium, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Spain committed 50% or more of AMIF funds to civil society organisations, with highest shares in France (84%) and Spain (91%). Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, and Slovenia allocated less

than 25% to civil society; while in Greece and the UK AMIF implementation has been entirely state-led (ECRE/UNHCR 2019: 20f).

Generally, NGO participation in implementing AMIF is found by ECRE/UNHCR research to be the more extensive, the stronger civil society sectors are, the more established structures of state-civil society collaboration exist, and the more NGOs do have pre-existing roles in national integration frameworks. Barriers to NGO involvement resulting from national approaches to managing the funds include lack of support in pre-application phase, non-transparent call procedures, cumbersome eligibility rules, lack of pre-financing and delays in project approval and payments. Where governments do not provide co-financing for national programme actions (e.g. Hungary and Romania), project carriers can be hard pressed to source additional funding (ECRE/UNHCR 2017: 40-43).

Reflecting on key challenges in view of the upcoming MFF, civil society funding experts from across Europe have stressed the reluctance of many governments to systematically involve organised civil society in the development and implementation of the national programmes.* Points of concern include only selective engagement in the programming phase, missed opportunities for stakeholder mobilisation, a propensity of governments to speak to

* ReSOMA Transnational Feedback Meeting 'Towards coordinated, complementary and comprehensive integration policies funded from EU programmes', March 2019. Participants represented experiences in Belgium, Czechia, Estonia, France, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain.

large non-profit actors rather than to small and specialised NGOs, barriers to participation for small entities resulting from payment rules and -schedules, lack of transparency in decision-making, and even a tendency in a few countries to use national AMIF implementation rules to harness critical civil society.

In what concerns AMIF uptake on the local level, the situation is even more pronounced than for civil society organisations. As evidenced by the Commission's mid-term review, only 10% of all national programme funds committed 2014 to 2017 have been spent by local public bodies under the AMIF integration priority, referring both to municipalities and local branches of national agencies (EC 2018d, ECRE 2018b, ECRE/UNHCR 2019). But only in 15 national programmes this category of implementing organisations features at all, with more than 20% of committed funds implemented via local public authorities only in Cyprus, Finland, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Sweden. With 48% their share is highest in Italy where integration measures are implemented through regional plans involving local authorities (ECRE/UNHCR 2019 drawing on national AMIF interim evaluation reports: 20f).

In the case of the ESF on the other hand, the current programme period has seen improvements insofar as Member States were encouraged to use the EU Structural Funds for so-called 'integrated actions for sustainable urban development', leading to an estimated third of the new urban strategies to include ESF funding. This and the requirement to use part of the national ERDF allocation for these integrated actions led to more frequent

direct responsibility of cities in the management of ESF funds. Notwithstanding these developments, cities continue to point out that Operational Programmes and calls leave key local challenges not addressed, that target groups and indicators do not match the local reality, or that coordination gaps exist at the ESF/ERDF nexus (EUROCITIES 2018a, HLG 2017, Urban Agenda 2018, Social Platform 2018a).

Evidence on cities' role in the integration of migrants and refugees

In any case, proposing broader involvement of local authorities in the funds is based on the assumption that cities have a key role, or are even better placed than national governments, to deal with the reception, early integration and long-term inclusion of migrants. In addition, cities and their organisations can point out that increased efforts at urban-level integration strategies take place in the context of a revival of local social inclusion and welfare policies, with innovation, experimentation and piloting of solutions that are difficult to achieve at higher levels of government (Jeffrey 2018). Ample evidence exists on the willingness of many cities, in particular during the 2015/16 arrivals, to take an open, welcoming stance and innovate local-level integration policies. Based on research among member cities, EUROCEITIES has documented such efforts in a series of publications on reception, education and labour market integration (EUROCITIES 2016, 2017a, 2017d). City networks like 'Solidarity Cities' and 'Arrival Cities' are built around such 'champions' and 'coalitions of the willing', with ongoing academic research exploring

this development (Bendel et al. forthcoming).

All of this evidence is used to argue that the proposals on better access for cities to integration funding would be effective, in the sense of sufficient uptake and absorption of EU instruments among cities. Other research has provided a more nuanced picture, pointing out that among European cities there are also those more reluctant to receive migrants or are even openly rejecting it (e.g. Ambrosini 2013), or that local-level integration policies may be closely tied to national reception policies with little leeway for autonomous action (e.g. Emilsson 2015). Findings like these indicate an uptake of means that possibly would be lower than expected by advocates of more EU integration spending being channelled to the local level.

Multi-stakeholder governance: evidence on partnership implementation in Structural Funds in general

With regard to the partnership principle, i.e. the participation of local and regional authorities as well as civil society organisations in programme planning, implementation and monitoring, a number of assessments is available. Following the adoption of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership (ECCP), a CEMR report has gathered evidence on its implementation in Member States throughout the Structural Funds (including ESF) in the planning of the current programme period, based on a membership survey. It found that out of 18 countries assessed only four had fully involved local and regional authorities in the process in all stages, and another ten Member States at least partially applied the standards set forth in the ECCP. Huge

differences in practices persisted not only across countries, but also from one fund to the other, and from partnership agreements to operational programmes (CEMR 2015).

These findings are confirmed by a report for the Commission on the implementation of the partnership principle in Structural Funds programmes including ERDF and multi-fund programmes co-financed by ESF, based on stakeholder perceptions and document analysis. It concluded that while the reinforced legal framework clearly contributed to significant improvements, the partnership principle is still implemented very differently, with the level and type of partner involvement often depending on national administrative structures, the existence of different historical legacies and the technical capacity of the partners. As a general picture across Member States, public authorities, especially from the national and regional levels, are overrepresented at the expense of the general public, civil society and the social and economic partners (Sweco, Spatial Foresight and Nordregio 2016, also cf. CPMR 2018b, EPRS 2017).

Evidence on implementation of the Partnership Principle in the ESF

Focused on the European Social Fund and its social inclusion and poverty reduction objective, a report of the European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN) based on a membership survey likewise found a generally low level of engagement of NGOs and low satisfaction with the quality of the engagement. Only nine out of the 16 EAPN member networks participating in the survey were involved in the drafting

of the ESF Partnership Agreement and the Operational Programmes (Czechia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain), while seven were not consulted. Only Germany, Italy, Poland and Romania confirmed a positive involvement that resulted in an impact on the Partnership Agreement and/or the Operational Programme. The quality of the social sector's participation in ESF Monitoring Committees is widely questioned, with only Germany, Romania and Spain reporting high levels of participation. Reasons highlighted for non-involvement were lack of access to political decision-making and insufficiently participative mechanisms (EAPN 2016: 8).

Most recently, a review of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership conducted by the ESF Transnational Platform identified the key problems leading to limited opportunities for genuine stakeholder involvement in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes. Notably, these findings resulted from comprehensive survey work with ESF management authorities, Programme Monitoring Committees, NGO stakeholders and social partners in all Member States. Recommendations for strengthened partnership provisions derived from these challenges include: More clarity on what representativeness means, with encouragement of greater diversity in partner selection and clear procedures for including partners; more transparency in decision-making processes with clearer guidance around timeframes, expectations and opportunities for partner input; ongoing involvement in all phases of programme development and implementation, going

beyond consultation and integrating the local voice through bottom-up and participative approaches; more assistance and training to strengthen the institutional capacities and partnership skills needed to contribute effectively to programmes and projects; and more proactive and appropriate involvement in review and assessment processes (ESF Transnational Platform/AEIDL 2018b: 32-35).

Evidence on implementation of the Partnership Principle in the AMIF

Concerning the AMIF, where the partnership principle is anchored in a less committing way than in the Structural Funds, systematic assessment is provided by ECRE/UNHCR research. Member States experience reflects the soft wording of the partnership provision in the AMIF regulation, only asking to include regional and local authorities 'where applicable' and NGOs and social partners 'where deemed appropriate'. In practice, the partnership principle is not applied in a consistent way, and in many cases it is not obvious how and if at all consultations impacted on the priorities chosen for the national programmes. Only seven Member States could be identified that consulted in the preparation phase with a range of stakeholders, while other countries witnessed pro-forma consultations after determination of priorities (France) or outright rejection of civil society consultation requests (Germany). Not a single national programme document refers to needs analyses or data provided by non-governmental actors; and nowhere is the Partnership Principle being interpreted as meaning that different

types of actors have equitable or minimum access to funding.

Likewise, with regard to civil society and local/regional authority participation in Monitoring Committees which oversee programme implementation, the Partnership Principle is interpreted in very different, often restrictive ways. Practices found include just observer status for civil society organisations (Hungary), participation of only the government office for cooperation with NGOs (Croatia), mere lip-service to the principle (Romania) and delayed inclusion of NGOs (Great Britain, Greece). Last not least, the report notes that the evaluation framework does not ask Member States to seek the input of partners, and that the AMIF regulation does not foresee implementation of the Partnership Principle at European level (ECRE/UNHCR 2018a: 36-40)

Evidence on higher efficiency and impact of policies based on consultation and participation

A common trait of all reports mentioned is that they mostly focus on assessing the implementation practice of the partnership principle, highlighting either good practices or deficiencies in Member States. This literature, however, scarcely refers to evidence on the outcome of policies that have been pursued in partnership, i.e. the reasons why governments should embark on a multi-stakeholder governance framework when developing and implementing policies in the first place. For example, the review of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership done by the ESF Transnational Network highlights and confirms the rationale for partnership as proposed by e.g. a 2014 Committee of

the Regions report for the Commission (Van den Brande 2014). Thus, effective delivery of structural funds programmes is catalysed by the partnership principle, leading to: Focus and improved coordination, as policy needs as well as perspectives of end-users and target groups are more clearly identified when including different societal actors; better access to resources and innovative solutions, as more creative and dynamic approaches become available from diverse contributions; institutional strengthening, capacity building and sustainability, as disadvantaged or marginalised actors gain a stronger voice in the political arena, overcome resource limitations and assume a more proactive role; and higher legitimacy, stability and sustainability, as a more democratic 'mandate' gained through broader participation of different organisations, groups and citizens results in durable change (ESF Transnational Platform/AEIDL 2018b: 5-7).

The stakeholder survey conducted for the Commission's assessment of the partnership principle's implementation confirms these propositions. The report found that added value in terms of better thematic balance and focus of structural funds programmes, stemming from more expertise and know-how consideration, is exemplified through countries such as Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, Malta, Poland and Slovenia. Higher commitment and more ownership, leading to facilitated policy implementation, could be observed in Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden (Sweco, Spatial Foresight and Nordregio 2016: 38-49).

Academic literature likewise provides only limited insight into the actual efficiency and impact of policies that are developed and implemented according to the partnership principle, at least in the area of migrant integration.[†] Research is rather focused on whether countries implement – and comply with – the partnership provisions stipulated as soft EU law; and whether the EU programme framework in general has had an effect on how Member States adapt, define and devise integration policies. Research of this kind is also interested in the extent to which a common understanding of migrant integration is fostered through concepts and coordination mechanisms associated with the EU framework, and if factors like public opinion or the strength of organised civil society exert significant influence on how EU instruments are implemented (e.g. Carrera and Atger 2011, Caviedes 2004, Geddes 2000, Sebastiani 2015, Van Wolleghem 2017, 2019).

EU policymakers may take note from such research that the overall capacities of civil society organisations appear to be more relevant for achieving government behaviour in line with EU objectives than financial incentives (notwithstanding that the inclination of governments to support multiculturalism has the strongest effect on implementation aligned to EU parameters). Empowering civil society actors that are in a good position to keep government in check, including providing them with a role in partnership-led programme implementation, thus offers a more efficient way to leverage EU policy

goals based on soft law than budgetary means (Van Wolleghem 2017).

In spite of research results like this, a research gap nevertheless seems to prevail on the efficiency and impact of partnership-led EU programme implementation, in the sense of assessing the quality of policies and integration outcomes linked to the way local level or civil society stakeholders are involved in programme development and -delivery. Such evidence, however, would be particularly helpful for anybody arguing for changes or modifications in how the partnership principle is implemented in Member States.

[†] Zeynep Kasli, ReSOMA's lead expert on integration, contributed to this chapter with insights into the state-of-art of current research.

Annex

Overview of policy options

3.1 Adequate funding

3.1.1

What is proposed	To introduce in the AMF national programmes under shared management minimum allocation and spending requirements for the integration and legal migration actions , to ensure that Member States adequately invest in these areas and are obliged to use the funds for these purposes. The ringfencing should amount to at least 30% of AMF funds allocated to, and spent by, a Member State (ECRE, CEMR). Flexible spending under the Thematic Facility , however, should not be bound by allocation requirements, but be closely overseen by the European Parliament (ECRE)
------------------	---

Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE, CEMR, EUROCITIES
---------------------	---

Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member States to allocate a minimum of 10% of their allocated funding to the integration-specific objectives (and a further minimum 10% to legal migration; (Amendment 93 on Art. 13.1) • Member States to ensure that their programmes include actions addressing all the specific objectives (incl. those related to integration) and that the allocation of resources among the objectives ensures that those objectives can be met (Amendment 104 on Art. 13.1a new) • a minimum of 10% of the funding from the Thematic Facility to be allocated to the integration-specific objectives (Amendment 103 on Art. 9.2)
---------------------------------------	--

3.1.2

What is proposed	To base allocation of AMF funds to Member States only on numbers of third-country nationals who arrived , and not also on numbers of persons obliged to return/being returned. Available funding should match the needs in the asylum and integration areas and not incentivise low recognition rates. Furthermore, allocation indicators should include beneficiaries of humanitarian protection/protection status under national legislation (next to recognised refugees and persons under subsidiary protection).
------------------	--

Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE
---------------------	---

Where does the proposal find support?	<u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of provision that 40% of national AMF means are to be allocated to Member States according to criteria related countering irregular migration including returns; only the number of third country nationals who do not or no
---------------------------------------	---

	longer fulfil the conditions for entry and stay in the territory of the Member State and who are subject to a final return decision to be taken into account as a criterion (Amendments 167 and 168 on Annex I.4.a and I.4.b)
3.1.3	
What is proposed	To increase the percentage of the AMF fund that is managed by the European Commission under the Thematic Facility from 40 to 50% .
Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE
Where does the proposal find support?	<u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> ---
3.1.4	
What is proposed	It should be possible for the European Commission to reabsorb funds where Member States deliberately chose not to spend EU resources and spend them under the Thematic Facility. Where the mid-term review finds consistent underspending or an unwillingness of a Member State to disburse the funding allocated to its national programme, the European Commission should suspend further dispersal of funds and ask for a reabsorption of the funds already dispersed to the Member State.
Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE
Where does the proposal find support?	<u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> ---
3.1.5	
What is proposed	To explicitly extend the general scope of support from AMF to include the early identification of victims of violence and torture and other vulnerable groups and the delivery of qualified psycho-social and rehabilitation services to the victims of violence and torture . The Thematic Facility should also expressly provide adequate support to specialized civil society organisations for delivering qualified psycho-social and rehabilitation services.
Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE
Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to add to the AMF scope of support the identification of applicants with special procedural or reception needs, including the early identification of victims of trafficking, minors and other vulnerable persons such as victims of torture and gender-based violence, and referral to specialised services (Amendment 196 on Annex III.2.c) • to add to the AMF scope of support the provision of qualified psycho-social and rehabilitation services to victims of

3.1.6	What is proposed	<p>violence and torture, including genderbased violence (Amendment 197 on Annex III.2.ca new)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to add the number of vulnerable persons assisted through the programme, including children and those granted international protection, to the information set out in Annual Performance Reports (Amendment 161 on Art. 30.2.ha new)
	Who is proposing it	<p><i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE</p>
	Where does the proposal find support?	<p><i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Commission to <i>at least annually</i> provide the European Parliament and the Council with information on programme performance in line with the AMF core performance indicators (Amendment 148 on Art. 28.1 referring to Annex V); the Commission to make available upon request to the European Parliament and to the Council the progress towards achievement of the programme objectives in line with the AMF output indicators (Amendment 149 on Art. 28.3 referring to Annex VIII) the Commission until end 2024 to present a mid-term evaluation examining the effectiveness, efficiency, simplification and flexibility of the Fund, taking into account all relevant information available, in particular the annual performance reports submitted by the Member States and the output and result indicators; and until 2030 to carry out a retrospective evaluation and to submit an evaluation report to the European Parliament and to the Council. All evaluations are to be conducted with meaningful participation of social partners, civil society organisations, including migrants and refugees' organisations, equality bodies, national human rights institutions and other relevant organisations in accordance with the partnership principle (Amendment 151 on Art. 29.a new) to publish the annual performance reports of Member States on a dedicated website and to forward them to the European Parliament and the Council; and the Commission to make summaries of annual performance reports available to the European Parliament and to the Council, and to publish them on a dedicated website (Amendments 152 and 162 on Art. 30.1 and 30.3)
3.1.7	What is proposed	<p>To increase from 25% to 30% the minimum share of ESF+ funds spent on social inclusion and reducing poverty in Member States programmes under shared management (and to exclude support addressing material deprivation from this share, to be covered by another minimum spending requirement, Social Platform). As the socio-economic integration of third-country nationals falls under this sub-heading of proposed ESF+ objectives, increasing the share would create more possibilities</p>

for targeted support of integration measures that go beyond labour-market integration.

Who is proposing it *among stakeholder organisations:*
Social Platform, EU Alliance for Investing in Children

Where does the proposal find support? *in the European Parliament:*
ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:

- Member States to allocate at least 27% of their ESF+ resources under shared management of their ESF+ resources under shared management to the specific objectives for the social inclusion policy (Amendment 92 on Art 7.3)

3.1.8

What is proposed To split the 'socio-economic **integration of third-country nationals** and of marginalised communities such as the Roma' into two **separate specific objectives**, on equal footing, of the future ESF+. Both groups should receive adequate attention in national ESF+ programmes under shared management and supporting one of them should not happen to the detriment of the other.

Who is proposing it *among stakeholder organisations:*
Social Platform

Where does the proposal find support? *in the European Parliament:*
ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:

- to promote long-term socio-economic integration of third country nationals, including migrants, as a separate specific objective (Amendment 89 on Art 4.1.viii/viii a)

3.1.9

What is proposed To require Member States to spend a **minimum share of 4%** of their ESF+ funds under shared management on the two specific objectives addressing **social inclusion of the most deprived and material deprivation** (instead of the proposed minimum spending requirement of 2% for the objective addressing material deprivation only). This would ensure that, post-FEAD, spending for social inclusion of the most deprived remains on an appropriate level, in line with the national strategic framework of poverty reduction and social inclusion as proposed as an ESF+ enabling condition.

Who is proposing it *among stakeholder organisations:*
Social Platform

Where does the proposal find support? *in the European Parliament:*
ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:

- Member States to allocate at least 3% of their ESF+ resources under shared management to the specific objective of addressing social inclusion of the most deprived and/or material deprivation; in addition to the minimum allocation of at least 27% of the ESF+ resources to the specific objectives vii to x of Article 4.1 (Amendment 92 on Art 7.4)

3.1.10

What is proposed Application of the ESF+ should be also **guided by the European Social Charter and the Sustainable Development Goals** (and not only the European Pillar of Social Rights), to ensure in the ESF+ target groups inclusion of asylum seekers, persons whose claims have been rejected or who have an irregular status.

Who is proposing it *among stakeholder organisations:*
ECRE, PICUM

Where does the proposal find support? *in the European Parliament:*
ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:

- As general objective of the fund, ESF+ to be in line with, among others, the commitment of the Union and its Member States to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (Amendment 88 on Art 3)

3.2 Broader participation

3.2.1

What is proposed **To create a new EU funding instrument offering direct financial support to cities in return for receiving refugees and asylum seekers.**

Under such an incentive scheme, municipalities would apply directly to receive funding for the integration of refugees and asylum seekers whom they wish to welcome. Working with municipalities, local-level NGOs and civil society initiatives would also benefit from such funds. The instrument should be linked to resettlement and/or EU-internal relocation programmes.

Who is proposing it The proposal was included in the European Parliament's resolution on the MFF post-2020 of 14 March 2018. French president Macron in his speech to the EP on 17 April 2018 likewise proposed the creation of a European programme to "directly financially support local communities that welcome and integrate refugees".

In more detail, the proposal has been articulated by Gesine Schwan of the Humboldt-Viadrina Governance Platform in cooperation with the European Stability Initiative (Knaus & Schwan 2018). In a similar vein, it has been promoted in the context of the project 'When Mayors Make Migration Policy' (Bendel et al. 2019).

It also resonated in the position paper of the Urban Agenda Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees coordinated by EUROCITIES, calling for direct access for cities to AMIF funding and Block Grants for cities (EUROCITIES 2018c).

Where does the proposal find support? The Commission proposals on the 2021-2027 MFF did not explicitly take up the concept. Potentially, however, the proposed AMF Thematic Facility could be used in an ad-hoc manner to implement elements of the proposal. Member States could also programme their national AMF programmes to support municipalities willing to receive refugees and/or asylum seekers.

3.2.2	What is proposed	To introduce reasonable minimum allocations for local authorities and civil society organisations across all priorities within national AMF programmes and reserve these for actions implemented by such actors (ECRE: 30% for such actions under the asylum and integration objectives).
	Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE, EUROCITIES
	Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> --- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • however, adding to the fund's scope of support the establishment and development of regional and local strategies for the implementation of the Union acquis related to asylum, legal migration and integration, in particular local integration strategies (Amendment 187 on Annex III.1.a) • adding to the fund's scope of support capacity building of integration services provided by local authorities (Amendment 216 on Annex III.3.a new)
3.2.3	What is proposed	<p>To facilitate civil society and local/regional authority participation in implementing national programmes across all AMF intervention fields, the maximum EU co-financing rate should be increased from 75% to 80%. Member States should be encouraged to provide matching funds for activities supported by the AMF.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed 90% EU co-financing rate for integration measures implemented by civil society organisations and local/regional authorities should be extended to any AMF-funded action pursued by these actors.</p>
	Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE
	Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to keep the maximum EU co-financing rate at 75%, but Member States to be encouraged to provide matching funds for activities supported by the AMIF. The EU co-financing rate for integration measures implemented by civil society organisations and local/regional authorities shall be a minimum of 80 % and may be increased to 90 % (Amendments 101 and 102 on Art 12.1 and 12.3)
3.2.4	What is proposed	To reserve a significant part of funding from the AMF Thematic Facility for local authorities (EUROCITIES) resp. 5% for civil society and local/regional authorities (ECRE) in the annual or multi-annual programmes, to support integration and reception actions implemented locally. It should be assured that the Thematic Facility funding is easily and directly accessible to cities and civil society.

Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> EUROCITIES, ECRE
Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to explicitly dedicate the Thematic Facility support for solidarity and responsibility efforts of Member States also to actions at regional or local level and to international and non-governmental organisations (Amendment 92 on Art. 9.1.e) • to grant a minimum of 5% of the AMF Thematic Facility to local and regional authorities implementing integration actions (Amendment 97 on Art. 9.6)
3.2.5 What is proposed	<p>To strongly anchor a mandatory Partnership Principle – ensuring meaningful and inclusive participation of civil society, local and regional authorities, equality bodies, national human rights institutions and social partners in the programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of EU funds under shared management – not only in the Common Provisions Regulation but also in the AMF and ESF+ Regulations. With regard to the AMF, the provision should be as far-reaching and inclusive as proposed by the European Parliament for the ESF+ regulation, also ensure that the EU Agency for Asylum is associated to the process of developing the programmes at an early stage, and expressly also extent to mid-term and retrospective evaluation (ECRE).</p> <p>The European Commission should also assess the extent to which partners have been adequately involved in the development of the national programme, closely supervise the practical implementation and make recommendations to the Member States in this respect. Some funding should be earmarked for capacity building of civil society organisations and local/regional authorities.</p>
Who is proposing it	<i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> CEMR, ECRE (re. AMF), EUROCITIES, Social Platform (re. ESF+)
Where does the proposal find support?	<i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add to the AMF regulation a provision on partnerships (without prejudice to Art. 6 CPR), to include at least local and regional authorities or their representative associations, relevant international organisations, nongovernmental organisations, in particular refugee and migrants organisations, national human rights institutions and equality bodies, and economic and social partners. These partners shall be involved in a meaningful way in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes (Amendment 73 on Art. 3a new) <u>ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Member State to ensure in partnership with local and regional authorities, meaningful participation of social partners, civil society organisations, equality bodies, national human rights institutions and other relevant or representative organisations in the programming and delivery of

3.2.6	What is proposed	<p>employment, education, non-discrimination and social inclusion policies and initiatives supported by the ESF+ strand under shared management; in accordance with Art. 6 CPR and the European Code of Conduct on Partnership (Amendment 94 on Art 8.1)</p> <p>To introduce, as an EU-level Partnership Principle, partnership planning also to the AMF Thematic Facility under direct or indirect management (Union actions). The European Commission should adopt the practice of regular consultation with civil society organisations and other stakeholders on the planning and implementation of activities under the Thematic Facility. Also on EU level programming and monitoring of implementation should take place in a consultative manner.</p>
	Who is proposing it	<p><i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> ECRE</p>
	Where does the proposal find support?	<p><u>AMF legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Commission to ensure regular engagement with civil society organisations in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of work programmes of the Thematic Facility (Amendment 93 on Art. 9.2) • the Commission to also consult with civil society organisations, including migrants and refugees organisations, when preparing delegated acts concerning actions eligible for higher co-financing (including integration measures implemented by local and regional authorities and civil-society organisations), operating support and further development of the common monitoring and evaluation framework (Amendment 60 on Recital 56)
3.2.7	What is proposed	<p>To include European civil society stakeholders in the ESF+ Committee (up to now bringing together government and social partner stakeholders), to reflect their key role in the design and delivery of the ESF and to come closer to an EU-level Partnership Principle.</p>
	Who is proposing it	<p><i>among stakeholder organisations:</i> Social Platform</p>
	Where does the proposal find support?	<p><i>in the European Parliament:</i> <u>ESF+ legislative resolution/amendments adopted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each Member State to appoint to the ESF+ Committee one government representative, one representative of the workers' organisations, one representative of the employers' organisations, one representative of civil society, one representative of the equality bodies or other independent human right institutions in accordance with Art. 6.1.c of the future CPR; at Union level the ESF+ Committee to include one representative from each of the organisations representing workers' organisations, employers' organisations and civil society organisations. (Amendment 152 on Art. 40.2 and 40.3)

References

- Ambrosini, M. (2017). Superdiversity, multiculturalism and local policies: a study on European cities, in: *Policy & Politics*, 45 (4): 605-622.
- ARSI, CARITAS Europe, COFACE et al. (2018). Ways to make the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework a vehicle for protection and integration of children in migration. Joint NGO Statement supported by 36 civil society stakeholders, Brussels
- Bilgili, Ö. (2015). *Evaluating Impact: Lessons Learned from Robust Evaluations of Labour Market Integration Policies*, Brussels
- Bendel, P. et al. (2019). A Local Turn for European Refugee Politics – Recommendations for Strengthening Municipalities in EU's refugee and asylum policy; based on Bendel, P. et al. / Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (2019). *Der Weg über die Kommunen Empfehlungen für eine neue Schlüsselrolle der Kommunen in der Flüchtlings- und Asylpolitik der EU*, Berlin
- Bendel, P. and Schammann, H. (forthcoming). *When Mayors Make Migration Policy – The Impact of Transnational Cities' Networks on EU Migration Policies'*, Universities of Erlangen and Hildesheim
- Caviedes, A. (2004) 'The Open Method of Co-Ordination in Immigration Policy: A Tool for Prying Open Fortress Europe?', in: *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(2): 289–310
- Carrera, S. and Atger, F.A. (2011). *Integration as a Two-Way Process in the EU? Assessing the Relationship between the European Integration Fund and the Common Basic Principles*, Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies
- CEMR Council of European Municipalities and Regions (2015). *Cohesion Policy. Planning of EU structural funds. Is local government treated as a real partner?*, Brussels
- CEMR Council of European Municipalities and Regions (2018a). *Declaration on the Commission proposal for the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) on regional development and cohesion*, Brussels
- CEMR Council of European Municipalities and Regions (2018b). *Cohesion Policy. 10 key messages for the future. CEMR's 10 key messages concerning the European Commission's proposals for the future of cohesion policy*, Brussels
- CEMR Council of European Municipalities and Regions (2018c). *EU Funds in the area of migration. Local and Regional Governments' perspective*, Brussels
- CONCORD (2018). *Making the case for strong EU development cooperation budget in the next Multiannual Financial Framework. CONCORD Europe Position*, Brussels
- CPMR Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (2018a). *Migration and Asylum in EU Regions: Towards a multilevel governance approach. Issue Paper*, Brussels

CPMR Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (2018b). Making sense of the EU Budget proposal for 2021 – 2027 focus on Cohesion policy, Brussels

EAPN European Anti-Poverty Network (2016). Barometer Report. Monitoring the implementation of the (at least) 20% of the ESF that should be devoted to the fight against Poverty during the period 2014-2020, Brussels

EC European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (2014). The European code of conduct on partnership in the framework of the European Structural and Investment Funds

EC European Commission, DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (2015). Support to asylum seekers under the European Social Fund and the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

ESF Transnational Platform/AEIDL (2018a). Social inclusion indicators for ESF investments – Areas for development in addressing the 20% social inclusion target in the ESF. Report for the ESF Thematic Network Inclusion, Brussels

ESF Transnational Platform/AEIDL (2018b). Review of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership (ECCP). Thematic Network on Partnership, Technical Dossier no. 7

EC European Commission (2018a). Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum and Migration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Border Management and Visa Instrument, 29.5.2018, COM(2018) 375 final – 2018/0196 (COD) & COM(2018) 375 final ANNEXES 1 to 22, 2.5.2018

EC European Commission (2018b). Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Social Fund Plus (ESF+), COM(2018) 382 final – 2018/0206 (COD) & COM(2018) 382 final ANNEXES 1 to 3, 30.5.2018

EC European Commission (2018c). Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund, COM(2018) 471 final – 2018/0248 (COD) & COM(2018) 471 final ANNEXES 1 to 8, 12.6.2018

EC European Commission (2018d). Interim evaluation of the Asylum, Migration and Integration fund. Final Report. Ramboll for the European Commission, Brussels

EC European Commission, DG Regional and Urban Policy (2018e). Toolkit on the use of EU funds for the integration of people with a migrant background

ECA European Court of Auditors (2018). The integration of migrants from outside the EU. Briefing Paper, Luxembourg

ECRE (2018a). Comments on The European Commission Proposal on the Asylum and Migration Fund (AMF), Brussels

ECRE (2018b). Amendments to the Draft EP Report on Asylum and Migration Fund Regulation, Brussels

ECRE & PICUM (2018). ECRE and PICUM position on the proposal for a Regulation of the European Social Fund + 2021-2027, Brussels

ECRE & PICUM (2019). ECRE and PICUM Policy Paper: Promoting Socio-economic Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees in the next EU Budget (2021 – 2027)

ECRE & UNHCR (2017). Follow the Money – Assessing the use of EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) funding at the national level, Brussels

ECRE & UNHCR (2018a). The Way Forward. A Comprehensive Study on the new Proposals for EU funds on Asylum, Migration and Integration, Brussels

ECRE & UNHCR (2018b). The Way Forward. A reflection paper on the new proposals for EU funds on Asylum, Migration and Integration 2021-2027, Brussels

ECRE & UNHCR (2019). Follow the Money II – Assessing the use of EU Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) funding at the national level 2014-2018, Brussels

ECRE, PICUM, Save the Children et al. (2018). 8 Ways to make the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework a vehicle for protection and integration of children in migration, Joint NGO Statement endorsed by 36 organisations, Brussels

ECRE (2018). The price of rights: Asylum and EU internal funding. ECRE's preliminary analysis of the European Commission's proposal for the EU multi-annual financial framework 2021-2027, Brussels

Emilsen H. (2015), A national turn of local integration policy: multi-level governance dynamics in Denmark and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 3(7)

EP European Parliament (2015). EU funds for Migration policies: Analysis of Efficiency and best practice for the future Policy Department for Budgetary Affairs, DG for Internal Policies of the Union

EP European Parliament (2018a). The next MFF: Preparing the Parliament's position on the MFF post-2020. European Parliament resolution of 14 March 2018 (2017/2052(INI))

EP European Parliament (2018b). 2021-2027 Multiannual Financial Framework and own resources. European Parliament resolution of 30 May 2018 (2018/2714(RSP))

EP European Parliament (2018c). Report on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Social Fund Plus (ESP+), Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (A8-0461/2018)

EP European Parliament (2018d). Compromise amendments on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Social Fund Plus (ESP+), Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (2018/0206(COD))

EP European Parliament (2018e). Draft Report on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (2018/0248(COD))

EP European Parliament (2018f). Amendments on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (2018/0248(COD))

EP European Parliament (2018g). EU funds for migration, asylum and integration policies. Policy Department for Budgetary Affairs, DG for Internal Policies of the Union

EP European Parliament (2019a). European Parliament legislative resolution of 13 March 2019 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund (P8_TA-PROV(2019)0175)

EP European Parliament (2019b). Amendments adopted by the European Parliament on 16 January 2019 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Social Fund Plus (ESF+) (P8_TA-PROV(2019)0020)

EPRS European Parliamentary Research Service (2017). Partnership within cohesion policy. Briefing September 2017

ESPON (2015). Territorial and urban aspects of migration and refugee inflow. Policy Brief in cooperation with CEMR, EUROCITIES and EUKN,

EU Alliance for Investing in Children (2018). How can the EU's post-2020 budget fight child poverty and social exclusion? Recommendations for the ESF+ and the Common Provision Regulations, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2014). Integrated services at local level. Social investment in cities, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2016). Refugee reception and integration in cities, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2017a). Cities' actions for the education of refugees and asylum seekers, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2017b). A strong cohesion policy for Europe and citizens. Policy paper on cohesion policy post-2020, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2017c). The future of cohesion policy Delivering results for citizens, contributing to a stronger Europe, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2017d). Labour market integration of refugees and asylum seekers, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2018a). Boosting employment and social inclusion in EU cities. Lessons learned from cities experiences with the European Social Fund in 2014-2017. Technical report – Preliminary findings, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2018b). Policy brief on the MFF proposal 2021-2027, Brussels

EUROCITIES (2018c). Boosting integration - start local. EUROCITIES policy statement on AMF proposal, Brussels

Fondazione Brodolini, CEPS and COWI for the European Commission (2016). The analysis of the outcome of the negotiations concerning the Partnership Agreements and ESF Operational Programmes, for the programming period 2014-2020. Final report: EU28 Analysis

FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2018). Current migration situation in the EU: impact on local communities (update). Focus Report, Vienna

Geddes, A. (2000) 'Lobbying for Migrant Inclusion in the European Union: New Opportunities for Transnational Advocacy?', in: Journal of European Public Policy 7(4): 632-49

HLG High Level Expert Group monitoring simplification for beneficiaries of ESI Funds (2017). Final conclusions and recommendations of the High Level Group on Simplification for post 2020, 11.07.2017

Jeffrey P. (2018). What role do cities play in social inclusion and welfare policies? Policy brief for EUROCITIES, Brussels

Knaus G. and Schwan G., A new approach for a common European asylum and refugee policy, unpublished discussion paper presented on 6 May 2018, Brussels

OECD (2018). Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees, OECD Publishing, Paris

Sebastiani L. (2015). Unraveling EU Policies: the Common Basic Principles and the European Integration Fund as a technology of government, in: Política y Sociedad, 52(1): 205-232

Social Platform (2016). Civil Society Participation & Partnership. Four principles for the meaningful involvement of civil society in the EU decision-making process, Brussels

Social Platform (2018a). European Social Fund Post-2020. A financial tool to deliver the European Pillar of Social Rights, Brussels

Social Platform (2018b). European Social Fund Plus (ESF+) – Proposal for Amendments

Sweco, Spatial Foresight and Nordregio for the European Commission, DG Regional and Urban Policy (2016). Implementation of the partnership principle and multi-level governance in 2014-2020 ESI Funds.

Urban Agenda for the EU, Partnership on the Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees (2018). Recommendations for improving cities' use of and access to EU funds for integration of migrants and refugees in the new programming period. Partnership Action Plan, Brussels

UNHCR (2018). EU Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027: Addressing forced displacement effectively. Recommendations to the European Union

Van den Brande, L. (2014). Multilevel Governance and Partnership. The Van den Brande Report. Prepared at the request of the Commissioner for Regional and Urban Policy

Van Wolleghem, P.G. (2017). Why Implement without a Tangible Threat? The Effect of a Soft Instrument on National Migrant Integration Policies, in: Journal of Common Market Studies 55(5): 1127–1143

Van Wolleghem, P.G. (2019). The EU's Policy on the Integration of Migrants. A Case of Soft-Europeanization?, Palgrave Macmillan

ReSOMA

RESEARCH SOCIAL
PLATFORM ON MIGRATION
AND ASYLUM

ReSOMA - Research Social Platform on Migration and Asylum

is a project funded under the Horizon 2020 Programme that aims at creating a platform for regular collaboration and exchange between Europe's well-developed networks of migration researchers, stakeholders and practitioners to foster evidence-based policymaking. Being a Coordination and Support Action (CSA), ReSOMA is meant to communicate directly with policy makers by providing ready-to-use evidence on policy, policy perceptions and policy options on migration, asylum and integration gathered among researchers, stakeholders and practitioners.

- 🌐 www.resoma.eu
- 🐦 [@ReSOMA_EU](https://twitter.com/ReSOMA_EU)
- ✉ resoma@resoma.eu

