EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Brussels, 16.9.2025
SWD(2025) 271 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

Mid-term Evaluation of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) 2021-2027

{SEC(2025) 248 final} - {SWD(2025) 270 final}

BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION

The Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund[1] (hereinafter the AMIF) for the programming period 2021-2027, was adopted on 7 July 2021. The temporal scope of this mid-term evaluation of the AMIF covers the period from 1 January 2021 until 30 June 2024. The geographical scope of evaluation is the 26 Member States bound by the AMIF, i.e. excluding Denmark[2]. The evaluation relied upon both qualitative and quantitative methods, including the consultation of the Member States, European Commission officials, implementing partners, and beneficiaries.

The AMIF was established as the successor of the previous Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund for the programming period 2014-2020. The AMIF 2021-2027 benefits from a significantly larger budget, enabling more comprehensive support to Member States. The initial allocation of the AMIF 2021-2027 was EUR 9.88 billion[3], in comparison to the initial allocation of EUR 3.14 billion for the AMIF 2014-2020.

The AMIF is implemented through shared management, direct management and indirect management. The programming occurs either at the Member State level through the Member State programmes or at the Commission level, via the Thematic Facility[4].

Moreover, in 2021-2027 the AMIF is now under the Common Provisions Regulation (CPR)[5] which sets the financial and implementation rules for most EU Funds in shared management. This new legal framework introduced more flexible payments, improving financial management and easing administrative burdens. In addition, the creation of the AMIF's Thematic Facility provides greater flexibility to respond to pressing needs and to changes in policy and Union priorities, and to steer funding towards actions with a high level of Union added value[6]. Accordingly, part of the AMIF funding is periodically allocated, via the Thematic Facility, to Specific Actions, Union Actions, Emergency Assistance, the European Migration Network, resettlement, humanitarian admission and relocation.

The AMIF has the general objective "to contribute to the efficient management of migration flows and to the implementation, strengthening and development of the common policy on asylum and the common immigration policy, in accordance with the relevant Union *acquis* and fully respecting the international obligations of the Union and the Member States arising from the international instruments to which they are party"[7]. This general objective is further elaborated in the following four Specific Objectives:

---

[1] Regulation (EU) 2021/1147, OJ L 251, 15.7.2021, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/1147/oj.
[2] As per Recital (73) of the AMIF Regulation, in accordance with Articles 1 and 2 of Protocol No 22 on the position of Denmark annexed to the TEU and to the TFEU, Denmark is not taking part in the adoption of this Regulation and is not bound by it or subject to its application.
[3] As set out in Article 10 of the AMIF Regulation.
[4] Article 11(1) of the AMIF Regulation.
[5] Regulation (EU) 2021/1060, OJ L 231, 30.6.2021, p. 159, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/1060/oj
[6] Recital (44) of AMIF Regulation.
[7] Article 3 of the AMIF Regulation.

1. Strengthening and developing all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension;

2. Strengthening and developing legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, and promoting and contributing to the effective integration and social inclusion of third-country nationals;

3. Contributing to countering irregular migration, enhancing effective, safe and dignified return and readmission, and promoting and contributing to effective initial reintegration in third countries;

4. Enhancing solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility between the Member States, in particular as regards those most affected by migration and asylum challenges, including through practical cooperation.

The implementation of the programmes in shared management started with some delay, due to the late approval of the Member State programmes and the nature of share management which requires Member States to set up necessary structures and procedures, launch calls, and complete project selection procedures before being able to spend their appropriations.

Moreover, the implementation context was considerably impacted by the Russian war of aggression in Ukraine, and the related inflow of persons under Temporary Protection, and the COVID-19 pandemic.

According to Article 34(1) of the AMIF Regulation, by 31 December 2024, the Commission should carry out a mid-term evaluation of the fund, in particular to assess:

a) its effectiveness, including the progress made towards the achievement of its objectives;

b) the efficiency of the use of resources allocated to the instrument and the efficiency of the management and control measures put in place to implement it;

c) the continued relevance and appropriateness of the implementation measures set out in the AMIF Regulation;

d) the coordination, coherence and complementarity between the actions supported under the instrument and support provided by other Union Funds;

e) the Union added value of actions implemented under the instrument.

This document sums up the results of that evaluation. In general, figures and data used for the analysis had 30 June 2024 as a cut-off date. Later developments are in principle not covered by the evaluation.

MAIN FINDINGS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Effectiveness

At different speeds, the interventions funded have been progressing in operational terms. Specific Objective 1 (SO1) (development of the Common European Asylum System) and SO2 (legal migration, integration and social inclusion of third-country nationals) have the highest absorption rates[8]. Significant financial progress is also observed in the implementation rate[9] of SO4 (Solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility) which is clearly influenced by the role played by the allocations related to resettlement and humanitarian admissions, which follow a specific programming cycle. In contrast, SO3 (return, reintegration, and countering illegal migration) has a lower implementation rate; likely due to the inherent difficulties of return measures, demanding needs in terms of coordination and dependence on the cooperation of third countries.

Following the approval of the Member States programmes by the end of 2022, information on the actual performance was still limited at the end of 2024, insufficient for reaching conclusions in terms of effectiveness. The Member State programmes Annual Performance Reports point to delays in the start of implementation due to national legal frameworks requiring lengthy procedures for the implementation of public tenders, delays in decision making on the institutional set-up governing the management of the programme, complex application procedures and applicants' lack of experience with EU funding, complexity in the development of new IT systems, and the administrative effort required in adapting to the requirements of the CPR.

Nonetheless, as regards the progress of output indicators towards their milestones, the greatest average performance is observed under SO1 (72% progress to milestone), followed by SO2 (25%), SO3 (21%) and SO4 (16%). However, for SO4 it should be noted the primary activities of resettlement, humanitarian admission and relocation are not captured by output indicators, but rather by result indicators, and these result indicators demonstrated the highest rates of progress to their targets.

Concerning the suitability of the monitoring and evaluation framework to inform on the progress towards the achievement of the objectives of the instrument, the evaluation concludes that the monitoring and evaluation framework for the AMIF has seen significant improvements compared to the 2014-2020 period thanks to predefined performance indicators, the differentiation between output and result indicators, and more explanatory documents and resources provided to Member States. Nonetheless, challenges persist in terms of quality of data collection, target setting, and reporting, as well as administrative burden for national authorities. The analysis on whether suitable organisational and procedural arrangements are in place to ensure compliance with the horizontal principles shows that all Member States are committed to

[8] This corresponds to the ratio between the costs declared and the allocations. It measures the effective implementation of activities.

[9] This rate is the ratio between the committed funds and the allocated funds. It serves as a proxy to approximate the level of activity implementation.

complying with them and promote them in their Programmes, although their effectiveness varies considerably from one Member State to another.

Efficiency

As the information on performance is still insufficient, it is too early to carry out a full cost-effectiveness analysis, but there are indications that financial progress is advancing efficiently. The Fund demonstrates a clear commitment to supporting cost-effective measures, nonetheless further efforts should be made to ensure an efficient delivery of the funding and reduce the administrative burden that is perceived as substantial by beneficiaries and Managing Authorities.

There has been a shift toward a more transparent, accountable, and performance-oriented reporting system, addressing inefficiencies identified in the earlier period. However, some beneficiaries and Managing Authorities report that regulatory and monitoring requirements remain cumbersome.

The introduction of simplification measures such as flat rates, lump sums, and electronic data exchange systems have eased administrative burdens and streamlined certain processes, and should be further implemented by Member States. Technical Assistance has played a critical role in strengthening management capacities, with resources allocated to improve IT systems and provide training.

Relevance

The AMIF addresses evolving needs both at the time of programme approval and during programme implementation. Moreover, the Thematic Facility Work Programmes have demonstrated a clear focus on addressing key priority needs and target groups.

The evaluation found that Member States can adapt their programmes to evolving needs, especially thanks to financial flexibility mechanisms under the Fund Regulation and Thematic Facility. While the needs assessment performed by the Member States at the beginning of the programming period is not regularly and systematically updated during programmes' implementation, there is evidence that timely inputs on evolving needs during programme implementation are provided by stakeholders involved within the Monitoring Committee.

Overall, the flexibility afforded by the AMIF Regulation has allowed Member States to adapt their Member State programmes to evolving needs over the course of implementation. The Thematic Facility has also proved a flexible component and helped address emerging needs and emergency situations. However, some concerns remain regarding the flexibility of Member States procurement procedures as there is evidence of administrative barriers across Member States that do not ensure a full flexibility of procurement procedures preventing their swift adaption to evolving needs.

Coherence

The AMIF demonstrates a satisfactory degree of coherence with initiatives supported under its policy domain and between the Member States programmes and the Thematic Facility. While further reporting on internal coherence is necessary for a comprehensive analysis, the data

available indicates Member States perceive the Member State programmes and the Thematic Facility are coherent.

While inter- and intra-agency cooperation at national level is widespread, further intensification and clearer coordination mechanisms in the Member State programmes are needed to maximise the effectiveness of these efforts.

The AMIF demonstrates strong coherence with the programming of other EU Funds, particularly the ESF+, the BMVI and the ERDF. Coherence and coordination between the AMIF and other EU funds are pursued through a variety of coordination mechanisms such as joint Monitoring Committees and regular exchanges of information. Nonetheless, coordination with other Union Funds could be further reinforced, particularly in view of the implementation of the Pact on Migration and Asylum.

As far as coherence with external spending programmes is concerned, notably the NDICI, enhanced cooperation and coordination on programming both between the Commission services and with EU Member States are needed. There are several challenges in the current funding architecture that should be addressed, including notably: the insufficient alignment of the Union's external migration and security funding with the Union policies in these areas; the persistent challenge to use all existing (policy, funding, investment and other) tools, both at the disposal of the EU and its Member States, in a Team Europe spirit, to use strategically and timely leverage in relation to partner countries in order to improve cooperation on migration and security; the limitations for funding migration- and security-related actions in third countries, given that most of spending in the external dimension must comply with the criteria for development assistance[10] eligibility.

EU added value

The assessment of the EU added value of the AMIF reveals significant contributions across various dimensions.

The AMIF has demonstrated clear scope effects in the majority of Member States, by addressing additional target groups and introducing new interventions to meet emerging needs, such as unaccompanied minors and Ukrainian refugees. The AMIF has also enabled the expansion of services and increased the number of end-users in a number of Member States. Finally, the AMIF has enhanced the administrative capacity in managing migration and asylum processes in 14 Member States.

Member States are not excessively dependent on EU funding. National resources continue to play a key role, with the AMIF serving as a complementary source of funding. Some Member States have taken measures to avoid full dependence on EU Funds by sustaining long-term integration services with national resources.

[10] Official development assistance eligibility criteria is set by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Finally, the Thematic Facility addressed priorities with a high Union added value such as improving reception conditions, providing psychological support and aligning EU standards and priorities. Also, a sizable part of the Union Actions component of the Thematic Facility supports projects in the field of external dimension.