Council of the European Union

Brussels, 9 October 2020
(OR. en)

Interinstitutional File: 2018/0248(COD)

10973/4/20 REV 4 ADD 1

**JAI 729
FRONT 257
ASIM 68
MIGR 96
CODEC 864
CADREFIN 273**

'I/A' ITEM NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Permanent Representatives Committee/Council
No. Cion doc.:	10153/18 + ADD 1
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund - general approach - statements

Statement by Austria

In order to better address the external dimension of migration management, Austria would have welcomed, if the regulation establishing the Asylum and Migration Funds (AMF) would have stated clearly that measures of the external dimension can be financed through the Thematic Facility as well as through national programmes. A clear wording concerning the external dimension would facilitate the work of the Member States in implementing specific measures in relevant third countries.

Furthermore, as expressed during the negotiation process, Austria has concerns regarding the method of calculation of the initial allocation of funds as stipulated in Annex I, paragraph 5, where only the statistical data covering the preceding three calendar years are taken into account. Austria would have welcomed the inclusion of a provision in the regulation ensuring compensation for the financial burden borne by the most affected Member States during the migration crisis 2015/2016.

Therefore, AT votes against the proposal.

Statement by Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands

Sweden, Finland and the Netherlands welcome the German Presidency's ambition to advance the negotiations of the Home Affair Funds with a view to meeting the timeframe ahead of the forthcoming budget period 2021-2027.

Nevertheless, we regret that the CEAS-provisions covered by the general approach have not been negotiated after the Commission adopted the Asylum and Migration Pact. Further discussions are necessary, especially in light of the concerns expressed by Member States regarding the provision on resettlement leaving out the common Union resettlement priorities. The current wording makes it very difficult in practice to determine if a resettled person belongs to the category *vulnerable group.*

While voting in favor of the general approach in a spirit of constructive approach, Sweden , Finland and the Netherlands wish to underline the importance of amending the resettlement provision during the interinstitutional negotiations in order to encourage and diminish the administrative burden for those Member States showing solidarity and engaging in resettlement of persons from the most vulnerable groups.