



Responsible Authority  
for Malta



PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIAT  
FOR THE EU PRESIDENCY 2017 AND EU FUNDS  
AUBERGE D'ARAGON, INDEPENDENCE SQUARE, VALLETTA, MALTA

# The Selection Process for the ISF and AMIF

**20<sup>th</sup> November 2015**



**Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund  
Internal Security Fund  
2014-2020**

Co-financing rate: 75% EU Funds 25% Beneficiary's Funds  
***Sustainable Management of Internal Security***





## **Contents**

- Horizontal Regulations
- Delegated Regulation on RA Designation
- Questions for the workshop



# Horizontal Regulation – 514/2014

- Article 24 (4) – Responsibilities of Member States
  - Member States shall set up **transparent rules and procedures** for the **selection** and implementation of projects in accordance with this Regulation and the Specific Regulations.
  
- Article 47 (2) - **Conformity clearance and financial corrections by the Commission**
  - A **breach of applicable law shall lead to a financial correction** only in relation to expenditure which has been declared to the Commission and where one of the following conditions is met:
    - (a) **the breach has affected the selection of a project under the national programme, or**, in cases where, due to the nature of the breach, it is not possible to establish that impact, there is a substantiated risk that the breach has had such an effect;



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Recital 4
  - The **selection and award procedure** for granting the Union contribution under national programmes **should comply with the principles of transparency, non discrimination and equal treatment**. It is therefore necessary to lay down the conditions under which Member States should implement the actions under the national programmes, in particular to identify under which circumstances the Responsible Authority may implement projects directly.



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 4 (e) – **Tasks** of the Responsible Authority
  - **organise and advertise calls for tenders and proposals, and organise and advertise the subsequent selection and award of projects** for financing under the national programme, in accordance with the scope and objectives of the Specific Regulations referred to in Article 2(a) of Regulation (EU) No 514/2014 and with the criteria set out in Article 9 of this Regulation;



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 7 & 8 provides four main processes for selection:
  - RA acting as an **awarding** body (**open** calls)
  - RA acting as an **awarding** body (**restricted** calls)
  - RA acting as an **awarding** body (**direct award** method)
  - RA acting as an **executing** body



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 9 – Selection and award procedure
  - The **calls for proposals** referred to in Article 7(1) shall be **publicised in a way that ensures open competition and appropriate publicity among potential beneficiaries**. Any substantial change to the calls shall be publicised in the same way.



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 9 – Selection and award procedure – cont
  - **The calls for proposals** referred to in Article 7(1) and (2) shall **specify** at least the following:
    - (a) **objectives**;
    - (b) **selection and award criteria**;
    - (c) arrangements for **Union** and, if applicable, **national financing**, including, where applicable, the possibility to apply a higher co-financing rate ...;
    - (d) **arrangements and final date for submission of the proposals**;
    - (e) **eligibility rules** for the expenditure;
    - (f) **project duration**; and
    - (g) financial and other **information to be kept and reported**.





# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 9 – Selection and award procedure – cont
  - 2. Before the award decision is taken, the Responsible Authority shall **satisfy itself** that the **beneficiaries in the project have the capacity to meet the selection and award criteria**.
  - 3. The Responsible Authority shall **define the procedures for the receipt of proposals**. It shall **subject proposals to a formal, technical and budgetary analysis and qualitative assessment applying the criteria laid down in the call for proposals in a transparent and non-discriminatory manner**. The Responsible Authority shall **record in writing** the reasons for the rejection of the other proposals.



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 9 – Selection and award procedure – cont
  - 4. The **award decision** shall indicate at least the **name of the beneficiaries, the essential details of the project and its operational objectives, the maximum amount of Union contribution and the maximum rate of co-financing** of the total eligible costs.
  - 5. The Responsible Authority shall **inform all applicants of its decision in writing**. It shall **give unsuccessful candidates the reasons for their rejection with reference to the selection and award criteria**.



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 10 - **Documents formalising grants** when the Responsible Authority acts as **awarding body**
  - In cases where the Responsible Authority acts as awarding body, it shall lay down project management procedures which require, at least to:
    - (a) sign grant agreements with beneficiaries and
    - (b) monitor the grant agreements, including any amendments thereto, by administrative means such as exchanges of correspondence or written reports.
  - Signs the Grant Agreement and provides a list of what it should include



# Delegated Regulation on RA Designation

- Article 11 - **Documents formalising grants** when the Responsible Authority acts as **executing body**
  - In cases where the Responsible Authority acts as executing body, it shall lay down project management procedures which require at least to:
    - (a) formalise an administrative decision to co-finance projects and
    - (b) monitor the administrative decision and any amendments thereto by administrative means such as exchanges of correspondence or written reports.
  - It continues to list the contents of the administrative decision



# Introduction to the workshop

## ■ Questions to address:

- Which type of calls will be issued and why?
- What are your experiences in adopting the executing method?
  
- Which admission/selection criteria are or should be utilised?
- How will the selection procedure ensure transparency, non discrimination and equal treatment?



## **Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period**

- Two main processes for selection
  - Awarding method
  - Executing method
- Similar application process
- Different communication channels
- Verification of application by RA
- Evaluation by the Projects Selection Committee of all eligible applications – both awarding and executing
- Rejected or ineligible applications have a right of appeal – Projects Selection Appeals Board



# Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period

- Process for call for applications
- In case of awarding method
  - Open call for applications
  - Published on the Government Gazette, newspapers and website
  - Holding of information sessions
  - Potential applicants could ask for clarifications
  - Deadline for clarifications
  - Deadline for submission of applications about six to eight weeks from issue of call – deadline always given in date and TIME (normally noon on Friday)



## Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period

- Process for call for applications
- In case of executing method
  - Restricted call for applications
  - Sent directly to the holding organisation of the entity involved – normally the permanent secretary of the Ministry
  - Potential applicants could ask for clarifications
  - Deadline for clarifications
  - Deadline for submission of applications about six to eight weeks from issue of call – deadline always given in date and TIME (normally noon on Friday)





# Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period

- Application form
- Guidance Note to Application Form
- Annexes to the Application Form
  - Annex I- Log Frame
  - Annex II- Financial Identification and Bank Details
  - Annex III- Declaration by Partner Organisation
  - Annex IV- Detailed Budget Breakdown
  - Annex V- Legal Entity Form
  - Annex VI- VAT Form
  - Annex VII- Declaration Operational Grant



## **Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period**

- Validation by the RA
- Once applications are received, the RA carries out a verification process and where applicable, missing documentation is requested from the beneficiary – certain documents indicated in the application form and the guidance are required but if not submitted the application is not deemed eligible
- RA asks for such documentation within the period indicated in the application and guidance. Beneficiary needs to submit such documentation within the stipulated time, otherwise application is deemed ineligible



## **Experience of Selection Process from the 2007-2013 Programming Period**

- Evaluation Process
- Eligible applications are evaluated by the Project Selection Committee
- For the 2007-2013 programming period these stages were described in a number of documents – e.g. Part in the Manual of Procedures, part in the Terms of Reference of the Project Selection Committee and or Project Selection Appeals Board, templates, etc
- During an EBF audit, the Court of Auditors recommended that a projects selection manual be organised
- RA accepted the recommendation although for the new programming period since selection for the 2007-2013 period was already finalised – a draft project selection manual was prepared



# The Project Selection Manual

- The draft Projects Selection Manual is divided into two main parts:
  - Project Selection Process
  - Projects Selection Appeals Process
- Contains a number of templates as annexes to ensure consistency:
  - PSC Nomination Letter
  - Attendance Sheet
  - Agenda and Minutes
  - Declaration of Impartiality
  - Projects Eligibility Sheet
  - Clarification Letter
  - Voting Templates
  - Project Ranking Sheet
  - Letter of acceptance/rejection by RA
  - PSC Project Selection Report
  - PSAB Nomination Letter



# The Project Selection Manual

- Project Selection Process
  - Selection of Projects
  - Functions of the Projects Selection Committee
  - Appointment Process
  - Proceedings of the PSC Meetings
  - Agenda and Minutes
  - Decisions and Conclusions
  - Written Proceedings
  - Conflicts of Interest
  - Validity of Resolutions
  - Access to Technical Expertise or Further Information
  - Voting and Criteria for Voting
  - Communication of PSC Decisions to the RA



# The Project Selection Manual

- Projects Selection Appeals Process
  - Membership
  - Agenda, Meetings and Minutes
  - Decisions and Conclusions
  - Written Proceedings
  - Conflicts of interest
  - Validity of Resolutions
  - Project Selection Appeals Board Procedure
  - Right of Review of Rejected Applications
  - Preliminary Appeals Stage 1 and 2
  - Full Consideration of the Appeal
  - Procedure after the Hearing



# The Project Selection Manual

- The Project Selection Process is steered by the Responsible Authority (RA) and supported by a Project Selection Committee (PSC).
- The PSC is chaired by the RA and includes members external to the RA who provide expertise in various areas.
- Its main function shall be to assess all proposals received and determine eligibility as well as assess eligible proposals according to the relevant selection/award criteria.
- The PSC shall have full power and authority to consider and or select applications for funding during the project appraisal process.
- The Chair and members (as well as any ad hoc experts) shall be functionally independent (in terms of direct reporting) of any unit within the organisation that is an applicant under a particular call.
- Any potential interest shall be declared.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Selection of Projects
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Open Calls
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Restricted Calls (due to the characteristics of the projects to be supported or the type of body on account of its technical or administrative competence)
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Direct Award of Projects (where the specific characteristics of the project or the type of organization on account of its technical or administrative competence leave no other choice, such as de jure or de facto monopoly)





# The Project Selection Manual

- The RA acting as an Executing Body (when it decides to implement the projects directly or in association with any national authority competent on account of its technical expertise, its high degree of specialization or its administrative powers, because the characteristics of the projects leave no other choice for implementation, such as de jure monopoly situations or security reasons)



# The Project Selection Manual

- The main functions of the PSC include:
  - Evaluate and assess the projects submitted in line with the objectives of the National Programmes of the ISF and the AMIF.
  - Following an evaluation, determine the projects most suitable for funding under the relevant Fund in line with the criteria established in this manual.
  - Rank projects in line with the criteria and funds available.
  - Draw up a list of projects in line with the order of precedence established by the ranking exercise (the projects selected for funding will be limited by the financial threshold available for the respective actions)



# The Project Selection Manual

- Project Selection Process
  - Selection of Projects
  - Functions of the Projects Selection Committee
  - Appointment Process
  - Proceedings of the PSC Meetings
  - Agenda and Minutes
  - Decisions and Conclusions
  - Written Proceedings
  - Conflicts of Interest
  - Validity of Resolutions
  - Access to Technical Expertise or Further Information
  - Voting and Criteria for Voting
  - Communication of PSC Decisions to the RA



# The Project Selection Manual

- Projects Selection Appeals Process
  - Membership
  - Agenda, Meetings and Minutes
  - Decisions and Conclusions
  - Written Proceedings
  - Conflicts of interest
  - Validity of Resolutions
  - Project Selection Appeals Board Procedure
  - Right of Review of Rejected Applications
  - Preliminary Appeals Stage 1 and 2
  - Full Consideration of the Appeal
  - Procedure after the Hearing



# The Project Selection Manual

- The Project Selection Process is steered by the Responsible Authority (RA) and supported by a Project Selection Committee (PSC).
- The PSC is chaired by the RA and includes members external to the RA who provide expertise in various areas.
- Its main function shall be to assess all proposals received and determine eligibility as well as assess eligible proposals according to the relevant selection/award criteria.
- The PSC shall have full power and authority to consider and or select applications for funding during the project appraisal process.
- The Chair and members (as well as any ad hoc experts) shall be functionally independent (in terms of direct reporting) of any unit within the organisation that is an applicant under a particular call.
- Any potential interest shall be declared.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Selection of Projects
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Open Calls
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Restricted Calls (due to the characteristics of the projects to be supported or the type of body on account of its technical or administrative competence)
  - The RA acting as an Awarding Body – Direct Award of Projects (where the specific characteristics of the project or the type of organization on account of its technical or administrative competence leave no other choice, such as de jure or de facto monopoly)
  - The RA acting as an Executing Body (when it decides to implement the projects directly or in association with any national authority competent on account of its technical expertise, its high degree of specialization or its administrative powers, because the characteristics of the projects leave no other choice for implementation, such as de jure monopoly situations or security reasons)



# The Project Selection Manual

- The main functions of the PSC include:
  - Evaluate and assess the projects submitted in line with the objectives of the National Programmes of the ISF and the AMIF.
  - Following an evaluation, determine the projects most suitable for funding under the relevant Fund in line with the criteria established in this manual.
  - Rank projects in line with the criteria and funds available.
  - Draw up a list of projects in line with the order of precedence established by the ranking exercise (the projects selected for funding will be limited by the financial threshold available for the respective actions)



# The Project Selection Manual

- Appointment process:
  - Appointed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry for European Affairs (Head of RA reports to PS MEAIM)
  - Chairperson is ex officio Director at the RA
  - Members (three) from three different Ministries (e.g. Home Affairs, Integration and Finance) after consulting with the Permanent Secretary of the relative Ministry
  - Secretariat provided by RA
- Decision and conclusions
  - selection of projects will be carried out following the end of discussions
  - all members must be present for the final decision and to agree on the final rating
  - Written procedure may be used if necessary





# The Project Selection Manual

- Conflicts of interest:
- All members of the PSC shall abide by the following the Code of Conduct and shall:
  - Take decisions in the public interest and shall not act towards obtaining benefits for themselves, their organisations or for other persons;
  - Notify the Chairperson of any conflict of interest situation they might find themselves in relation to a certain topic under debate, before the meeting and shall not participate in the meeting;
  - Keep confidentiality of information;
  - Respect the decisions adopted by the Committee.
  - All the members of the PSC, including the Chairperson and the Secretary shall sign the Declaration of Impartiality.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Access to technical expertise
  - The PSC has the right to seek technical advice from experts according to the project that is being discussed.
  - The technical experts will be expected to be present and provide input on the relevant project and any other relevant matter, who participate in an advisory capacity and shall not be entitled to vote.
- Voting
  - All the members of the PSC, except the Chairperson and the Secretariat have the right to vote in the project selection process.
  - Each voting member shall assess and evaluate each project individually and may include comments.
  - Once voting by each member is finalised, the members forward their evaluation/voting sheets to the secretariat, who shall work out the arithmetical average of each vote for the criteria. The result will be the final vote of the process



## The Project Selection Manual

- Criteria for voting
- For example these are based on the indicative criteria laid down in the regulations for the Four Funds (but are indicative):
  - Relevance and justification
  - Quality of the proposed action
  - Capacity of the organisation to implement the activities proposed
  - Results and indicators
  - Cost effectiveness
  - Dissemination of project results
  - Complementarity with other actions funded by the EU or national programmes
  - Readiness



## The Project Selection Manual

- Criteria for voting – cont...
  - A project must achieve 50% of the marks to be considered for funding. However, the project must achieve the threshold for each of the relevant criteria (where applicable), in order to be considered further, even if the total points achieved exceed 50%.
  - The voting members shall decide how the project proposal addresses each of the above criteria and assign points according to the following guide:

□ Excellent	81 to 100% of points
□ Very good	76 to 80% of points
□ Satisfactory	50 to 75% of points
□ Very poor	26 to 49% of points
□ Unacceptable	1 to 25% of points.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Criteria for voting – cont...Example with thresholds

Criterion	Max Points	Threshold	Ex 1	Ex 2	Ex 3
Relevance and Justification	20	10	12	8	8
Quality of the proposed action	5	NA	2	3	3
Capacity of the Organisation	20	10	12	8	14
Results and Indicators	10	NA	6	4	8
Cost effectiveness	20	10	12	10	12
Dissemination of project results	5	NA	3	2	3
Complementarity	10	5	6	4	8
Readiness	10	NA	7	6	7
	100		60	45	63
			Approved	Not Approved	Not Approved



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Relevance and Justification*
  - Does the proposal address an existing EU-relevant challenge?
  - Does the applicant demonstrate a clear understanding of the context and of the challenge that the organisation is planning to address?
  - Does the proposal add value in relation to previous projects of similar nature?
  - Are the proposed activities adequately justified and designed to address the issue and to achieve the stated objectives?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Quality of the proposed action*
  - How well is the proposal prepared in terms of information (qualitative and quantitative) provided, clarity of action, work-plan, implementation period?
  - Is the proposed action feasible in terms of the budget (e.g. has market research been undertaken)?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Capacity of the Organisation to implement the activities proposed*
  - Does the organisation have the sufficient capacity, experience, expertise, reliability and financial resources to implement the project?
  - Does the Project Leader have sufficient experience in project management?
  - How well is the Project Leader versed with EU funding rules?
  - Is the experience of the Project Leader in the field of migration substantial?





# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Results and Indicators*
  - Does the proposal identify quantifiable results?
  - Does the proposal address more than one indicator?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Cost effectiveness*
  - What is the added value of the project?
  - Is the proposed expenditure justified and does it address the objectives proposed?
  - How cost effective is the forwarded proposal?
  - Does the proposal addresses cost reduction through effective procurement?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Dissemination of project results*
  - Does an appropriate plan exist for the dissemination of results and knowledge transfer?
  - Does an appropriate strategy exist for publicity and visibility of the EU funding to a broad audience?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Complementarity*
  - The extent to which the project is compatible with existing national policies in the area of integration and social inclusion;
  - The extent to which the project complements other actions funded by the general budget of the EU or as part of national programmes;
  - The extent to which the proposal addresses the specific priorities identified in the European Commission Decision adopting the strategic guidelines;
  - The extent to which the requested budget is in accordance with the objectives and activities of the Fund;
  - The extent to which the forecasted expenditure is in accordance with the eligibility of expenditure under the Fund;
  - The extent to which the forecasted expenditure is realistic vis a vis the plan of action in the project proposal
  - Avoidance of duplication of effort with existing projects or services in the relevant geographical area



# The Project Selection Manual

- Guidance for each criterion
- *Readiness*
  - How ready the project is to start: (have tenders/request for quotations been launched)?
  - Have participants been identified?
  - Have the relevant partners identified their respective roles and functions?
  - Is there anything hindering the start of implementation?
  - Are the necessary resources and processes available to the RA to ensure a proper technical evaluation of proposals?
  - Are the actors involved properly trained and knowledgeable and the objectives of the fund?



# The Project Selection Manual

- Communication of PSC Decisions to the RA
  - Once the PSC has drawn up a list of projects to be funded, ranked according to the marks obtained and the actions under the National Programme, the Chairperson and the Secretariat shall proceed to draw up a report to the Head of the RA
  - Head of the RA may accept or reject the recommendation. If the Head of the RA accepts the recommendation, then he/she will write accordingly to the Chairperson and letter be deemed as the grant award decision.
  - In the case where the Head of the RA does not agree with the recommendation of the PSC, he/she shall proceed to write to the PSC a reasoned letter outlining the reasons for non agreement. The PSC shall reconvene to discuss the reasons as outlined in the Head of RA letter and decide accordingly. A report shall be drawn up and presented to the Head of the RA who shall decide accordingly the grant decision. Such decision will also be subject to the review process under the Project Selection Appeals Board if one or more of the applicants submits an appeals letter



# The Project Selection Manual

- Projects Selection Appeals Process
  - Ineligible and/or unsuccessful applicants shall have the right to appeal to the PSAB, presenting a detailed justification as to why the project should be re-considered. The PSAB shall be specifically set up to review such decisions.
  - The Projects Selection Appeals Board is set up and chaired at Permanent Secretary level.
  - The role of the PSAB is to receive, review and evaluate appeals lodged by aggrieved project proponents in case of rejected proposals. The decision of the PSAB is final. The PSAB shall have full power and authority to consider and approve or reject appeals for review of rejected application forms.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Projects Selection Appeals Process
  - The appeal must state the grounds and the reasons for the appeal. The appellant must therefore give a detailed explanation/justification supported by relevant documentation/testimonials as to why the appellant does not agree with the decision taken by the PSC. No additional information (other than that produced in the application process) will be considered during the review. Requests for review are received by the Responsible Authority within 5 working days from the date of the letter of rejection. Late appeals WILL NOT be considered.





# The Project Selection Manual

- Right of Review of Rejected Applications
  - Applications which do not meet the eligibility criteria will not proceed to the selection process for further appraisal and scoring. Projects that pass the gateway eligibility test but do not score higher than 50% of the marks in the appraisal based on the selection criteria, will also be rejected.
  - A rejection letter, in both paper and electronic format, will be remitted to the applicant indicating the main reason for the decision and the criteria where the project failed to acquire at least 50% of the allocated marks.
  - Rejected applications will be given a right of review within 5 working days from the date of the letter and outlined in the RA's letter of rejection. The appeal must be made by the appellant (that is the project leader) and or the person authorised to sign on behalf of the applicant.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Preliminary Appeals Stage
  - The purpose of this preliminary stage is to establish that the appeal is properly made. The secretary of the PSAB will first consider the appeal in order to decide three matters of procedure:
  - whether the appeal is properly made and contains all the information required;
  - whether the appeal was made in time. If it is out of time, the secretary will consider whether, there are, exceptionally, grounds for allowing the late application to go forward for consideration; and
  - whether the appeal is given on adequate basis.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Preliminary Appeals Stage
  - Next is for the PSAB to consider those aspects of the appeal referred to them by the Secretariat in order to establish whether the appeal is valid.
  - If the PSAB decides that the appeal has not been properly made and/or is out of time (and that it was reasonably practicable for it to have been made in time), the appeal will be rejected. If there is any doubt about the validity of an appeal, the appellant will be given the benefit of the doubt. The decision of the PSAB is final. There is no further right of appeal against this decision.
  - Unless there is due justification, this decision will be communicated to the appellant by letter by Secretary of the appeal. The letter will give summary reasons for the rejection of the appeal.
  - The PSAB will take its decision on the basis of the information contained in the appeal. Therefore, it is in the best interests of the appellant to ensure that all the relevant information that the appellant wishes to be considered is contained within the appeal documentation.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Full Consideration of the Appeal
  - If the preliminary stages have established that the appeal is valid, the PSAB will consider the full appeal. The date of the appeal hearing will be no later than one (1) month following the date of receipt of the appeal by the secretary to the PSAB from the RA.
  - The purpose of the appeals hearing is so that the members of the PSAB can review the documentation and comments to enable them to fully assess the submitted appeal and make a decision on whether the appeal is successful or not. No PSAB member may hear an appeal if there is any conflict of interest in his/her so doing.
  - The PSAB may request that the appellant will be entitled to appear at the hearing and be heard. He/she may choose not to appear and ask for the appeal to be decided on the basis of their written representations. The burden of proof is on the appellant. This means it is for the appellant to prove that one or more of the grounds of appeal are established.



# The Project Selection Manual

- Procedure after the Hearing
  - The decision of the PSAB, together with its reasons, must be sent in writing to the appellant and within fifteen (15) working days of the hearing.
  - The PSAB may also, if it sees fit, attach a recommendation as to how the application could be improved if project promoter wishes to submit again under a new call. This will be a recommendation and is by no means a guarantee for success as each project must compete on its own merits.
  - There is no appeal against the decision of the PSAB.



Responsible Authority  
for Malta



PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIAT  
FOR THE EU PRESIDENCY 2017 AND EU FUNDS  
AUBERGE D'ARAGON, INDEPENDENCE SQUARE, VALLETTA, MALTA

**Thanks for your Attention**



**Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund  
Internal Security Fund**

2014-2020

Co-financing rate: 75% EU Funds 25% Beneficiary's Funds

***Sustainable Management of Internal Security***

