

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS  
CO FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF  
THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

(Report set out in Article 48, 2 (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC)

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: **Republic of Bulgaria**

**Ministry of Labour and Social Policy  
Free Movement of Persons, Migration and Integration Directorate  
(FMPMI Directorate)**

Date:

6 July 2010

Name, Signature (authorised representative of the Responsible Authority):

**Liliana Stankova**  
Director, Head of the RA

.....

Name of the contact person (and contact details) for this report in the Member State

Hristo Simeonov,  
State expert and member of RA  
Tel.: +359 2 8119-546  
Fax: +359 2 9870514  
e-mail: hr\_simeonov@mlsp.government.bg

**GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON EVALUATION EXPERTISE AND ON METHODOLOGY**

*1. Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?*

Yes/ No:            No

- If *Yes*, for what part(s) of this report?            .....

- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:

\* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.): (please describe)

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

*2. Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise:*

Important remark

Any evaluation expertise must be obliged by the Responsible Authority to:

- use this template, exclusively;
- fully comply with any instruction, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out in this template.

**EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS CO-FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

**CONTENTS**

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
3. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD, 2007 THROUGH 2009
4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
5. BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
7. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

**Part I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009  
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD**

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions;*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement);*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available.*

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “awarding body” method (as defined in Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 – the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No:    YES

- If *Yes*, fill in Part I, pages 8 to 13.
- If *No*, do not fill in Part I, but go directly to Part II (Implementation of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method) on page 14.

## **I.1 - Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “awarding body” method from 2007 to 2009**

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “awarding body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: 100 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2008: 100 %
- Programme 2009: 100 %

## **I.2 - Calls for proposals**

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual EIF programmes in the “awarding body” method.

- Programme 2007: 4
- Programme 2008: 3
- Programme 2009: 0

### **I.3 - Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for proposals**

Definitions:

- If more than one call for proposals was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that programme, figures combining all of that programme's calls.
- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary
- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

*Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.*

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	40	56	0	96
Projects selected	22	31	0	53
Projects funded	13	14	0	27

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for proposals been funded?

Yes/No: No

- If No, explain why:

The project selection process was performed by Evaluation Commissions, consisting of experts, chosen under a separate procedure (voting members) and a Chair and Secretary from RA (both non-voting members).

All projects that received more than 65 points out of maximum 100 were to be considered selected, but only those 1 or 2 which got the most points in each scheme component got funded due to the limited amount of funds under the different program priorities and actions.

**I.4 - Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar**

In duly justified cases, grants may be awarded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals (Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules -, third paragraph).

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Please indicate the number of projects funded (*see definition on page 8*) in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals.

Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>0</i>

**I.5 - Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method in the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes**

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27</i>

**I.6 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

*By Priority*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Priority: each of the four Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Priorities)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>0</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	<i>6</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 2	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 3	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 4	<i>-</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

**I.7 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

*By Category of Actions*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Category of Actions: each of the four Categories, from a) to d), set out in Article 3 of the EIF Council decision (Decision 2007/435/EC)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Categories)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...</b>			
Category a)	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Category b)	<i>6</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>
Category c)	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Category d)	<i>-</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

**I.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

**N/A**

*Specific Priorities*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- *Specific Priorities: the five Specific Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)*
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two of the headings listed below)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only			
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only			
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority			

**Part II: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009  
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD**

N/A

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of Actions*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority*
- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement)*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available*

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method (as defined in Article 8 of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: .....

- If *Yes*, fill in Part II, pages 15 to 20.
- If *No*, do not fill in Part II, but go directly to Part III (Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method, 2007 through 2009) on page 21.

## **II.1 - Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “executing body” method from 2007 to 2009**

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “executing body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: ... % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: ... %
- Programme 2009: ... %

## **II.2 - Calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method**

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar organised for the implementation of the yearly EIF programmes in the “executing body” method

- Programme 2007: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

**II.3 - Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, consultation with potential beneficiaries or similar selection method in the “executing body” method**

Definitions:

- If more than one call for expression of interest, call for proposals or similar was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that annual programme, figures combining all of that programme’s calls.

- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary

- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

*Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.*

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009
Proposals received				
Projects selected				
Projects funded				

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method been funded?

Yes/No: .....

- If No, explain why: .....

**II.4 - Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar**

Please indicate the number of projects funded (see definition on page 15) in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals, or similar selection method, e.g. direct negotiation.

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number				

**II.5 - Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method in the programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009**

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>Total Prog. 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method (see table II.3)				
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)				
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method				

**II.6 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

*By Priority*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Priority: each of the four Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Priorities)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1			
Priority 2			
Priority 3			
Priority 4			

**II.7 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

*By Category of Actions*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- Category of Actions: each of the four Categories, from a) to d), set out in Article 3 of the EIF Council decision (Decision 2007/435/EC)
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two Categories)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)			
Category c)			
Category d)			

**II.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “executing body” method - 2007, 2008 and 2009**

*Specific Priorities*

- Only for projects funded, only number of projects in each case
- *Specific Priorities: the five Specific Priorities defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission (Commission Decision C(2007)3926)*
- No project may be counted twice in the table below (i.e. under two headings listed below)

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →			
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only			
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only			
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority			

**Part III: SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED  
IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND  
IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD  
2007 THROUGH 2009**

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of each project to be found in the grant agreement);
- All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority;
- Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available.

Explanations for this part:

Please provide a summary description of the projects funded (see definition on page 8) under your annual programmes 2007 through 2009, broken down by Priority as set out on the next pages. Under each Priority describe separately projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition please describe separately (as set out below) projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals and projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, for proposals, or similar .

No breakdown per year is required in the items 1 to 6.

Referring to Tables I-6, I-7 and I-8 as well as II-6, II-7 and II-8 above, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009. In this context describe separately any change to the distribution for projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and for projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition, highlight any other significant change to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and to projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand over the period from 2007 to 2009 (other than their distribution).

(Explanations continue on the next page)

*It is not required to make a full description of all projects. What is needed is a concise, but very concrete description of the types of operations implemented under each Priority. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. A list of projects is not an adequate description.*

*Technical assistance measures and publicity measures are covered by another part of the template and should not be described here.*

*Finally, you will be asked to describe two “success stories” and one “failure”, among all projects funded from 2007 to 2009.*

*For each item the maximum length is mentioned below the item’s description.*

### **III.1. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 1 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009**

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Under Priority 1 there were several projects in AP 2007 and 2008. The projects were related to the following:

- performing of analysis on the state of play and trends in migration flows and respectively on integration of immigrants in Bulgaria;
- establishment of a network of information centres for immigrants in Bulgaria;
- establishment of a separate centre for information and support of integration of immigrants;
- activities for helping the immigrants and the host society to get to know better each other in order to live together;
- enrichment of the Bulgarian labour market and facilitation of the immigrants' integration;
- creation of partnerships in the immigration process;
- targeted information initiatives for immigrants in given municipalities

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

### **III.2. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 2 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009**

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Under Priority 2 there were several projects in AP 2007 and 2008. The projects were related to the following:

- support for active inclusion of immigrants in the Bulgarian society;
- support for development of policies and strategies for successful economic and social immigrants’ integration in Bulgaria;
- analysis of the legislation and administrative practice in the field of integration of immigrants;
- development and suggesting of a set of effective indicators for evaluation of the integration policy and measures in Bulgaria and fulfilment of goals;
- proposal of a system for establishment of monitoring techniques and indicators for immigrants’ integration;
- making better the information collection in Bulgaria in relation to the integration;
- development of methodology and implementation of a pilot survey for monitoring of the socio-demographic status and of the TCNs’ attitudes;

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

### **III.3. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 3 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009**

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Under Priority 3 there were several projects in AP 2007 and 2008. The projects were related to the following:

- strengthening of the administrative capacity within the system of MLSP regarding the immigrants’ integration; a series of trainings was performed;
- integration policy capacity strengthening in partnership with local authorities, social partners and institutions and NGOs;
- establishment of local capacity for implementation of integration policy;
- development of a strategy for joint work among the different stakeholders in the process of integration of immigrants;
- support for comprehensive integration in strategic partnership with the Bulgarian society.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

**III.4. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 4  
in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009**

N/A

In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

**III.5. Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009**

**N/A**

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

*Please refer to Table I.4., excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals. Technical Assistance measures should not be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.*

**III.6. Summary description of the projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009**

**N/A**

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

*Please refer to Table II.4., excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar. Technical Assistance measures should not be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.*

**III.7. Referring to Tables I-6, I-7 and I-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009**

*Maximum length: half a page*

There are no significant changes to the distribution of the projects over the period 2007-2008.

The zero number for the AP 2009 is due to the fact that the implementation of projects hasn't started yet. The contracting of projects and their implementation is planned to begin after 30 June 2010.

**III.8. Referring to Tables II-6, II-7 and II-8, explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “executing body” method, by Priority, by Category of Actions and by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007 to 2009**

N/A

*Maximum length: half a page*

**III.9. Highlight any other significant change (other than the distribution referred to under points 7 and 8) to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method over the period from 2007 to 2009**

N/A

*Maximum length: half a page*

In the “awarding body” method

In the “executing body” method

### **III.10. Description of two “success stories”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009**

*Please describe two projects (preferably under two different Priorities) which, in your opinion, deserve particular attention since you consider them as e.g. of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirement, or innovative, or a good practice, of interest for other Member States, etc. It is up to you to judge what projects deserve particular attention.*

*It is necessary to provide a very concrete description of the projects concerned and of the reasons you consider them “success stories”. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.*

*Maximum length: half a page*

#### **Case 1: Implemented by the IOM mission in Sofia**

This case was implemented under Priority 1 – the activity related to the establishment of information centres for immigrants.

The RA considers this case as a very successful one, because by this project for first time in Bulgaria there was an institution like Information centres established exactly and only to serve to the immigrants. Such centres are not concentrated only in Sofia – the capital city, where definitely are most of the immigrants, but also in other major cities with immigrant population. Another positive feature is related to establishment of a Mobile Information Team that regularly covers smaller places, where there is evidence for presence of immigrants.

#### **Case 2: Implemented by the Association of the Industrial Capital in Bulgaria – one of the 6 acknowledged as nationally representative employers’ organisations**

This case is also implemented under Priority 1 – the activities related to preparation of analyses of migratory trends and connected to that integration needs, as well as support for attraction of qualified immigrants.

Among the results of the project can be stated the following:

- analysis of the administrative structures and applicable instruments and administrative practices for the implementation of the state integration policy
- research on the environment factors for attraction of qualified immigrants for integration on the Bulgarian labour market;
- development of a methodology for research of the trends in the needs for qualified migrants; etc.

### **III.11. Description of one “failure”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009**

*Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there may be one project which you would regard as an important “failure”, because it proved impracticable, it did not meet expectations, or any other reason for you to judge, and you think there are lessons to be drawn from its failure.*

*The project should not be identified (i.e. the name of the project or beneficiaries should not be mentioned).*

*It is essential that the description of the project, your justification for a “failure”, and the lessons to be drawn can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF , but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.*

*Maximum length: half a page*

**Case: Implemented by a private company.**

This case was also under Priority 1 – in relation of establishment of information centres.

This is a typical case of a well prepared work for real functioning of an Information centre for immigrants, which unfortunately couldn't make a stable ground for a future functioning of the centre – lacking the capacity to maintain the work. Therefore it couldn't show its full capacity as planned.

The lessons learned are related to the need of a more in depth evaluation of the capacities of the projects for their future development and not only for the time of the project.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY</b></p>
---

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on technical assistance and on information and publicity available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *Any relevant national document and information available to the Responsible Authority in these matters;*
- *Any independent evaluation of the items addressed below, if available.*

#### **IV.1. Technical assistance**

*Please provide a concrete description of the activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.*

*15 lines maximum*

The main activities under the TA are related to:

- establishment of the teams for the RA – on contractual basis; additional experts were hired when needed;
- development of the Procedures' Manual of the RA with all its chapters;
- further development of technical capacity and material resources of the RA and the office premises and workplaces used for EIF management;
- office supplies etc.;
- trainings of the RA staff;
- all information and public activities below were also funded under the TA.

## **IV.2. Information and Publicity**

*Please provide a concrete description of the information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EIF Implementing Rules) implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.*

*Describe separately the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority and those by the final beneficiaries.*

*As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the annual information activity which you have organised to present, as of 2008, the launch of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2) a) of the EIF Implementing Rules.*

### **- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority**

*Maximum 15 lines*

- internet webpage for EIF in Bulgaria – IT-expences, incl. for development and maintenance;
- publications in newspapers;
- information days;
- trainings of the beneficiaries and of the RA-team.

### **- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries**

*Maximum 15 lines*

All projects performed some or all of the following:

- public events like conferences, seminars etc.;
- printed information materials – leaflets, brochures, handbooks etc.;
- web-pages;
- media events;
- films etc.

**Part V: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF  
FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

*Based on the Commission Decision approving each annual programme and on the information available to the Responsible Authority on the budget implementation of the programmes, please fill in the table below:*

Annual Programme	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the annual programme  Amount, Euro (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010  Amount, Euro (2)	EIF budget implementation rate  (EIF Committed/ EIF Available)  Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	451 159,77*	450 934,19	99,95%
Programme 2008	451 093,32*	359 431,13	79,68%
Programme 2009	744 730,51* <i>(hasn't started yet)</i>	- <i>(hasn't started yet)</i>	- <i>(hasn't started yet)</i>
TOTAL 2007-2009	1 646 983,60	810 365,32	-

\* Activities without TA

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009</b></p>
--

*Based on:*

- *All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme;*
- *Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.*

*Provide your assessment of the implementation of the annual programmes from 2007 through 2009 for the items listed below.*

*In each case please explain the reasons for your judgement. If for any item you cannot provide an assessment by June 2010, please answer “Not known by June 2010”.*

**VI.1.      Assessment of the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme**

**1.      Has the 2007 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

*15 lines maximum*

The AP 2007 was implemented according to its Activities which were developed as components of 4 schemes for collection of project proposals – for all of them the RA was acting as awarding body. **As a result 99,95% of the funds under AP 2007 were contracted.** There was only a slight change in the financial plan after the third scheme was contracted – the remaining funding in all activities was combined under one activity, which appeared to be unpopular under the first 3 calls for proposals – aiming to increase its popularity. This relocation was under 10% of the total sum, so it was done in accordance to Art. 23, para. 2 of the basic act. The last call was exactly for this relocated funding and was successfully executed although it was with a short duration.

In relation of the time schedule there was a delay of the start of the program, because after the approval of the AP there was a need to establish all the internal documents for operation of the EIF in Bulgaria to be developed in details and approved accordingly. As the RA started from scratch, this process took more time than envisaged in advance.

**2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2007 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?**

*15 lines maximum*

The RA encountered the following problems and obstacles:

- short implementation period due to the late start of the real implementation. It was conditioned by the need of extra time in advance for capacity building and development and establishment of all the internal documentation regarding the procedures' manual.
- for one of the activities there was a real lack of interest – no project proposals due to the small amount of funding envisaged.

The RA took the following measures for overcoming these problems:

- broad public activity in order to attract more proposals for all the activities even though they were planned for a period of 4-6 months.
- the remaining funding from all activities after the first 3 calls for proposals were collected and relocated under the unpopular one and thus a proposal was successfully received and implemented.

**3. Has a revision of the 2007 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?**

*15 lines maximum*

As already stated above, there was just one change in AP 2007 – relocation of small remaining amounts of funding from several activities into one of them in order to make it more attractive.

As a result – the activity in question was successfully contracted and implemented.

This relocation was made in accordance to Art. 23, para. 2 of the basic act – Council Decision 2007/435/EC, timely communicated to the European Commission and accepted by the Commission.

- 4. Have you implemented the 2007 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

*15 lines maximum*

After the first calls for proposals the RA encountered the above described problem with an unpopular activity. In order to achieve a maximum level of implementation the relocation of funds was made, as stated above. As a result, full implementation of AP2007 was achieved – 99,95% contracted funding.

- 5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

The preliminary estimation shows that the expected qualitative and quantitative results under the separate activities are achieved according to the indicators, given in the approved by the Commission AP 2007. A more detailed analysis is going to be presented with completion of the final report for the implementation of the AP 2007. This report is still drafted and will be finalized on time.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2007 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

*15 lines maximum*

The actions included in the approved by the Commission AP2007 were appropriate. They represent the core activities, which are also set in the following AP's for Bulgaria and no need for serious reorganization has been observed yet.

The distribution of the funding between the activities has followed the logic set out in the MAP 2007-2013 and appeared to be appropriate. However, it appeared that the funding for one of the activities was not attractive enough. This was corrected through the slight relocation (under 10%) of funding to that activity, which was communicated on time and in advance to the Commission.

## **VI.2. Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme**

- 1. Has the 2008 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

*15 lines maximum*

The AP 2008 was implemented according to its Activities which were developed as components of 3 schemes for collection of project proposals – for all of them the RA was acting as awarding body. **As a result 79,68% of the funds under AP 2008 were contracted.**

In order to achieve a better percentage, a slight change in the financial plan (after the second scheme was contracted) was presented to the Commission – the remaining funding in the activities was envisaged for relocation under two activities, which appeared to be more popular under the first 2 calls for proposals, thus needing more funding to complete them. This relocation was under 10% of the total sum, so it was done in accordance to Art. 23, para. 2 of the basic act. Nevertheless, the envisaged subsequent call with 3 components has not been started due to the very short duration remaining till the end of the AP 2008 in 30 June 2010.

In relation of the time schedule there was a delay for the above-stated reasons for AP 2007. The implementation of AP 2008 started very shortly after the first call under AP 2007.

**2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2008 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?**

*15 lines maximum*

The RA encountered the following problems and obstacles:

- short implementation period (for first contracts with beneficiaries – before the prolongation of the AP2008) due to the late start of the real implementation. It was conditioned by the need of extra time in advance for capacity building and development and establishment of all the internal documentation regarding the procedures' manual.
- short implementation period for projects after the relocation – this stopped the envisaged and prepared call for project proposals.

The RA took the following measures:

- broad public activity in order to attract more proposals for all the activities even though some of them were planned for a period of 4-6 months.
- the remaining funding from the activities after the first 2 calls for proposals were collected and relocated.

**3. Has a revision of the 2008 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what were/are the main changes?**

*15 lines maximum*

As already stated above, there was a change in AP 2008 – relocation of remaining amounts of funding from several activities into two of them in order to make use of their popularity for the achievement of the goals of EIF. Also half of the remaining funds under one less popular activity were relocated and the rest was left to be announced as one of the components in the envisaged call for project proposals.

As a result – a call for proposals with 3 components was prepared, but not started due to the short remaining time for implementation.

This relocation was made in accordance to Art. 23, para. 2 of the basic act – Council Decision 2007/435/EC, timely communicated to the European Commission and accepted by the Commission.

- 4. Have you implemented the 2008 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved/to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

*15 lines maximum*

After the first calls for proposals the RA encountered the above described problem with one less popular activity and remaining funder several others. In order to achieve a maximum level of implementation the relocation of funds was made, as stated above. Unfortunately, the last call for proposals according to the relocation made couldn't be started.

As a result, full implementation of AP 2008 was not achieved – the percentage of the contracted funding is still high – 79,68%.

- 5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

The preliminary estimation shows that the expected qualitative and quantitative results under the separate activities are going to be achieved almost according to the indicators, given in the approved by the Commission AP 2008 – probably not to full extent.

A more detailed analysis is going to be presented with the final report for the implementation of the AP 2008. This report is going to be drafted after the end of the programme and will be finalized on time.

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2008 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

*15 lines maximum*

The actions included in the approved by the Commission AP2008 were appropriate. They are following and further developing the core activities, which started with AP 2007 for Bulgaria. As a mistake at the programming phase is considered the ambitious splitting of activities into a bigger number, which made the funding under each of them smaller and thus less attractive for project proposals.

The distribution of the funding between the activities has followed the logic set out in the MAP 2007-2013 and appeared to be appropriate, regardless the fact that it was in smaller amounts due to the bigger number of activities. This latter was also a reason for the proposed slight relocation (under 10%) of funding, which was communicated on time and in advance to the Commission.

**VI.3. Assessment of the implementation of the 2009 Annual Programme**

*Not known by June 2010 – the AP is to be started soon*

- 1. Has the 2009 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

*15 lines maximum*

- 2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2009 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?**

*15 lines maximum*

- 3. Has a revision of the 2009 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what are the main changes?**

*15 lines maximum*

- 4. Do you expect to fully implement the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme)? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

*15 lines maximum*

- 5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2009 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission – to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

6. **In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme to date, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

*15 lines maximum*

**VI.4. The Management and Control System of the EIF programmes and the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007 through 2009**

*Based on:*

- *All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each Annual Programme 2007 through 2009;*
- *The Management and Control system of the EIF in your Member State;*
- *Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority.*

*Provide your assessment for the following items. Please explain the reasons for your judgement.*

**1. Has the Management and Control System of the EIF, which you designed in 2007-8, been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far?**

*Half a page maximum*

Yes, with the present functioning Management and Control System (MCS) of the EIF in Bulgaria an effective and efficient management of AP 2007 and AP 2008 has been performed. This reflects in the relatively high percentage contacted funding under these two APs achieved.

MCS is in full correspondence to the basic act and to the national legislation (Law on Financial Management and Control of Public Finances).

**2. Please list the changes you have made in the Management and Control System of the European Integration Fund which you designed in 2007-8, bearing in mind the experiences gained/ lessons learned during the implementation of the annual programmes 2007 - 2009**

*Half a page maximum*

The functions of the RA, including the preliminary control for EIF, are structurally defined:

- the function of preliminary control on the procedures (preliminary technical control) is performed by an expert of the Migration, Integration and Civil Rights Unit within the RA – FMPMI Directorate – *expert for preliminary technical control*;
- the function of preliminary control on the payments (preliminary financial control) and of irregularities' control are performed by an inspector of the Inspectorate within the Ministry – *expert for preliminary financial control*.

Because of entering into force of new Structural Regulations of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, changes in the structure of the units within the RA and CA are under finalisation. These changes are leading to slight changes in the MCS respectively.

**Part VII: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE  
AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF  
PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009**

*In case you had recourse to an external expertise for other parts of this report:*

***This part must always be filled in by the Responsible Authority itself***

**VII.1. What is your overall assessment of the EIF implementation in your Member State from 2007 to 2009?**

*1 page maximum*

The overall assessment of the EIF implementation in Bulgaria since 2007 is very good. The implementation started at the end of 2007 with the first draft of the MAP 2007-2013 and of the Management and Control System. In 2008 the drafting process was finalized and MAP was approved by the Commission together with the first 2 annual programs – AP 2007 and AP 2008. In 2009 the AP 2009 was also approved and respectively in 2010 – the AP 2010. Before the first calls for project proposals also a Procedural Manual of the RA was adopted.

As a good result for the RA is the fact that under the calls for project proposals more and more proposals are received every next time. Thus, the popularity of EIF grows within the Bulgarian society. This also reflects in a better quality of the proposals, presented every next year. A reason for that is that the RA is performing its activities in a very transparent way – all relevant information is timely published on the internet website of EIF for Bulgaria, which is also frequently updated.

Even though the real project implementation under EIF started in the middle of 2009, all the projects under AP 2007 have been finalized on time, as well as the first projects under AP 2008 – 31.12.2009. The last contracted projects under AP 2008 finish according to the new deadline – 30.06.2010. It appeared, though, that this deadline was not enough to contract enough projects and thus to implement the proposed reallocation of funds under AP 2008. The real start of implementation of AP 2009 is going to be in the middle of 2010, which is still under preparation.

The reason for the very good assessment of the implementation is also due to the fact that all implemented projects contribute to the fulfilment of the goals of EIF in accordance to the basic act, the MAP and the relevant APs.

**VII.2. On the basis of the information available to you by 30 June 2010, please provide your preliminary assessment in relation to the following aspects of the European Integration Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009**

**\* Relevance of the EIF programme's priorities and actions to your national situation**

*Please describe how relevant the programme's priorities and actions are overall to the problems and needs identified in your Member State. Has there been an evolution in your Member State which required a reshaping of the intervention?*

*15 lines maximum*

All the actions within the program priorities under the APs up to now appear to be very relevant to the situation in Bulgaria – a country that from a sending and transit is becoming more and more a destination country. Placing the accent on analyses, capacity building, information centres and campaigns and development of assessment methods and of more comprehensive indicators is exactly what is needed.

The only change is that the implementation showed that some activities are more popular than others among the beneficiaries, but that does not reflect on the relevance of the actions to the problems and needs in Bulgaria.

**\* Effectiveness of the programme**

*Please highlight the key results of your programme so far and the extent to which the strategy set out in your multiannual programme strategy has been implemented. Are the results of the intervention (as far as they are known by 30 June 2010) consistent with your objectives?*

*15 lines maximum*

The key results are related to:

- increased awareness in the Bulgarian society about the immigration and integration matters;
- activation of the civil society structures – NGO, academic society, social partners – on the matters and goals set up for EIF;
- start of establishment of information centres for immigrants.

Taking into account the n+1,5 period for implementation of the APs we can say that the set out strategy in the MAP is still at the first phase of its implementation and the RA expects in the future to achieve a better level of fulfilment.

\* Efficiency of the programme

*Please estimate the cost of the management of the European Integration Fund so far and whether in your opinion the programme's objectives are being developed in accordance with the original planning at a reasonable cost.*

*15 lines maximum*

The above stated results are achieved efficiently as the funding under EIF is used to achieve the goals to a maximum extent. The program's objectives are followed in accordance to the planning set out from the beginning. The only problem is that everything started a bit late, so the planning has to gain up all the time.

\* Complementarity

*Please explain how you ensured complementarity with your nationally funded programmes in the area of intervention of the EIF, on the one hand, and with other EC financial instruments, on the other hand, in particular the European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund. Did you encounter any difficulty in this respect and, if so, what measures did you take?*

*15 lines maximum*

The EIF develops itself very independently in Bulgaria, mainly because of the very specific target group differing from those of the ESF and ERF. Nevertheless, complementarity of all these funds can be found mainly in the field of training and strengthening of the administrative capacity for dealing with the different target groups. Also, complementarity can be found in the similarities in some procedures and measures for integration. The main idea is to avoid duplication of financing for one and the same action by the different EC funds and in the same time to fulfil the goals of the EIF.

\* Added value

*Please explain how you perceive the EIF added value in your Member State in comparison with existing national programmes/policies/budget, and in relation to other EC financial instruments, in the area of intervention of the EIF.*

*15 lines maximum*

EIF is a unique financial instrument for the integration of immigrants' matters. For Bulgaria it appears as the perfect complementary instrument for the implementation on practice of the National Strategy on Migration and Integration 2008-2015 (NSMI). The EIF MAP 2007-2013 is developed as an additional more in-depth document for further development of the integration policy set up by the NSMI and for giving a framework for its implementation on practice. This framework is fulfilled by the APs.

As added value, the results (expected and already achieved) of the overall implementation of EIF in Bulgaria could be considered, e.g.:

- establishment of new evaluation techniques and set of indicators for the integration policy;
- establishment of a network of information integration centres for immigrants; etc.

**VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement**

*In total 2-3 pages maximum*

Under this item please specify in particular:

\* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the annual programming exercise in general?

*Half a page maximum*

From the point of view regarding the programming exercise no changes at EU-level are observed as needed for the time being.

\* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the implementation of the actions / projects and the control mechanisms on the actions/ projects?

*Half a page maximum*

The RA for EIF in Bulgaria shares the view that each Member State should have the opportunity to define its own rules for the eligibility of expenditure, corresponding to its national rules and procedures – the same way as for the Structural Funds. So we are very much in favour of such a change.

\* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in terms of the guidance and support by the Commission to the Member States on the implementation of the programming exercise and the management and control system?

*Half a page maximum*

For the time being the RA for EIF in Bulgaria has no special suggestions / recommendations. We are thankful for the help we have received by the Commission for both programming exercise and for the management and control system.

*End of the report*