

**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: (Member State)

.....CYPRUS REPUBLIC.....

Date:

.....30/06/2010.....

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

Mr. Alexander Kerveris

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

Mrs. Anna Ellina
**Solidarity and Management
of Migration Flows Funds**
Ministry of Interior- Republic of Cyprus
Tel: (+357) 22 409999
Fax: (+357) 22 409948
E-mail: aellina@moi.gov.cy

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: 11.08 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2008: 70.82 %
- Programme 2009: 41.46 %

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: 1 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: 2 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2009: 2 (number of calls for proposals)

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 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th 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	2	18	17	37
Projects selected	0	7	5	12
Projects funded	0 ¹	7 ²	5 ³	12

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

Yes/No: YES

- If No, explain why:

¹ Two action to be implemented by awarding body method were included in the AP2007. Those were included in a Call for Proposals but no final beneficiaries were found.

² One action was included in the Call for Proposals, but no final beneficiary was found.

³ One action was included in the Call for Proposals, but no final beneficiary was found. This action is published in a second Call for Proposals.

I.4 - Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals

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>0</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>0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>12</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>12</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 →	0	7	5
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	0	2	1
Priority 2	0	3	3
Priority 3	0	2	1
Priority 4	0	0	0

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>0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
Category b)	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
Category c)	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
Category d)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

I.8 - Distribution of projects funded in the “awarding 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 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→	<i>0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>

<p style="text-align: center;">Part II: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD</p>

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: YES

- 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: 88.92 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 29,18 %
- Programme 2009: 58,54 %

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: 1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 1 (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 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th 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	22	27	13	62
Projects selected	3	3	3	9
Projects funded	3	3	3	9

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

Yes/No: YES

- 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	0	0	0	0

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)	3	3	3	9
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	3	3	3	9

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 →	3	3	3
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	2	2	2
Priority 2	0	0	0
Priority 3	1	1	1
Priority 4	0	0	0

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 →	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
Category b)	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>
Category c)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
Category d)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

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 →	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>

**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

In the frame of these Annual Programmes the actions implemented are focusing on teaching Greek Language to third country nationals [TCNs] (adults) and dissemination of information regarding aspects of the host society, such as constitutional rights, health, social services, etc. There are also actions promoting interaction and mutual understanding between locals and TCNs, such as summer camps for children under 16 years old and organisation of intercultural events.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Under the executing body method are implemented actions by the Ministry of Educations and Culture. The actions include teaching Greek language to TCN students in public schools. There are also actions regarding dissemination of information regarding the educational system in Cyprus and mutual understanding between TCNs and locals through their interaction in school.

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

In the Annual Programmes are included actions targeted on gathering data on the present situation regarding TCNs in Cyprus and developing mechanisms in order to facilitate the evaluation of the progress of the measures taken towards the integration of TCNs. More precisely, there are actions investigating the attitudes and perceptions of Cypriot citizens towards TCNs, as well as a research on TCNs’ perceptions towards admission procedures and public services provided to them. The aforementioned Annual Programmes also include researches on the quality of knowledge and practices of public officials in relation to services provided to TCNs, and identifying vulnerable groups of TCNs in order to propose measures to address TCNs’ needs and assist their integration into Cypriot society. In addition, another action is being implemented with a complementary function to the abovementioned actions, aiming at developing reliable indicators and methods to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the measures taken.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

In the frame of these three Annual Programmes the actions implemented are targeted at public officials and employees of stakeholders providing services to TCNs (eg. NGOs, local authorities, etc.) offering intercultural training and development of capacity to handle diversity. Moreover, training seminars are provided to journalists, on issues concerning TCNs, integration policies and information dissemination for raising public awareness.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Under the executing body method there are actions implemented by the Ministry of Educations and Culture. The actions focus on training of teachers employed in public schools in relation to the teaching of Greek language to TCNs as a second language, as well as special training seminars on intercultural education and counselling. There is also one action implemented by the Civil Registry and Migration Department which intends to upgrade the existing computerized system, so that accurate and up-to-date data about TSNs becomes easily available to officials, policy makers and practitioners dealing with integration issues.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

In the Annual Programmes are included actions concerning the establishment of multilateral networks with Mediterranean countries, for the exchange of information and best practices on organisational structures for integration and diversity management.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

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”.

N/A

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

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”.

N/A

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

No significant changes took place

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

Maximum length: half a page

No significant changes took place

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

Maximum length: half a page

In the “awarding body” method

N/A

In the “executing body” method

N/A

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

A) Annual Programme 2007

Action C: Training seminars for teachers.

These seminars were specifically organised for teachers, including special training seminars on intercultural education and teaching of Greek as a second or foreign language. The purpose of the action was to further increase the capacity of teachers in terms of the treatment of migrants and TCNs integration problems. In particular the seminars provided teachers with necessary knowledge and information regarding new teaching methods and best practices to be used while teaching TCNs.

These seminars were attended by the teachers with enthusiasm, as they considered them to be very useful in understanding the perception of TCN children and gave them essential information and practices in order to handle adequately this target group. The outcome of the seminars had an impact on the capacity of the teachers to teach effectively the TCN students and the ability of TCN to develop more easily and in less time more skills concerning Greek

language. Based on the skills of these teachers, further measures aiming at the integration of TCNs could be implemented in the future, and discrimination phenomena in classrooms will decrease.

B) Having in mind the fact that all actions included in the Annual Programme 2008 will be fulfilled on the 30/06/2010 and the implementation of actions included in the Annual Programme 2009 will begin in September 2010, the Responsible Authority cannot evaluate their outcomes at the present. Consequently, it would be premature to identify a project as a success.

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

Annual Programmes 2007 and 2008

Action D.1. Organisation of a Mediterranean Forum:

Action E. Establishment of multilateral networks with Mediterranean countries

The above mentioned actions were proposed under Priority 4 of the EIF and even though they were included in several Calls for Proposals, no Final Beneficiaries were found. Specifically only one organisation expressed interest but its proposals were not in compliance with the requirements of the Call for Proposals. Therefore, no action under Priority 4 was implemented in the Annual Programmes 2007 and 2008.

It is considered that the main reasons for this failure were:

- a) the relatively short period left for implementation of the projects and
- b) the lack of experience and/or capacity of organisations in Cyprus to undertake and successfully implement this kind of actions.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

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

Technical Assistance measures are being directed towards the activities outlined in Annex 11 of the Implementing Rules. The measures financed under the annual programmes (2008 and 2009) include among others, staff salaries of the Responsible and the Delegated Authorities involved in the programmes. Moreover, these cover expenses related to travel and accommodation of the Designated Authorities as regards to preparation, management and implementation of the annual programmes (eg. SOLID Committee meetings, bilateral meetings with DG JLS Unit, participation to seminars organized by the DG JLS Unit etc).

In addition, a press conference launching the four Funds was financed under technical assistance, in the framework of information and publicity measures. Educational/training seminars were also organised for the staff of the Delegated Authorities and final beneficiaries regarding the procedures set in the Management and Control System and the Manual of Procedures drawn up by the Responsible Authority. IT equipment and consumables have also been financed as well as the translation of the relevant approved Programmes.

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

Information and publicity activities were implemented by the Responsible Authority under the Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 aiming at increasing the visibility and transparency of the Fund's activities and informing major potential final beneficiaries and the public about the targets and priorities, as well as the actions to be implemented in the framework of the multiannual programmes 2007-2013.

Information activities that took place during calendar year 2008:

- The Responsible Authority launched its web page (19th November 2008).
- The emblem of the Responsible authority was created, in order to be displayed on all relevant documents and publicity items, indicating the co-financing by the Funds.
- Assembly of the Partnership Committee for the formation of Annual Programme 2009
- Publication of Calls for Proposals (Press, Gazette, web page, etc.)

Information activities that took place during calendar year 2009:

- The multiannual programmes were launched on the 19th of February 2009 during the press conference "Launch of the Implementation of Actions in the Framework of the EU Solidarity Funds" organised by the Responsible Authority.
- Publicity items (e.g. portfolio, pens, stress balls e.t.c) carrying the emblem of the Responsible Authority were created to be distributed for promotion of the Funds.- Posters and a power point template were designed for the activities organised by the Responsible Authority (e.g. training seminars, informative events or other presentations).
- Assembly of the Partnership Committee for the formation of Annual Programme 2010
- Significant sized flags of the European Union and the Republic of Cyprus are displayed in a prominent point, at the entrance of the Responsible Authority's premises.
- Publication of Calls for Proposals (Press, Gazette, web page, etc.)

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

- All documents drafted indicate the co-financing by the Fund e.g. Publication of Calls for Tenders, material provided to the participants, press releases, posters, etc.
- All equipment purchased or actions implemented under the European Integration Fund include the technical characteristics mentioned in article 35 of the Implementation Rules.
- The final beneficiaries when acting as contracting authorities (Call for Tenders method) follow commonly used means of publication (e.g. Official Journal of the European Union, Gazette of the Republic of Cyprus, the Internet, local newspapers) in which the co-financing of the Fund (E.U. contribution) is mentioned.
- Usually the final beneficiaries, at the beginning and the end of each project, organise press conferences for the launch of the project and the presentation of its results. Moreover, articles and announcements regarding the implementation of the projects are published in local press, radio and web pages. It is noted that in all the aforementioned information and publicity measures reference is made in relation to the co-financing of the EIF.

**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 (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (2)	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	766.802,46	496.839,46	64,79%
Programme 2008	848.856,46	768.003,26	90,48%
Programme 2009	853.447,02	89.741,29	10,52%
TOTAL 2007-2009	2.469.105,94	1.354.584,01	54,86%

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

As regards the Annual Programme 2007 there has been deviations from the programme schedule (as regards or compared to the approved revised version) where certain actions or projects have not been implemented as expected. More specifically, the projects to be executed using the awarding body method were not implemented, as no adequate final beneficiaries were found. On the other hand, the projects to be executed using the executing body method were implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

15 lines maximum

Due to the delays occurred in the formation of the Management and Control System, the approval of Annual Programme by the Commission, the preparation of the Manual of Procedures and the launch of Call for Proposals, there was very limited time left for the implementation of certain actions. Therefore, it was considered that it would not be possible to implement six of the actions included in the Annual Programme.

As a result, the Responsible Authority submitted to the Commission a revised version of the Annual Programme removing these actions. The remaining amounts were allocated to actions implemented using the executing body method and to a new action (implemented by awarding body method) which was included in the programme. Moreover, some small

actions were grouped as projects under broader actions with a common budget, in order to facilitate their proper implementation and avoid future budgetary amendments.

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

15 lines maximum

See information in answer for IV.1.2

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

The two projects to be executed using the awarding body method were not implemented, as no adequate final beneficiaries were found. On the other hand, the three projects to be executed using the executing body method were fully implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

In general, the actions implemented using the executing body method in the frame of the Annual Programme 2007 have been successfully implemented and the expected quantitative and qualitative deliverables have been achieved according to the approved revised programme. Excluding the actions in awarding body method which were not implemented, the fulfilled actions of the Annual Programme have been implemented on schedule and as described in the programme. However, no official evaluation of the programme has yet taken place. Please note that this type of evaluation, based on the relevant indicators, will be included in the Final Report on the Implementation of the Annual Programme.

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

Taking into consideration the strategic guidelines (2008-2013) set by the Commission for the implementation of the European integration Fund and Cyprus's operational objectives designed to meet the country's requirements, all actions set out in the programme

submitted to the Commission follow the intervention logic of the Multiannual Programme for the period 2007-2013.

In the Annual Programme 2007 the actions selected were appropriate since they enhanced and enriched the existing national policy as regards integration measures. The distribution of funding between the actions is considered appropriate since the actions co-financed under Priority 1 reflect the main axes of Cyprus's national policy on integration of TCNs and consequently more funds have been allocated under this Priority. A weighted allocation of financial resources has also taken place among other actions/projects due to their supportive nature to the implementation of the national strategy for integration.

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

As regards the Annual Programme 2008 there has been some deviations from the programme schedule (as regards or compared to the approved revised version) where one of the projects has not been implemented as expected. More specifically, the project "Establishment of multilateral networks with Mediterranean countries" was published in a Call for Proposals, but no adequate final beneficiary was found and therefore the project was not implemented. On the other hand, all other projects have been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

15 lines maximum

Due to the delays occurred in the formation of the Management and Control System, the approval of Annual Programme by the Commission, the preparation of the Manual of Procedures and the launch of Call for Proposals, there was very limited time left for the implementation of certain actions. Furthermore, other difficulties occurred, when governmental departments acting as final beneficiaries (executing body) expressed their inability to implement some projects under the EIF, and there was not any interest for other actions published in Call for Proposals. Therefore, it was considered that it would not be possible to implement two of the actions included in the Annual Programme.

As a result, the Responsible Authority submitted to the Commission a revised version of the Annual Programme removing these actions. The remaining amounts were allocated to other projects and to a new project (implemented by awarding body method) which was included in the programme. Moreover, some small actions were grouped as projects under broader actions with a common budget, in order to facilitate their proper implementation and avoid future budgetary amendments.

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

See information in answer for IV.2.2

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

The project "Establishment of multilateral networks with Mediterranean countries" to be executed using the awarding body method was not implemented, as no adequate final beneficiary was found. On the other hand, all other projects were fully implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

In general, the implementation of the Annual Programme 2008 has been successful and the expected quantitative and qualitative deliverables have been achieved according to the approved programme. In addition, almost all actions included in the Annual Programme have been implemented on schedule and as described in the programme. However, no official evaluation of the programme has yet taken place. Please note that this type of evaluation, based on the relevant indicators, will be included in the Final Report on the Implementation of the Annual Programme.

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

Taking into consideration the strategic guidelines (2008-2013) set by the Commission for the implementation of the European integration Fund and Cyprus's operational objectives designed to meet the country's requirements, all actions set out in the programme submitted to the Commission follow the intervention logic of the Multiannual Programme for the period 2007-2013.

In the Annual Programme 2008 the actions selected were appropriate since they enhanced and enriched the existing national policy as regards integration measures. The distribution of funding between the actions is considered appropriate since the actions co-financed under Priority 1 reflect the main axes of Cyprus's national policy on integration of TCNs and consequently more funds have been allocated under this Priority. A weighted allocation of financial resources has also taken place among other actions/projects due to their supportive nature to the implementation of the national strategy for integration.

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

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

15 lines maximum

As regards the 2009 programme there has been a slight deviation from the programme schedule where certain actions have not commenced at the beginning of 2009 as expected. More specifically, the actions implemented using the executing body method, are expected to be implemented as scheduled.

Moreover, a Call for Proposals for all actions implemented in the awarding body method has been published and the Delegated Authority will be signing the Grant Agreements with the successful applicants at the beginning of July. Therefore, these will commence shortly and are expected to be completed without any delay.

However, regarding action 3.1.4 "Production and publication of information material in different languages" a Call for Proposals has been published but no applications were submitted, thus the Delegated Authority published a new invitation for Calls for Proposals on the 25th of June 2010. In the event that no applications will be submitted, then a new action will be selected and the Annual Programme will be revised accordingly.

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

15 lines maximum

No major problems have been encountered so far. In case that difficulties regarding the implementation of any action/project occur, specific measures will be taken to ensure the effective implementation of the Annual Programme and the re-allocation of the funds.

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

The 2009 annual programme has not yet been revised.

- 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

It is expected that nearly all actions/projects set out in the programme approved by the Commission will be implemented by the end of the eligibility period. In case that no applications will be received during the second call for proposals, then a new action/project will be selected and the Annual Programme 2009 will be revised accordingly.

- 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

It is too early to make assumptions, since the implementation of the projects included in the programme is at an early stage.

- 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

In the Annual Programme 2009 the actions selected are considered to be appropriate since they enhance and enrich the existing national policy as regards integration measures. Taking into account Cyprus's operational objectives designed to meet the country's requirements, all actions set out in the programme and the distribution of funding between them are considered to be appropriate, despite the fact that actions co-financed under Priority 1 are still receiving the lion's share of the programme's funding. Compared to the Annual Programme 2008 more actions have been added supporting other Priorities too.

VI.4. The Management and Control System of 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

The Management and Control System designed for the implementation of the four Funds is in line with the provisions set in Article 22 of Decision 435/2007/EC establishing the European Integration Fund. The system has been designed in a manner that ensures a proper separation of functions between the authorities involved in the implementation of the Fund and has the infrastructure required to communicate easily with a wide range of users.

Moreover the Management and Control System complies with the European Commission fund management rules and the financial capabilities and skills to manage the funds allocated to the Republic of Cyprus under the European Integration Fund. It should also be mentioned that the Annual Programmes are being implemented in accordance with the provisions set in the Management and Control System regarding the procedures set out for the implementation of the actions, monitoring, validation and payments.

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

Originally four Management and Control Systems had been drawn, one for each Fund and submitted to the European Commission. The Commission after examining the four Systems proposed for the submission of one revised joint description of the Management and Control System for all Funds. It is noted that the Commission mentioned in a letter dated 09 January 2009, that "the description allows a good understanding of the compliance of the system".

However, outstanding comments/issues were forwarded to the Responsible Authority, so that the Management and Control System could be finalised (letters dated 09/01/2009 and 19/01/2010). Some of the comments refer to the following:

- indication of the date of the official delegation of the tasks of the Responsible Authority to the four delegated authorities (through an Act of Delegation).
- adequacy of human resources allocated to delegated bodies and Certifying Authority.

- indication when the Manual of Procedures was finalised and when it became operational. The relevant changes have been included in the Management and Control System which is now considered to be finalised.

In addition, on the 8th of December 2009, an audit control has been carried out by the Audit Authority to verify the effective functioning of the Management and Control System in accordance with the Basic Acts and the relevant regulatory framework of the Solidarity Funds. With a letter dated 13th of April 2010, the Audit Authority stated that the audit to the Management and Control System is deemed to be satisfactory.

Bearing in mind the experiences gained/ lessons learned, a change that took place in the Management and Control System referred to the designation of the Certifying Authority of the four Funds. In the initial version of the Management and Control System, the Accounts Office of the Ministry of the Interior had been designated as the Certifying Authority. However, for the Certifying Authority to be more operationally independent from the other authorities and to maintain a clear separation of functions, the Treasury of the Republic has been designated as the Certifying Authority of the Solidarity Funds. This is an independent government service which acts separately from the Responsible Authority, the Designated Authorities and the Audit Authority. The Treasury of the Republic is also the Certifying Authority for all interventions co-financed by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund of the European Union. The Treasury of the Republic has also been designated as the National Fund for the Pre-accession Aid and the Transition Facility Assistance.

**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 implementation of the European Integration Fund for the period 2007 to 2009 is taking place without any significant problems. Apart from the delays and the difficulties that occurred during the implementation of the Annual Programme 2007, the Annual Programmes 2008 and 2009 are being implemented quite successfully.

Regarding the implementation of the Annual Programme 2007, not all action included in the programme were implemented. As mentioned above potential final beneficiaries expressed no interest or they did not submit an adequate proposal during the Call for proposals. As a consequence, the implementation rate of the programme will be quite low, although the three actions implemented by executing body were implemented as scheduled.

All actions co-financed under the Annual Programme 2008 (apart from project E) have been successfully completed, payments have been effected and almost full absorption of the Fund's allocations for the 2008 programming period is expected. It should be noted, that the actions/projects included in the Annual Programme 2008 were published in a Call for Proposal without serious delays and, as a result, there was enough time for their implementation and satisfactory interest by applicants. Having in mind that most of the final beneficiaries are quite inexperienced regarding the implementation of action co-financed by Solidarity Funds, their monitoring and control will be more demanding.

As regards the 2009 annual programme, although not all actions have commenced according to the schedule approved in the respective annual programme, no significant delays are expected to occur in the overall implementation of the programme and full absorption is expected to be achieved. A Call for Proposals has been published and Grant Agreements will be signed with final beneficiaries for most of the projects, except from one, which is included in a new Call for Proposals published on the 25/06/2010. In the event that this project, implemented in the awarding body method, will not manage to attract any prospective beneficiaries, then a new project will be proposed by the designated authorities and a revised version of the programme will be submitted.

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

As it is described in the multiannual programme, Cyprus despite being small in terms of area and population, hosts large numbers of third-country nationals compared to other EU Member States and is primarily a destination country for them rather than a transit country. Thus, it was essential to take measures regarding the development and implementation of integration processes for newly-arrived TCNs and also facilitation of the development and implementation of admission procedures relevant to and supportive of the integration process of TCNs. More over action should be taken to support the capacity to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of TCNs. Until now national budgetary constraints is one of the reasons that our integration policy lacks of measures and actions, and it is expected that the financial contribution provided by the Fund will ease the situation and give us the opportunity to implement efficiently the Cyprus's integration policy and relevant strategies. In short, the programme's objectives to a great extend have managed to address Cyprus's national needs on the matter, although integration measures are just comencing in Cyprus.

* 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 majority of the objectives set in the multiannual programme for the implementation of the European Return Fund are being implemented under the Annual Programmes 2007- 2009, as actions from the three main Priorities have been successfully implemented.

It should be noted that the effects of the actions are still under evaluation and the final results will be drawn with the submission of each programme's Final Report.

* 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

According to chapter V of the Basic Act (435/2007/EC) and the respective Implementing Rules (457/2008/EC), a management and control system has been developed. At least ten officers, in all Designated Authorities, are dealing partly or exclusively with matters regarding the implementation of the procedures set out in the management and control system for the European Intergration Fund. In addition to the abovementioned administrative cost, the cost of consumables, training and the organization of promotional events for both Authorities should also be calculated. Therefore, an important amount of financial resources is being spent on the management of the Fund.

A certain delay in the absorption of the amount allocated for the European Integration Fund has been created taking into account that the implementation of the Fund was at its early stages and the relevant inexperience of the Authorities and the final beneficiaries involved as regards Calls for Proposals. Due to the difficulties encountered and the time consuming procedures for the preparation and implementation of the Management and Control System, the programme's objectives have been developed but at a higher management cost than expected.

However, it is estimated that if more funds were available to the Republic, the cost regarding the management would remain approximately the same compared to the present cost. This is due to the fact that the time-consuming bureaucratic procedures which were necessary to be set according to the basic acts and the implementation rules, would still be the same.

* 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*

Cyprus does not have any national or Community instruments to support programmes exclusively concerned with integration of third-country nationals. As a result, the programme and the actions to be financed by the Integration Fund are powerful instruments for achieving an end result from the efforts we are making as a host country to integrate third-country nationals.

In order to ensure coordination and complementarity with other Community financial instruments, the following procedures are being put in place:

- a) According to the Management and Control System, the approval of the annual programme is given by a Technical Committee, in which representatives of other EU Funds participate;
- b) The Responsible Authority for ERF and EIF is the same, and therefore there is a constant communication and cooperation between the responsible officers;
- c) Special meetings are arranged in the frame of Partnership Committee, between the Delegated Authorities of IF and ERF and representatives of relevant European Funds, before the preparation of multiannual and every annual programme, in order to inform each other on planned actions and exchange views on the successful implementation of the relative strategies. The Community Funds can be informed about the actions proposed or implemented by EIF and ERF, propose complementary

- actions and contribute to the effective implementation of the Funds with their experience;
- d) Circulation of annual and multiannual plans between the Delegated Authority for EIF and the authorities implementing other Community Funds (eg. European Social Fund, Equal, etc.).

The Responsible Authority did not face any difficulties regarding this aspect of the Fund.

* 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

As described in the Multiannual Programme, Cyprus faces disproportionate to its size and population pressures by immigration flows and there are growing needs in relation to integration of TCNs in the host society. It should be noted that Cyprus's limited financial resources are one of the reasons that the national policy on this matter lacks of measures and actions. In this respect, the financial resources of the Fund ease the abovementioned situation and enhance as well as enrich the country's integration activities. Therefore, the co-financing offered by the EIF is of outmost importance for the advancement of realization of the integration strategy of the country in order to achieve an efficient, credible and multidimensional integration policy.

It also should be mentioned that in Cyprus not many specific measures towards integration of TCNs were taking place before the implementation of the EIF. At the present, there are more funding opportunities for organisations of the civil society, national and local authorities, as well as educational institute in order to take initiatives towards the implementation of actions in relation to TCNs' integration.

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

None

* 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

We suggest that each Member State should define the eligible expenditure to be applied, in relation to the national rules and procedures. We propose that a relevant discussion with the SOLID Committee should take place.

* 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

None.

End of the report