

**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)

The Czech Republic

Date: 30. June 2010

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

PhDr. Tomáš Haišman, director of Department for Asylum and Migration  
Policy, Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic

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

Ing. Lucie Trávníčková, tel.: 00 420 974 832 524, e-mail: [travnickova@mvcz.cz](mailto:travnickova@mvcz.cz)

## **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

To provide an expert evaluation of the results and impact of activities co-financed by the European Integration Fund as listed in the following tables, the methods of monitoring and summarization of data available to the Responsible authority were used, such as respective Annual programmes, lists of projects received, selected and funded.

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

- 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)

no in-house evaluation expertise was recourse

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

no external evaluation expertise was recourse

*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: 1 call for proposals
- Programme 2008: 3 calls for proposals
- Programme 2009: 1 call 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 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	2	21+5+22=48	27	77
Projects selected	2	9+4+17=28	19	49
Projects funded	2	9+4+14=27	17	46

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

Yes/No: NO

- If *No*, explain why: Following projects were selected but the applicants withdraw from signing of the contract: three projects from the EIF 2008 (3<sup>rd</sup> call for proposal) and two projects from the EIF 2009 were selected for funding conditionally. The conditions related to increase of the quantifiable results and indicators and the applicants refused to follow the conditions.

#### **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	0	0	0	0

#### **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)	2	27	17	46
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	2	27	17	46

**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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	2	27	17
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	2	11	9
Priority 2		1	1
Priority 3		12	6
Priority 4		3	1

**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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	2	27	17
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)		20	10
Category b)	2	3	5
Category c)		1	1
Category d)		3	1

**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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	2	27	17
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only		1	1
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only		8	4
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	2	18	12

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part II: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 ANNUAL PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD</b></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: 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: 75 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 75 %
- Programme 2009: 75 %

## **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: 0 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 0 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 0 (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: N.A.

- If No, explain why: N.A.

**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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 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>Program me 2007</i>	<i>Program me 2008</i>	<i>Program me 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

Under annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009, 10 centers for support of the integration of third-country nationals were established in the following regions: South-Bohemia, South-Moravia, Karlovy Vary, Liberec, Moravia-Silesia, Olomouc, Pardubice, Plzeň, Ústec and Zlín.

The centers have become an initiator and implementing entity of integration activities and actions supporting and enabling improvement of mainly the social, legal, language and cultural position of foreigners in the selected regions of the CR. In the centers the foreigners are provided free of charge with the information, guidance and services which help them to remove obstacles of their integration and to support their successful individual social integration. When necessary, interpreter services are used. The centers furthermore provide introductory trainings in social-cultural orientation of foreigners in the Czech society (including the information on rights and duties of foreigners), **social and legal counseling, they further arrange Czech language lessons for foreigners, and put an emphasis on development of civil society and involvement of the majority society into the integration process. Language courses correspond to the specific needs of foreigners in their location, including lessons for parents with children.**

Each Centre is involved in or initiated in establishing of the regional counseling platform for the integration of foreigners in which important actors in the field of the integration of foreigners in the given region are represented.

**Within the respective priority** the projects supporting individual integration of foreigners - unaccompanied minors after their departure from the facility for minors – foreigners (support in arranging housing, job seeking, help with access to health and social services) were also implemented.

Furthermore, the projects were implemented focused mainly on enhancing awareness and active involvement of the host society (majority society, media, public administration authorities and other relevant organizations) into the integration process, including creating an accurate media portrayal of foreigners and providing the information on objective problems of their integration, such as festivals, bulletin publication or the transversal project Next Door Family.

#### In the “executing body” method

N.A.

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

Within the Priority 2, indicators and monitoring procedures of the integration of third-country nationals were processed with focus on an access of third-country nationals to the Czech labor market and education in the CR. Research was performed as regards the information that has been so far collected about attitudes of Czech society to foreigners with recommendation for further studies. Practical knowledge on status and monitoring of the integration of third-country nationals in the field of employment and education was obtained by means of social investigations based on discussion groups with representatives of non-governmental, non-profit organizations and educational facilities supplemented by interviews with foreigners and round tables with experts on the above mentioned activities.

An aggregate output of all partial activities is preparation for the system of indicators and monitoring procedures of the integration process of third-country nationals with the focus on their access to the Czech labor market and education. These outputs will be one of the key platforms for multiannual regulation of the policy and measures in the field of the integration of foreigners in the CR.

#### In the “executing body” method

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

Within the projects of the above mentioned action, free social services had been provided to members of alien communities that facilitated their contact and communication with majority institutions and authorities. Assistance services to third-country nationals had been provided within the annual programmes 2008 and 2009 in the regions which were not covered by the integration centers.

Furthermore, within the 2008 and 2009 annual programmes, the seminars focused on support of pedagogues at their work with pupils - foreigners had been running. Activities with foreigners and medical personnel took place during their care of third-country nationals.

#### In the “executing body” method

N.A.

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

##### In the “awarding body” method

The objective of the implemented projects was to exchange experience, internships and establish cooperation and develop international thematic networks aimed at specific selected issues of the integration of third-country nationals.

Furthermore, the **international meeting** of representatives of EU NNOs and representatives of NNOs and the Czech public self-regulatory bodies active in the integration of foreigners was organized, which was focused on the exchange of knowledge and best practices as well as the discussion about possible implementation of joint projects at the European level.

##### In the “executing body” method

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**

*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**

*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**

Within the implementation of the 2008 and 2009 annual programmes, more projects relating to the Priority 3 were implemented than originally planned, i.e. providing assistance services to third-country nationals. These services were provided mainly in the regions where the integration centers had not yet been established.

At the same time a number of the projects implemented under the Priority 4 grew, i.e. the actions of an exchange of experience, best practices and information in the integration among Member States, because more organizations expressed their interest in this action.

The last action at which an increase was recorded was strengthening of intercultural competences of state administration employees.

**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.

**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**

In the “awarding body” method

No significant change in the monitored period occurred.

## 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.*

Priority 1, action no. 1

#### Successful story 1. Integration centers

Under the Action no. 1, the support of integration of legally residing third-country nationals into the majority society through the centers established at the regional level was decentralized. Under annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009, 10 centers for support of integration of third-country nationals were established in the following regions: South-Bohemia, South-Moravia, Karlovy Vary, Liberec, Moravia-Silesia, Olomouc, Pardubice, Plzeň, Ústec and Zlín . The integration centers in the remaining regions (Central Bohemia, Vysočín and Královehradec) will be established under the 2010 annual programme. Under the 2011 annual programme the integration centre in the capital city of Prague will be established. The centers have become an initiator and implementing entity of integration activities and actions supporting and enabling the improvement mainly of social, legal, language and cultural position of foreigners in the regions of the CR.

The centers fulfill especially the following objectives:

- support of the integration of foreigners in the majority society by means of counseling, cultural and enlightenment activities,
- increasing knowledge of the Czech language,
- support of economic self-sufficiency (development and implementation of tools facilitating an access of foreigners with long-term and permanent residence to the labor market and their ability to remain in the labor market),
- support of the orientation in society, particularly by means of trainings in social-cultural orientation.

Priority 1, special priority no. 5

Evaluation report on Implementation of actions co financed by the European Fund  
for the Integration of third-country nationals

## Successful story 2. Next door family

Under this project annual meetings of Czech and foreign families take place in all regions of the CR.

Pairs of families (always 1 Czech family and 1 family of foreigners living in the same region) are selected according to the specific criteria. The criteria are focused so that the barriers between family pairs are as little as possible, on contrary, so that they have as many joint discussion topics as possible (similar education level, family with children, family without children, similar professions, similar interests, similar age of parents and children, good accessibility etc.). The criteria were set so that the established relationships have a real chance to continue further.

The meetings of newly involved families were held in all regions on the same day and time at the end of November of each year. Thus the collective lunch – the meeting of Czech and foreign families with the presence of an assistant (ca 550 persons in total) will take place at the same time at 50 different places throughout the republic.

The project also includes an extensive media campaign.

### **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*

We assess as our failure the fact that within the annual programmes certain actions were not implemented. Within the 2009 annual programme no project application was delivered under the Action **“Mapping out sociopathological barriers of integration of foreigners”**. Since applicants/beneficiaries have to provide 25% of the project co-funding, they are not interested in the implementation of all 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.*

- Publishing of the call for proposals in a national daily newspaper;
- Translations of documents
- Monitoring of the projects implemented under the annual programmes. The travelling expenses associated with checking the individual projects (transport, subsistence allowance and, for remote regions, even accommodation) will be paid from the technical assistance. The responsible body will seek to carry out at least 1-2 monitorings for each project. The calculation of the travelling expenses to be reimbursed and the subsistence allowances will be based on the valid Travelling Expenses Reimbursement Act;
- Exchange of experience, best practices and information during the implementation of EIF among Member States (travel expenses, accommodation and subsistence allowances);
- Clearly organised website on EIF
- The monitoring of the visibility of co-funding from the EIF in the implemented projects and promotion of these projects will be ensured.
- The salary expenses, including the social security expenses of the officials working for a specific period of time, who were employed solely for the purpose of implementing the EIF.
- The salary expenses, including the social security expenses, are only warranted in the following cases:

- officials with an employment contract for an indefinite period of time, who were temporarily transferred to some other work by the formal decision of the responsible body and who have been charged with performing the above-mentioned tasks
- officials working under an employment contract entered into for a specific period of time, or possibly employees from the private sector who were employed solely for the purpose of performing the above-mentioned tasks.

## **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**

Higher awareness of the applicants for the public financial support was achieved through organised informational meetings, seminars and workshops; which resulted in higher quality of the project proposals submitted. The informational meetings are focused on presentation of the annual programme and individual measures, projects and goals, which are to be achieved. The information also concerned the division and allocation of the funds to individual measures.

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

Over the entire implementation of the project the promotion and publicity of individual projects have been secured by beneficiaries, especially by means of:

- websites of the respective organizations, mostly in multilingual versions,
- information banners installed on the premises of the implementation of individual projects,
- promotional materials – leaflets, informational brochures, visit cards, stickers etc. were made for project purposes,
- promotional items, e.g. pens, notebooks, folders or other project promoting items.

During the project implementation the activities were presented in the form of press releases which were published on the websites of individual organizations. The projects were further presented in selected local and national journals with the objective of informing the general public of the implementation of project activities.

EU logo was affixed to the prepared materials (according to the EIF rules).

**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	<b>1 323 425,91</b>	440 913,00	33 %
Programme 2008	<b>1 793 443,34</b>	1 008 308,39	56 %
Programme 2009	<b>2 272 760,99</b>	1 811 346,15	80 %
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	5 389 630,24	3 260 567,54	60 %

## **Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

*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?**

Due to the delay in approving the programme documents, AP 2007 was implemented in the calendar year 2009 concurrently with AP 2008. The call for proposals for both programs was published at the same time and within the 2007 annual programme only the Action no. 1, the foundation and operation of integration centers, was implemented. Other actions set forth in AP 2007 were not implemented.

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

Due to the delay in approving the documents on the part of the EC, the 2007 annual programme was implemented as late as in 2009 and therefore the allocated funds were not fully utilized.

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

The revision of the 2007 programme by the Commission was not necessary.

**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)**

Under AP 2007 only action no. 1, the foundation and operation of integration centers, was implemented. Other actions set forth in the annual program approved by EC were not implemented.

**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?**

Under AP 2007 only the action no. 1, the foundation and operation of integration centers, was implemented. Although the number of integration centers was achieved, the monitoring indicators were not met due to the above mentioned delay.

**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?**

When processing the proposal for the 2007 annual programme, we presumed a full implementation of the program. Due to the delays that occurred, only the Action no. 1, the foundation and operation of integration centers, was implemented under this annual programme. The funds allocated to other actions were not utilized.

**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?**

AP 2008 was implemented in accordance with the programme. Since the total allocated funds were not under the 1<sup>st</sup> call for proposals fully distributed, the second call for proposals was announced halfway through the year 2009. A success of the 2nd call for proposals was that an implementing entity of the Priority 2 had been found. After the EC had prolonged the eligibility period till 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010, the 3<sup>rd</sup> call for proposals was announced with the aim to distribute the remaining unutilized allocated funds. At the information meeting beneficiaries were asked to divide, where possible, the projects for the year 2010 into two parts, with the first part of the project being implemented under the 3<sup>rd</sup> call for proposals in 2008 and the second part of the project under the 1<sup>st</sup> call for proposals in 2009. This was one of the last chances to increase the level of distribution of allocated funds of AP 2008.

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

Despite the fact that due to 3 calls for proposals a significant part of allocated funds was utilized, administrative demands connected with the implementation and control of the projects were enormous.

Within audits of individual projects yet another division of the Asylum and Migration Policy Department was asked for assistance with audits of activities of the selected projects.

**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?**

Revision of AP 2008 related only to a change of allocation within the Actions which exceeded 10% of the total allocation of the annual programme.

**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)**

Within AP 2008 the projects under all actions set out in the annual programme were implemented.

**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?**

Within the respective AP most of the expected quantifiable results was achieved.

**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?**

Distribution of funding between the Actions was appropriate; nevertheless, given the fact that within certain Actions more projects were implemented and the change in the allocation exceeded 10%, it was necessary to review the 2008 annual programme.

**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?**

The 2009 annual programme was implemented as originally planned, except for the Action "Mapping out sociopathological barriers of integration of foreigners" which was not fulfilled.

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

Implementation of the 2009 annual programme commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010 and no serious problems have occurred so far which would have to be resolved by our department.

**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?**

We do not expect that it will be necessary to review the annual program.

- 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)**

The Action “**Mapping out sociopathological barriers of integration of foreigners**” has not been fulfilled as of yet, whereas the projects under the other Actions were implemented.

- 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?**

The implementation of the part of the projects under AP 2009 commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010, the implementation of the remaining projects will start on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010. These projects follow up the projects from the 3<sup>rd</sup> call for proposals under AP 2008, the objective of which was to increase allocation of unutilized funds allocated under AP 2008.

- 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?**

The distribution of the funding allocated under AP 2009 between the Actions was appropriate.

#### **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?**

The management and control system has not been set efficiently, considering the fact that so far we have not received the guidelines from the European Commission relating to the “minimum requirements for certification”. Therefore the processes of the certification authority have been set for preventative reasons more strictly than it will be probably required.

**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**

The management and control system corresponds to the reviewed proposal which was submitted to the European Commission for approval on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2009. Nevertheless, the organization structure of the responsible authority, or more specifically, the Asylum and Migration Policy Department (AMPD), changed.

In the original proposal the activities of the responsible authority were secured by employees from the department for EU and international law under AMPD. However, with the effect from 31<sup>st</sup> January 2009 this department was cancelled and divided into two new departments and effective 1<sup>st</sup> February 2009, the activities of the responsible authority have been newly secured through the European Community Funds Department under AMPD.

**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?**

The largest portion of the allocated funds was assigned to the Action no. 1, “the foundation and operation of integration centers”, within which the support of integration of legally residing third-country nationals into the majority society through the centers established at the regional level was decentralized. Under annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009, 10 centers for support of integration of third-country nationals were established in the following regions: South-Bohemia, South-Moravia, Karlovy Vary, Liberec, Moravia-Silesia, Olomouc, Pardubice, Plzeň, Ústec and Zlín. The integration centers in the remaining regions (Central Bohemia, Vysočín and Královehradec) will be established under the 2010 annual programme. Under the 2011 annual programme the integration centre in the Capital City of Prague will be established.

The centers have become an initiator and implementing entity of the integration activities and actions supporting and enabling improvement mainly of the social, legal, language and cultural positions of foreigners in the regions of the CR. In the regions where the centers have not yet been established, the projects were implemented within the action of providing the assistance services to third-country nationals.

Furthermore, the projects were implemented in favor of foreigners – unaccompanied minors (“minor foreigners”), which helped to improve individual preparation of minors for independent life (integration) after attaining the age of majority and their departure from the centre designated for them and their departure from the facility.

The projects were implemented focused mainly on enhancing awareness and active involvement of the host society (majority society, media, public administration authorities and other relevant organizations) into the integration process under the 2008 and 2009 annual programmes. The projects were implemented by a broad spectrum of NNOs both in regional and nationwide scope.

Last but not least the cooperation among Czech regional and local authorities, NNOs and similar institutions from particular Member States was supported during the implementation of integration policies and application of the actions for support of the integration of foreigners.

**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?*

In response to an increased number of foreigners in the territory of the CR in 1999 the Czech Republic prepared a fifteen-clause strategy “*The Principles of the Integration Conception for Foreigners in the Czech Republic*” which became the basis of the document “*The Integration Conception for Foreigners*” prepared and adopted by the government of the CR in 2000. Since that year the conception has been annually updated and submitted to the government for approval. By this conception a necessary prerequisite for gradual development of targeted and systematic policy in the integration of foreigners was established. The effort of the governmental policy was mainly to bring the status of foreigners living in the Czech Republic legally and for a long time closer to the status of citizens of the CR and to systematically protect political, economic, social and cultural rights of immigrants and remove obstacles preventing foreigners from their integration.

In accordance with the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration in the European Union, the Czech Republic places great emphasis on basic knowledge of language, history and institutions of the host society. Therefore a new statutory obligation was established by law which requires foreigners who apply for permanent residence in the territory of the CR to pass the examination in the Czech language at A1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. In addition to language education the CR considers education in general to be one of the key areas without which a successful integration of *immigrants (foreigners)* is unthinkable.

It was clearly defined that the primary interest of the government is to facilitate the integration of foreigners who reside in the territory of the CR, or, as the case may be, want to reside, on a long-term or permanent basis (it is based on the assumption that the longer a foreigner resides in the territory of the CR, the more likely it is that s/he stays here; an intention of a foreigner to reside in the territory of the CR on a long-term or permanent basis may also be presumed from the purpose of residence of the respective foreigner). Generally, the target group of The Integration Conception for Foreigners consists of foreigners residing and living in the territory of the CR legally and for a long time.

Experience shows that the process of integration of foreigners is most successful, when it takes place soon after their arrival in the host country and covers a broad scope. At the same time it is clear that such governmental policy is very costly. The target group of The Integration Conception for Foreigners excludes nationals of EU Member States and applicants for international protection.

The projects implemented within EIF are complemented by the projects implemented within the Integration Conception for Foreigners in the territory of the CR.

\* 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?*

Results of the projects implemented within the respective APs are in accordance with the objectives set in MAP.

\* 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.*

Efficiency is secured by the selection of projects, because only the projects whose efficiency has been secured as early as at the moment of setting the project objectives and budget are co-funded from the Fund.

Subsequently the projects are monitored and audited by the responsible authority.

\* 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?*

In the process of selecting the projects by the selection committee for assessment of the projects submitted under EIF, possible individual overlaps of the submitted project with other Community funds (for example, in relation to the European Social Fund) are examined.

The Ministry of the Interior (simultaneously responsible for the European Refugee Fund – hereinafter only as the “ERF”) will also ensure the conditions for exclusion of possible overlaps and duplicities between ERF and EIF.

Thus, to make an overlap of projects under EIF and their duplicate funding under the Community funds impossible, the Ministry of the Interior will take administrative measures so that a project application published as a part of the invitation will include a question on whether finances from other sources of the EU will be used for the same project and require

the information about all similar projects implemented by the applicant within the relevant period. If so, the project will be excluded at an early stage of selection.

The responsible authority also take other legal, organization and control measures to exclude duplicate funding – obligation to draw only from one EU source is incorporated in the contracts concluded with the project implementing entity.

The Ministry of Interior prepares annual summaries of all projects focused on the integration of foreigners. When assessing the projects under EIF, the summaries are used as an ancillary control mechanism to detect duplicate funding, if any.

### \* 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.*

The projects implemented within EIF are complemented by the projects implemented within the Integration Conception for Foreigners in the territory of the CR. This was taken into account in the course of preparation of MAP and APs.

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

See below.

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?

The requirement of the EC for revision of annual programmes in case of redistribution of allocated funds by more than 10% increased administrative demands of programming. Therefore, we suggest this activity to be left in the competence of Member States.

Furthermore we suggest that 3-year program documents are prepared instead of annual programmes in order to decrease administrative burden imposed both on Member States and the European Commission.

\* 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?

Implementation of projects was quite demanding due to the missing unambiguous interpretation of the Annex no. 11 Eligibility of Expenditure. We have already received a 3<sup>rd</sup>

interpretation version of this document from the EC and this is not the final one, either. In case of ambiguities, when the EC is contacted, the answers usually are delivered with long delays.

\* 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?

It would be helpful in the implementation if the EC provides promised documents on time/earlier. The promised guidance related to the minimum requirements for certification which is still not submitted 3 months before the date set for submitting the final report may serve as an example.

*End of the report*