

**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)

Finland.....

Date:

30.6.2010

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

Johanna Puiro  
Deputy to the Director General,  
Senior Adviser, Legal affairs  
International Affairs Unit  
Ministry of the Interior  
Finland

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

Kristiina Mauriala  
tel: + 358 71 878 8265  
kristiina.mauriala@intermin.fi

**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; all the programmes 2007-2009 have been implemented using the awarding body method....

- 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 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: 2 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2009: 1 (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 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	47	70	48	118 <sup>1</sup>
Projects selected	10	18	12	40
Projects funded	10	18	12	40

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

Yes/No: No....

- If *No*, explain why: In 2008, one of the selected projects withdrew their proposal after the selection due to the complicated administration measures. The applicant had not been prepared to the complexity of the EU -funding. The funding reserved for this project was granted for another project that had been put on a reserve list by the IF steering Committee in the selection meeting. The project was implemented with substantially lower amount of funding than it had requested.

<sup>1</sup> The 2007-2008 Call for Proposals was organised at the same time, therefore the proposals received for 2007 and 2008 include the same 47 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	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)	10	18	12	40
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	10	18	12	40

**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 →	10	18	12
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	4	10	6
Priority 2	2	0	2
Priority 3	4	8	4
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>10</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>12</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
Category b)	<i>7</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>9</i>
Category c)	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</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>10</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>12</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>2</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>0</i>

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

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

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

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes/No: .....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*By Priority*

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

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

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

*By Category of Actions*

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

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

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

*Specific Priorities*

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

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

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

*Explanations for this part:*

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

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

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

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

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

*(Explanations continue on the next page)*

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

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

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

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

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

Under priority 1 there are two types of actions. In the first one measures are funded which:

- support the integration of immigrants in a vulnerable position for example by improving individual integration plans
- prevent problems, such as marginalization, loneliness, violence and exclusion
- increase the awareness of immigrants in a vulnerable position of their rights and opportunities
- develop integration measures and -services to better cater for the special needs of the immigrants in a vulnerable position

The second set of actions include measures which:

- develop new measures for the integration of newly arrived third country nationals
- develop and test guidance, advisory services and training at the country of departure, which supports the integration of TCNs at arrival
- serve the special needs and opportunities for smooth integration of the work and study-related immigrants

#### 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

The first set of actions under priority 2 include measures which

- develop qualitative and quantitative indicators for integration
- produces studies and surveys for the development of public and private services to serve the needs of groups with special needs and to disseminate best practices

Examples of the second set of actions funded include

- development of a barometer to collect immigrant views on the measures, efficiency and usability of integration policies
- measures utilizing immigrant views and opinions in the integration policy planning and decision-making

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

Under action 5 are funded measures which

- increase the expertise and awareness of the authorities, service providers and third sector actors through training and equality planning
- develop and implement intercultural training, increase intercultural preparedness and diversity management
- increase tolerance towards immigration and integration measures by increasing the awareness of different actors
- increase the TCNs’ access to training and employment and their opportunity for various services

Under action 6 are funded measures which

- increase the equality of TCNs
- increase the two-way process of integration by developing the exchange of information between interest groups, by increasing the interaction between cultures, communities and religious groups and by developing new measures for hearing of the parties of TCNs
- increase sustainable participation of TCNs in the activities of the society

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

N/A

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**

Majority of the applications were directed at action A1 whereas actions B3 and B4 received very few applications. Similarly, actions C5 and C6 raised little interest in the first call for proposals, but they the situation improved in the 2009 call for proposals. Action A2 has not materialized to the extent expected due to the economic situation.

The special actions have been defined specifically enough in the programme and hence no changes to them have been required. A large part of the projects have implemented specific priorities.

**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*

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**

*Maximum length: half a page*

**In the “awarding body” method**

As a result of the open calls for proposals organised in 24/10/2008 - 8/12/2008 and in 23/11/09 - 11/12/09 no proposals were received for the following Actions which were included in the original Annual Programme:

Under Priority 2:

- ACTION 3: Qualitative and quantitative indicators of integration
- ACTION 4: Barometer

In a revised 2008 programme funds were shifted between the Actions following the results of the 2 open Calls for Proposals.

### 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*

#### **Priority 1**

The project aims to develop, test and design a model for a social centre with accessible services for vulnerable women, children and young people from third countries. The purpose of the working environment is to support the integration process by preventing problems associated with the integration process. Examples of these problems are marginalization, loneliness, violence and inadequate awareness of one’s rights and opportunities. The project is conducted by third-country citizens, their organizations and agencies. The working methods include the training of immigrant women, personal customer service, counselling and advice.

The project has exceeded all the expectations. The beneficiary has been able to create services that are easy to reach also for the most vulnerable groups of women and young people. The services provided at the centre support the other services provided by the NGO and therefore women that visit the centre receive help and get guidance for also several problems they face in life. The importance of the centre has been acknowledged nationally and most importantly the target group finds the centre to be safe and easily accessed. Around 40-50 women visit the centre daily.

### **Priority 3**

The project aims to raise awareness among authorities about immigrants in regional area Pirkanmaa's Thai community. The project highlights problems from the immigrant's point of view and creates cooperation networks between different actors. Mutual awareness and knowledge is added during the project. The results are used for training the Police Force and for the design and the implementation of the municipal integration policy and measures.

The project has successfully reached the target group. The Thai-community is in an especially vulnerable position as they easily fall outside the scope of authority measures. Therefore the project tackles a problem which is not easy to solve. A lot of information has been gathered about the target group which can be utilized in both the planning of public services and in organizing cooperation with the third sector. The project results can be utilized nation-wide and information sharing has already taken place. The results are especially useful during police training and it can be used in relation to other target groups.

#### **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*

The project aimed to prevent social exclusion and promote integration of children and young people by creating a model for family learning of language and culture. The project was implemented by a municipal elementary school. The project gained some positive feedback and gave new development ideas for the municipality but overall effectiveness of the project was poor.

The main reason for the failure was that the project concentrated organising different small scale activities for the target group and the actual modeling process was never conducted. The results were local and it did not produce any greater value. More over, the project was left unconnected to the integration work done elsewhere. The project struggled with the target group of the Integration Fund, since especially at school level it is against the Equality Act to

differentiate the participants in to “refugees and other third country citizens”. Therefore, the project did not manage to reach its target group properly.

Furthermore, the beneficiary was not prepared for the complexity of the EU -funding. The budget of the project was relatively small and thus it did not have a coordinator that would have taken care of the project administration and other responsibilities. The administration was managed by few teachers that had to take care all their other responsibilities at the same time. Because of this the project was delayed from the very beginning by several months. Added to this during the implementation of the pproject the organisation of the school was changed, which diminished even more the time the beneficiary was able to spend with the project administration.

## **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.*

The technical assistance of the Fund is used for the management and control system and implementation of the Fund and for the preparation of the programmes. The activities under the technical assistance include e.g. staff costs, preparation costs of the Multi-annual and Annual Programmes, Calls for proposals including publications, training activities, to cover travel costs (e.g. on-the-spot monitoring visits to the projects, travelling to the SOLID Committee meetings and to other fund-related meetings) and other measures needed to implement the Fund. The technical assistance measures for the Integration Fund are implemented together with technical assistance measures for the three other SOLID Funds. The portion of the costs for common measures is charged to the corresponding Fund in a reasonable and variable manner, and measures will be taken to ensure that there is no double financing of the costs.

In the International Affairs Unit, acting as the responsible authority for all the SOLID Funds, one national coordinator is appointed for the Integration Fund. There is also a coordinator for the Return Fund, External Borders Fund and the European Refugee Fund, and two financial coordinators who take care of the financial issues related to all the four Funds and a secretary common to all coordinators. The EBF coordinator has the overall responsibility of horizontal issues related to the SOLID Funds. The salary, travel costs and per diems of the coordinator for IF (including i.e. participation to the SOLID Committee meetings, monitoring visits to the projects, and cooperation with other Member States designated authorities) will be covered from the technical assistance. Salaries (partly) of the financial coordinators and secretary in the RA and the salary (partly) of the CA will also be covered from the IF technical assistance. Also the travel costs related to the IF of these persons will be covered from the IF technical assistance.

The technical assistance measures under the RF will be implemented together with technical assistance measures under the three other SOLID Funds. The portion of the costs of common measures is charged to the corresponding Fund in a reasonable and verifiable manner, and efforts will be made to ensure that there is no double financing of the costs.

## **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**

The responsible authority has ensured visibility of the Integration Fund in its activities. The EU-logo has been used in all written material and displayed in the IF events.

A common website was created on 7 December 2007 for the SOLID Funds and under this website there is a sub site for each SOLID Fund. The common site provides general information about the funds, forthcoming training sessions for potential applicants and materials from all the training sessions for (potential) final beneficiaries. Summaries of multi-annual and annual programmes, application guidelines, application forms, project implementation materials (report templates, guidelines etc) and lists of funded projects have been published on the webpage.

The calls for proposals have been published in two national newspapers and on the ministry's webpage. In addition information about the call has been distributed through several mailing lists and other web-sites.

Articles about SOLID Funds have also been published in professional publication (Monitori magazine) by the responsible authority in autumn 2007 and in winter 2008.

The Responsible Authority organised an information tour in September and October 2008 where information of the four SOLID Funds was distributed. The information day consisted of a general part and fund-specific workshops. The tour was organised to launch the SOLID Funds nationally. The tour was organised in Helsinki, Tampere, Rovaniemi, Oulu and Kuopio.

In 2009 the Responsible Authority organised training for the potential final beneficiaries (ERF, IF and RF) in August and September in Helsinki, Tampere, Oulu and Kuopio and for the EBF beneficiaries in October in Helsinki. In December 2009 the Responsible Authority organised a common meeting for the final beneficiaries of the four SOLID Funds. In this meeting the Responsible Authority gave a state of play of the Funds and the final beneficiaries presented their projects co-financed from the SOLID Funds (management, best practises etc.). This meeting was also an opportunity for the final beneficiaries to meet each other and find possibilities to cooperate.

During guidance visits the responsible authority has provided guidance for each project individually in following the visibility regulations of the IF. Information and publicity have also been monitored during the project implementation through interim reports and in-situ visits to projects.

At this stage it has still been too early to create publicity for the achievements of the annual programmes.

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

The projects are given guidance on following the visibility regulations of the IF. The projects have submitted a publicity plan where they have listed the planned visibility activities and described how the contribution from the IF is made visible.

The contribution from the IF has usually been made visible through dissemination activities including reports and other written materials as well as internet, seminars, articles and interviews by the media. An indication of IF co-financing has been printed on project material and EU-logo has been used where appropriate. The EU-logo has been placed on the equipment purchased for the project. In seminars, conferences and other public events, the audience have been made aware of IF co-financing. If the projects have published material in newspapers, noticeboards, etc, the IF-logo has been made visible.

Majority of the funded projects have been relatively small, local projects. These projects have received publicity mainly in local newspapers and radio. Larger, nationwide projects have sometimes gained publicity in the national media.

**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	784 364,00	784 364,00	100%
Programme 2008	750 236,00	750 236,00	100%
Programme 2009	907 280,00	907 280,00	100%
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	<b>2 441 880,00</b>	<b>2 441 880,00</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Based on:*

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

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

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

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

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

Due to the late start of the IF programme implementation in 2007 the first call for proposals was delayed until the end of 2008. The funding decisions were finally made in February 2009. The projects did not want to risk starting the activities or recruiting project personnel before the official funding decisions were made and therefore the selected projects started the activities at a very late stage in spring 2009. This affected several projects' possibility to receive the objectives set out in the funding decision and to use all the funding.

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

In autumn 2008 it was discussed at the SOLID committee that the 2007 and 2008 programmes could be implemented simultaneously. Therefore, a common Call for Proposals was organised. This has created confusion since the commission instructed at later stage that the programmes should be reported separately. Due to this confusion the projects were divided into two separate annual programmes only after the funding decisions had been made.

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

Revision of the 2007 programme has not been 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)**

The programme has been fully 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?**

It is too early to estimate the results. The responsible authority has received all the final reports but they have not been reviewed yet.

At least part of the results will not be achieved since many of the projects have not materialized fully.

**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?**

Since the call for proposals for 2007 and 2008 was organised simultaneously there were no difficulties in the distribution of the IF funding between the Actions. However, had there been a separate call for proposals for the AP 2007 a revision would most probably have been

needed. During the 2007-2009 most of the project applications have been addressed to Action 1 and therefore more funding has been allocated for these actions in the 2010 programme.

The actions do not fully support the national need for integration measures. Majority of the IF project have been funded under Action 1 as it is the action that annually receives a majority of the project proposals. However, since the Actions have been modified and the criteria made clearer (Call for proposals for 2009) also the Actions under priority 3 have received more proposals.

## **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?**

Due to the late start of the IF programme implementation in 2008 the first call for proposals was delayed until the end of 2008. The funding decisions were made in February 2009. This delayed the implementation of the projects accordingly, and affected several projects' possibility to receive the objectives set out in the funding decision and to use all the funding.

The second call for proposals was organised because it was foreseen that part of the funding would remain unspent. At the same time the commission extended the eligibility period. The eligibility period for the projects funded in the second call for proposals was only six months. Many of these projects have struggled in the implementation and therefore, some of the funding will probably still remain unused.

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

Due to the delay in the implementation the selected projects were not able to use all the funding that was granted to them in the funding decisions.

Since the eligibility period for the 2008 AP was extended a new call for proposals was organised in order to commit all the funding.

### **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?**

The AP 2008 has been revised twice. The revisions have been made following the results of the two Calls for Proposals. The Financial Plan has been revised since funding has been reallocated between different actions and quantitative and qualitative indicators have been completed. After the first call for proposals two Actions were removed from the programme since no proposals were received for them.

- 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)**

All funds have been committed by funding decisions but it is still too early to estimate if the 2008 AP will be fully 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?**

It is too early to estimate this. The responsible authority has received 9 of the 18 final reports but they have not been reviewed yet. There are still 9 projects on-going until the end of June 2010.

At least part of the result will not be achieved since many of the projects have been implemented smaller than originally estimated.

- 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?**

During 2007-2009 most of the project applications have been addressed to Action 1 and therefore more funding has been distributed there in the 2010 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 programme has been implemented as originally planned. The call for proposals was organised during the summer 2009 and projects were selected in autumn 2009. The award decisions were made in December 2009. The projects have been able to start in January 2010 and they will finish in the end of the 2010.

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

So far, there have not been any problems in implementing the 2009 programme.

**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?**

A revision is needed for the AP 2009. The revision will follow the results of the Open Call for Proposals organised in 2009. The Financial Plan should be revised and quantitative and qualitative indicators modified.

The revision is under progress and will be sent to the commission.

**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)**

It is too early to estimate this. The projects have started in January 2010 and the first progress reports will be received in the end of June 2010.

**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?**

It is too early to estimate this. The projects have started in January 2010 and the first progress reports will be received in the end of June 2010.

If the projects have been implemented as planned we expect that all the quantitative and qualitative results will be achieved.

**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 IF funding between the Actions has not been appropriate. From the 48 proposals received 15 was directed to Action 1, whereas only 1 project proposal was directed to Actions 3 and 4 each. Due to the financial situation there hasn't been need for recruitment from abroad and the Action 2 has not been implemented in the scale originally planned.

In the 2011 AP this is foreseen to be corrected and more emphasis will be placed on the Action 1 (Vulnerable third country citizens), 5 () and 6 (), which are Actions that need the most attention nationally.

#### **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?**

Yes. A Common management and Control System for all four Solid -funds has supported the management of the Integration Fund. All the funds have the same Audit and Certifying Authority, which has made cooperation with them smooth and well-functioning.

**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 workload of all four SOLID funds has been re- evaluated and more personnel have been appointed to the tasks, for example separate coordinators for the Return and Integration Funds have been appointed from 1 November 2009.

A manual of procedures relating to the functions of all designated bodies has been drafted and approved.

Different checklists have been designed for certifying task and for other tasks.such as payments and report cheks.

At the moment the responsible authority is evaluating the possibility to work more as a team where tasks between different Solid Funds would be divided process based instead of Fund based. In which case the processes such as evaluation of the project proposals and evaluation of the progress and final reports could be done as team work. This would speed up the process and also divide and balance the workload between different Funds.

The Commission audit mission to Finland took place during 14-18 June 2010. The commission made two main observations concerning the project management system of the SOLID funds: the most important finding was that the division of tasks within the Responsible Authority should be made clearer so that the coordinators are less involved in all parts of the management cycle.

The commission also recommended the RA to improve communication with the project applicants by a FAQ-application to ensure the project-related questions and answers are available to all applicants equally. Although the RA ensures the applicants do have equal access to guidance and informations, the RA has decided to introduce a FAQ function in the near future.

**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?**

On the one hand the IF has offered much needed resources for the development of integration measures which could not have been funded otherwise. There are no national resources available for this kind of development work. The IF has also empowered small NGOs that would not have had funding otherwise.

On the other hand the overall impact of the IF programme in Finland is rather limited because the annual allocation from the fund is relatively small. The funded projects are small in size and are often implemented locally. Also, more emphasis should be placed on modelling and disseminating the results achieved. A few larger projects are, however, implemented that have significance also at the national level. The implemented projects complement national and local actions.

**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 general the Actions have been relevant. The problem encountered is that despite the need to implement all the Actions there are not many beneficiaries who are able to implement them or there is no national funding available. Also, a connection between the programme level and

the project level is not always very strong even though the implemented projects are in line with the set Actions.

\* 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?*

The fund has benefited the groups in especially vulnerable position for whom there have been no previous integration-related measures available and/or whose needs have not been noted adequately in the services of the authorities. Additionally, the fund has provided an opportunity to develop indicators for integration and ethnic relations, the development of which has been on the agenda for some time, but which have lacked financing.

Further development is required on part of intercultural dialogue and two-way processes of integration. This has been partially hindered by the economic depression which has fed negative attitudes towards immigrants. Also, measures related to economic or work-related immigration under priority 2 have been left underdeveloped for similar reasons.

\* 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.*

The fund has made possible some good results with very few resources. But the funds are managed with small resources and there is a risk that the lack of resources hinders full utilizations or these type of measures.

\* 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?*

The aim has always been that the projects selected for IF funding would supplement action at national level. The principle is also laid out in the application criteria. However, in practice it is not always clear when IF programme funding is used for genuinely improving existing

practices and developing new operating approaches and when it is used as a substitute for action at national level.

When the projects are selected for co-financing, special attention is paid to the complementarity i.e. co-financed actions complete national migration and integration policy and other actions co-financed by the other EC instruments. Special attention is paid to make sure that programmes funded under the Action 2 (Assessment of counselling services and development of introductory courses) do not overlap with ESF. Double funding is avoided for example by contacting the regional Economic and Development Centres that coordinate the regional ESF funding in Finland before granting the funding for IF projects.

The specification of target groups has produced quite lot confusion between the IF and the European Refugee Fund. In Finland integration services are the same regardless of the status person has when he/she arrives to Finland. Therefore, categorising the target group by its status is very artificial and does not fit into many actions funded from the Integration Fund. However, the complementarity with the ERF is always checked before making the funding decisions and if a project is aimed at integrating refugees or other persons with an international protection (etc) status the project is not funded under IF.

#### \* 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.*

Although the importance of integration has been widely recognised, little public funding has been allocated for integration, particularly at municipal level. There are no national resources available for this kind of development work and the IF has brought much needed resources to the development of integration measures. A major part of the projects could not have been funded otherwise. IF funding has allowed the development, testing and evaluating of integration models and helped to fill in some gaps in the services. The Fund has particularly benefited the situation of the vulnerable third country citizens and small migrant NGOs.

However, the overall policy impact of the If programme in Finland has been rather limited because the annual allocation from the Fund is relatively small.

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

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 overall aims and priorities of the multi-annual programme are set too tight and there is not enough room for programme modifications and such modifications are administratively heavy. This affects also the annual programming since it is not possible to amend the programme to correspond the yearly needs. During 2007-2009 the Annual Programme for the Finnish Integration Fund has been quite similar and no big changes have been made. The reason for this is that we have wanted to get experiences of the programme before making any changes or removing Actions. Depending on the call for proposals for the 2010 some bigger changes might be made for the AP 2011. In summary, the strict programming framework fails to serve the changing needs of the national level.

The management tasks of the responsible authority should be simplified. The first recommendation is to simplify the programming and reporting obligations, which are too time consuming and leave too little resources for follow-up of the implementation and ability to concentrate on the content. The programming periods should be extended so that annual programmes would not be needed, and more flexibility should be provided to implement the calls for proposals through various theme-calls, for example. Instead of preparing a separate annual programme for each year it would be more ideal to follow the implementation via annual reports. This would increase efficiency as well as reduce the administrative workload.

Most of the revisions for the annual programmes are following the results of the open calls for proposals after which it is most often the financial plan or the indicators that are revised. However, in this context the content of the programme itself usually does not change. The guidelines for programme revisions should therefore be reconsidered so that only larger changes to the multi-annual programme would be reported.

\* 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?

The management structure of the IF could be simplified. Particularly at the project level, the eligibility rules and other implementation rules are often experienced to be too heavy.

The eligibility rules create confusion because there seems to be no unified interpretation for them. Therefore, they should be simplified and strict interpretations should be abandoned. This would also help to ensure a higher utilization of the funding.

For the beneficiaries, it is difficult to identify and separate the target groups of the IF and the ERF. The question is also more wide-ranging; concerning equality of the target groups as well as how integration and particularly the two- way process of integration can succeed if one group is excluded from the process?

\* 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?

*End of the report*