

**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: (Greece)

**Hellenic Republic
Ministry of Interior, Decentralization and E-Government
General Secretariat for Migration Policy
General Directorate for Migration Policy and Social Integration
Social Integration Division**

Date: 15 July 2010

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

**ANDREAS TAKIS
SECRETARY GENERAL FOR MIGRATION POLICY**

.....

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

Mrs Athanasia Ioannou
Head of Implementation Unit
Social Integration Division
Ministry of Interior, Decentralization and E-government
General Secretariat for Migration Policy
General Directorate for Migration Policy and Social Integration

Address: 2, Evangelistrias Str
105 63, Athens, Greece
Tel.: +30 210 3741015, +30 210 3741263
Fax: +30 210 3741242
Email: intl.metanastefsi@ypes.gr

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

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

Yes/ No: **NO**

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

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

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

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

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

Important remark

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

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

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

CONTENTS

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

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No: **YES**

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

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

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

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

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: eight (8) calls for proposals
- Programme 2008: eleven (11) calls for proposals
- Programme 2009: eight (8) calls for proposals have been published

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009*	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	56	46	-	102
Projects selected	8	11	-	19
Projects funded	7	11	-	18

* For 2009 Annual Programme no proposals have been received as the deadline for the submission of applications is 02/08/2010.

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

Yes/No: **NO**

- If *No*, explain why: The project belongs to 2007 Annual Programme, under Priority 1, Category Action b, Specific Priorities 2 & 3 and was funded in the awarding body method, with a call for proposal.

The Responsible Authority had to terminate the Grant Agreement of the project and recall the Approval Decision, due to the following reasons:

- The project presented unjustified divergence in regards to the terms of the Grant Agreement. In particular, the final beneficiary did not perform the obligation for submitting to the Responsible Authority, in specified terms and even after several

reminders and notification letters were sent and deadlines for submission were stipulated, the quarterly reporting documents, without also justifying the reasons for not complying with that obligation.

- After performing administrative and on the spot verifications, the RA detected irregularities concerning the processes and transactions of a specific cost category. More specifically, the underlying methods and transactions concerning the employment contracts and payments of staff did not comply with the national rules and procedures governing public sector organizations as well as the legal framework of the final beneficiary.

However, no procedure for the return of amounts unduly paid or paid following an irregularity was activated, due to the fact that no pre-financing or any other reimbursement of expenditure had been paid to the final beneficiary.

Therefore, the number of projects actually funded under 2007 Annual Programme are seven (7).

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	No projects funded yet	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)	7	11	No projects funded yet	18
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	0	0	No projects funded yet	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	7	11	-	18

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 →	7	11	No projects funded yet
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	4	7	-
Priority 2	0	1	-
Priority 3	3	2	-
Priority 4	0	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>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	7	11	No projects funded yet
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	2	2	-
Category b)	1	0	-
Category c)*	4	8	-
Category d)	0	1	-

*We wish to note that when AP 2007 and AP 2008 were drafted and approved, projects were correlated to Article 4 of the EIF Council Decision (Decision 2007/435/EC), which in par.3 allocates the eligible actions to both categories c) and d) of Art. 3. However, in this table we allocate – as requested - every project to the category (c or d of Art.3) we consider to be the predominant one.

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→	7	11	No projects funded yet
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	0	0	-
Specific Priority 2 only	1	0	-
Specific Priority 3 only	0	0	-
Specific Priority 4 only	0	1	-
Specific Priority 5 only	1	1	-
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	1	0	-
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	4	9	-

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No: **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 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.

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

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

Yes/No:

- If No, explain why:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Priority

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

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

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

By Category of Actions

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

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

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

Specific Priorities

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

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

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

Explanations for this part:

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

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

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

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

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

(Explanations continue on the next page)

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

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

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

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

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Under a call for proposal:

- Projects concerning information/advertising actions (booklets, media, workshops) addressed to TCN's in order to a) enable them to develop a full image of their rights and obligations, b) smoothen their integration process to local society and c) assist social cohesion by eliminating phobic syndromes within local societies.
- Projects concerning programmes of greek language/educational programmes as part of the national integration policy in order to a) create conditions which fully ensure equal participation of TCN's in the educational services, b) safeguard the individual and social rights of TCN's, c) promote equal opportunities and d) further strengthen the social dimension of school and the development of intercultural orientation.
- Projects concerning pre-departure measures educational programmes in order to a) familiarize potential migrants with the Greek language as well as with the wider social and cultural environment in Greece, b) enable migrants to strengthen their self-sufficiency and make use of their skills and c) facilitate their access to the labour market.
- Projects concerning cultural events in order to a) promote the integration of T.C.Ns, b) contribute to bridging TCN's cultural identities with those of the host society and c) eliminate discrimination, negative stereotypes, xenophobia and social exclusion.
- Projects concerning information systems (portal, data base) in order to a) upgrade the information provided by the state to immigrants and b) ensure the cohesion and efficiency of national integration policy implemented.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

Under a call for proposal:

- Project concerning the development of indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of actions related to the admission and integration of third-country nationals to greek society in order to a) identify qualitative and quantitative elements as an important parameter and precondition to define specific objectives and elaborate feasible action plans and b) to modernize integration policies and strengthen the mechanisms of planning, implementation and monitoring of integration policies.
- Projects concerning studies for statistical recording of data about a) female integration to Greece and an assessment of actions in the sector of the labour market and b) the profile of second generation immigrants and their living conditions by identifying opportunities, challenges and needs.
- Project concerning opinion polls for the planning and management of integration policies as well as an interpretation of the results, reflecting social trends and provide useful information on the assessment of the policies.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Under a call for proposal:

- Projects concerning training programmes of civil servants dealing with TCN's or handling issues related to them in order to a) enable public servants at all levels of government to meet their commitments and successfully fulfill their obligations and b) to assist them in the acquisition of specialized knowledge required to serve immigrants and the planned national policies.
- Project concerning collection of appropriate data and information for NGOs responsible for the planning and implementation of national migration policy in order to a) constitute the basis for the creation of an integrated information system at a subsequent stage and b) lay the foundations of a platform of dialogue with civil society.
- Project concerning training programmes addressed to staff serving in the area of the penitentiary offices services and the central office of the Ministry of Justice, in order to sensitise and consolidate the concept of respect to diversity, eliminate social exclusion, conflicts and racial discrimination.

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

Under a call for proposal:

- Project for the presentation of good practices from member states, that promotes the acceptance on behalf of T.C.Ns of components forming their national identity (history, tradition and cultural heritage, civilization and culture, values and principles) as well as their empowerment and the development of relations and contacts with the Greek society at various levels (social, financial, cultural).
- Project concerning the implementation of a pan-european conference in order to highlight concerns and give answers to issues concerning health, welfare services provided to TCN's in order to improve the current situation.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

N/A

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

N/A

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

Maximum length: half a page

No significant changes occurred to the distribution of projects funded.

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

Maximum length: half a page

No significant changes occurred to the distribution of the projects funded.

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

No other significant changes 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.

Maximum length: half a page

Greek language and history courses for migrant mothers (1.3/07)

Project 1.3/07, under Priority 1 of 2007 Annual Programme was implemented by the City of Athens Development Agency S.A. in cooperation with the Hellenic Migration Policy Institute and the Institute for Life-long training. It took place at municipal playschools of Athens from September 2009 to December 2009. The total realised cost amounts to 298.871,59 € The particular educational programme aimed at a first familiarization of migrant mothers with the Greek language and history enabling them to improve their quality of life, strengthen their self-sufficiency and assist their children at school.

Immigrant women, particularly at time of arrival, exhibit different observable and unobservable characteristics, as well as different behaviour. The imperfect knowledge of language and of cultural and social norms is potentially a significant handicap for them in their every day life.

Studying the added value of the project special attention is devoted to the fact that the project was accessible to migrant mothers *with* their children. During the courses infant teachers were taking care of immigrants’ little children. Moreover, the project guaranteed the access to the right to education that

meets the needs and abilities of migrant women. On this basis, the educational programme took into account the needs of different groups of women and provided two (2) levels of Greek language courses for beginners and advanced learners. Thus, it offered a personal approach that combined enforcement with facilitation in a balanced way.

In general, the above mentioned project is expected to offer durable improvements in participants' quality of life and to support active involvement of immigrant women in working to achieve their personal objectives as well as active participation in public and political life. Furthermore, creating an environment of empowerment and motivation resulted in the development of skills that enable immigrant women to increase their productivity at work.

Educational programme in Moldova (pre-departure measures) for potential migrants (1.5/07)

Project 1.5/07, under Priority 1 of 2007 Annual Programme, was implemented by the International Organisation for Migration - Greek Mission, in cooperation with the International Organisation for Migration - Mission of the Republic of Moldova. It took place at Chisinau from September 2009 to December 2009. The total realised cost amounts to 129.136,71€ The particular educational programme aimed at a first familiarization of potential migrants with the Greek language as well as with the wider social and cultural environment in Greece. The objectives of the action promoted the possibility of obtaining formal and informal information on the institutions and values of the Greek society, practical knowledge as well as professional orientation.

Focusing on the added value of the project it should be mentioned that for the first time - within the framework of the mobility partnership between Greece and the Republic of Moldova – our country succeeded in reaching out groups of potential migrants that it was difficult to reach before.

The project sought to sensitise prospective migrants about their legal rights and obligations in the destination country and provided the necessary tools to enable this specific target group to strengthen its self-sufficiency. Linked to this was the attempt to facilitate potential migrants' access to the labour market, through professional orientation, in accordance with the procedures provided in the national legislation. This part of the project is expected to contribute to a better matching of skills with real jobs.

At the same time, wide dissemination of information about how to process migration, for those who want to migrate in Greece, is expected to increase the percentage of legal migration and prevent possible attempts of illegal entering in the country.

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

No “failure” projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that during the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme one project (1.4/07 Innovative project for Greek language learning through music and songs for migrants’ children beyond the levels of the Greek educational system) undertaken by the Municipality of Ano Liossia has been recalled due to the fact that the final beneficiary did not comply sufficiently with grant agreement’s terms and conditions. The process of recall was completed before funding the project.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

IV.1. Technical assistance

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

15 lines maximum

- Upgrade of infrastructure to strengthen the operational capability of the RA, CA and AA in terms of computer equipment.
- Provision of specialized advisory services in order to strengthen the technical and administrative capacity of the RA in relation to the call for proposals, the monitoring and completion of the projects, as well as the ex-post evaluation activities.
- Establishment and functioning of committees and sub-committees in order to assist the tasks (evaluation, monitoring and completion of the projects) carried out by the RA
- Actions concerning the strengthening of the operational capability and auditing procedures carried out by the CA and the AA.
- Information, dissemination, publication actions of the Annual and Multiannual programme
- Acquisition, installation and maintenance of the Management Information System of the EIF.

IV.2. Information and Publicity

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

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

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

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

Maximum 15 lines

- Publication of the Calls for Proposals to the national press and the internet portal of the Fund.
- Publication on the internet portal of the Fund of the list of the final beneficiaries and the financial contributions concerned.
- Dissemination of the objectives and the content of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013 and of the Annual Programmes through: a) a public event for the presentation of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013 and of the Actions under A.P. of 2007 and 2008, and an event for the presentation of the content of the Actions approved under A.P. 2007 and 2008, presented by each Final Beneficiary and c) a public consultation event regarding Actions of Annual Programmes.
- Publication regarding the Multiannual Programme as well as the Annual Programmes of 2007 and 2008.
- Supply of permanent prominent plaques for the premises of the Responsible Authority.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

Final beneficiaries' followed certain rules and procedures concerning publicity/information activities during the implementation of the projects and in particular:

- In all documents, reports, certificates, correspondence addressed either to the RA or to third parties, the emblems of EU, EIF and national contribution (flag) were included.
- According to the content of the publication (e.g. letter, tv or radio spot, printed material etc) an extra statement was included, highlighting equally EU and national contribution (e.g. percentages of EU and national contribution) with reference to the title, code and in some cases budget of the project.

**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	1.527.626,75	1.305.130,47	85,4
Programme 2008	2.063.575,78	2.008.426,96	97,3
Programme 2009	2.653.009,62	0,00*	-
TOTAL 2007-2009	6.244.212,15	3.313.557,43 *	53,1 *

** For 2009 Annual Programme no projects have been funded yet as the deadline for the submission of applications is 02/08/2010.*

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

Based on:

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

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

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

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

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

15 lines maximum

In general, 2007 Annual Programme has been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule, apart from one action that was terminated, and another action that needed to be revised due to improper reference of target group indicated in the Grant Agreement (the reasons described in previous part of this report), and therefore no revision of the programme was necessary. The implementation of the actions by the final beneficiaries was in alignments with the Grant Agreements and all the relevant clauses.

Other amendments made to the Grant Agreements concerned physical aspects and financial adjustments of the actions during their implementation.

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

15 lines maximum

During the implementation of 2007 Annual Programme, the following issues were identified. Due to the fact that the Management and Control System of the RA was under finalization, mechanisms concerning the programming phase of the actions (e.g. establishment of Committees) and the

cooperation between the three funds (IF,ESF,ERF) was never activated. Furthermore, in reference to the submission deadline of the applications, a short period of time was allowed to potential beneficiaries. Concerning the above issues, the RA shall activate the mechanism of cooperation between the three above mentioned Funds and the involvement of members of the Funds in the selection committee for the programming period 2010 and also allow a minimum of 40 days for the submission of applications, for the programming period 2009.

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

15 lines maximum

For 2007 Annual Programme, no revision was 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)

15 lines maximum

For 2007 Annual Programme the majority of projects were implemented, apart from one action, for the reasons mentioned in PART II of the present report.

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

15 lines maximum

Expected quantified results and proposed indicators from the implementation of the actions under 2007 Annual Programme have been broadly achieved, while no major variations occurred between the proposed targets and the realized results.

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

15 lines maximum

The distribution of EIF funding between the actions was appropriate and in alignment with the 2007 Annual Programme submitted to the Commission. More specifically, the actions were consistent with the targets and the needs of the key actions of 2007-2013 Multiannual Programme.

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

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

15 lines maximum

In general, 2008 Annual Programme has been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule. The implementation of the actions by the final beneficiaries is in alignments with the Grant Agreements and all the relevant clauses.

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

15 lines maximum

As mentioned in PART VI.1, section 2. However, some delays for the award of projects under 2008 Annual Programme were encountered, due to the fact that 2007 and 2008 AP were published at the same period of time and too many applications were submitted. Apart from that, no other significant problems raised during the implementation.

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

15 lines maximum

A revision of 2008 Annual Programme was considered necessary, due to the finalization of the Management and Control System of the Responsible Authority, as well as the Manual for Procedures for the MCS. Furthermore, appropriate arrangements concerning procedures for the functioning of the RA and the designated Authorities as well as the implementation of the Fund took place. For that reason revisions in regard to the Implementation Methods and the Technical Assistance Actions accordingly were necessary. In more detail, the revision concerned: a) the appointment of an Evaluation Committee for the evaluation and approval of Actions under 2008 Annual programme, and the fees of its members, b) the appointment of a Project Monitoring and Completion Committee, and the fees of its members. The number of events concerning information and dissemination of the Multi-annual and 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes.

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

15 lines maximum

2008 Annual programme has been fully implemented as approved by the Commission.

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

15 lines maximum

Quantified results and proposed indicators from the implementation of the actions under 2008 Annual Programme are expected to be broadly achieved, with no major variations between the proposed targets and the realized results.

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

15 lines maximum

The distribution of EIF funding between the actions was appropriate and in alignment with the 2008 Annual Programme submitted to the Commission. More specifically, the actions were consistent with the targets and the needs of the key actions of 2007-2013 Multiannual 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?

15 lines maximum

No projects have been funded yet.

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

15 lines maximum

No projects have been funded yet.

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

15 lines maximum

A revision of 2009 Annual Programme was necessary, and the RA has already proceeded with the recording of the proposed changes and the submission of a revised programme to the Commission. The changes mainly concerned the description of some actions in order to be more detailed and precise.

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

15 lines maximum

The experience gained from the implementation of 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes as well as finalization of the Management and Control System and the detailed description of the procedures, have assisted the RA to better manage and implement its tasks and role as Responsible Authority of the EIF and therefore, all projects to be approved under the revised 2009 Annual Programme are expected to be fully implemented and be in broad line with the programmes schedule.

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

15 lines maximum

No projects under 2009 Annual Programme have been funded yet. However according to forecasts that have been made by the RA, taking into consideration the results of the implementation of 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes, the quantitative and qualitative results of 2009 as set out in the revised Annual Programme are expected to be in line with the scheduled programme.

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

15 lines maximum

No projects have been funded yet under 2009 Annual programme.

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

Based on:

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

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

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

Half a page maximum

The Management and Control System as well as the Manual of Procedures have been efficient so far for the functioning of the Responsible Authority in regards to the implementation of the Fund and the Annual Programmes. The written standards, procedures and documentation/guides concerning project evaluation and selection, verifications of the expenditure declared by final beneficiaries, including administrative verifications of the applications for reimbursement, on the spot verifications of individual projects and audit trail guidelines, ensured proper audit of expenditure and sound financial management of the projects. Although no major problems were illustrated during the implementation of the MCS, a limited number of issues were identified, mainly concerning the composition of committees in order to further improve the cooperation between the three funds (IF, ESF,ERF) and the complementarity of the actions financed under them and the functioning of the MASIF information system in order to ensure full compliance with the tasks of the delegated authorities (Audit and Certifying Authority).

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

Half a page maximum

The changes occurred in the MCS are stated in the submitted 2009 revised Annual programme and they refer to the following:

- Explanatory additions concerning the operational status of the Management and Control Systems.
- References to relevant national legislation, as basis for the implementation of the MCS procedures.
- Specification of the functions carried out directly by the Responsible Authority or/and in cooperation with other implicated bodies, in the context of management and monitoring of the Annual Programmes implementation.
- Issues relating with outsourcing of the R.A.'s tasks.
- Explanatory additions relating to organizational structure and specification of functions of the Responsible Authority and the cooperating Directorates of the Ministry of Interior, Decentralization and e-Government.
- Specification of procedures and functions of the R.A. when acting as an executing body.
- Specification of the functions carried out by the Audit Authority.
- Explanatory additions and specifications in regards to the achievement of key targets concerning:
a) Functioning of designated authorities, b) Operational and financial processes, c) Information management.

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

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

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

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

1 page maximum

The EIF's strategy in Greece has fitted into a pattern of general national initiatives and has responded to an overwhelming need in the area of social integration. It attempted particularly to provide advisory and educational services to TCNs and to enhance awareness raising of the host society and to contribute to the elimination of phenomena of racism, xenophobia and marginalisation.

The 2007 & 2008 Annual Programmes emphasised on projects of language training and employment counselling, on information campaigns addressed to TCN's and the host society, training programmes for Intercultural Mediators and surveys regarding the collection of data for Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Associations of Migrants in Greece as well as the setting up of indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of actions related to the admission and integration of third-country nationals to the Greek society.

In general, positive steps have been taken to improve various areas of TCNs' social integration. The results achieved for the period 2007 to 2009 confirm a general satisfaction since the majority of the goals and objectives of the annual programmes were accomplished.

It should be noted that EIF's strategy in Greece furthered the cooperation and communication between representatives of civil society, private and public actors. Building partnerships enabled a constructive approach of project operators through the exchange of know how, technical information as well as best practices regarding migration issues.

With regard to the organisational set-up and annual programmes' implementation, the Social Integration Division of the General Secretariat for Migration Policy of the Ministry of Interior, Decentralisation & E-Government as the Responsible Authority for Greece drafted and publicised the Calls for Proposals for 19 projects implementing 2007 & 2008 Annual Programmes (8 Actions for 2007, 11 Actions for 2008). In order to ensure the widest possible participation, the Responsible Authority proceeded to the publicity of the Call for Proposals on the official website of the European Integration Fund in Greece (<http://ete.yypes.gr/>). Furthermore, brief notices for the call for proposals were published in national daily newspapers.

In order to ensure the requisite transparency, guidelines for applicants were published on the official website of the European Integration Fund in Greece (Implementation Guide, Eligibility Rules).

The selection of projects for funding for the 2007 & 2008 Annual Programmes was carried out by the Evaluation Committee on June and July 2009. A large number of applications seen seemed of a high quality. The selection of final beneficiaries was carried out on the basis of specific criteria.

The selection procedure for the Annual Programmes 2007 & 2008 was completed by signing the Grant Agreement with the selected final beneficiaries.

With the view to ensuring the effectiveness and the implementation quality of the projects, the Responsible Authority has established a follow up mechanism which contains the following activities: a. drawing up a template of Datasheet for the Monitoring of the physical and economic progress of the project and b. constitution of the Monitoring Committee. Moreover, employees of the RA provided constant support and assistance to the final beneficiaries regarding issues related to the operational and financial aspect of the project.

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

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

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

15 lines maximum

Before examining the relevance of the EIF programmes' priorities and actions to our national situation emphasis should be laid on recent reforms on the legislative basis of social integration strategy of TCNs in Greece and are expected to substantially influence orientation and requirements of future integration schemes, especially by prioritizing the intensification of integrational effects at local/municipal level and the cooperation with migrant communities. More specifically:

A. A major reform regarding social integration was introduced by the law on the acquisition of Greek citizenship and the civic participation of TCNs adopted on March 2010 (Law 3838/10).

Among the changes introduced in the legislation are:

1. Specific procedure for the acquisition of Greek citizenship for children born in Greece whose parents residing legally and permanently for a long period of time in the country as well as for children of TCNs who have completed successfully at least six classes of Greek school in Greece, in order to reinforce their social integration.
2. Improvement of the procedure for the acquisition of Greek citizenship by means of naturalisation. In particular, the new law provides for a specific justification of the administrative decision and exhaustive deadlines regarding the citizenship procedure.

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

Additionally, an exhaustive list of substantial requirements for naturalisation is introduced aiming at evaluating the applicants' integration into the country's economic and social life.

3. Voting rights for ethnic Greeks and long term immigrants legally residing in the country in municipal elections, starting from the forthcoming elections in October 2010, aiming at enhancing their social integration at a local level.

B. Moreover, the administrative reform being advanced by the government in the local administration (Law 3852/2010 - code-named "Kallikratis") establishes local immigrant councils as consultative bodies, composed by elected representatives of the municipal board, actors of the local society as well as actors representing immigrants at a local level. The above mentioned councils constitute an institutional reinforcement of local government, aiming at enhancing civic participation as well as social integration of TCNs at a local level.

Past experience suggests that legal steps are only effective when the necessary information is made available to migrants, their families and host society. Projects implemented from 2007 to 2009 have generally been relevant to the current needs of social integration of our country. Initiatives such as information campaigns addressed to TCN's, language training and setting up of an internet portal for TCNs, especially in the light of recent reforms regarding citizenship and voting rights are very important.

The overall relevance of the annual programmes is also seen in relation to the national strategy set by the Ministry of Interior, Decentralisation and E-Government. Projects such as training programmes for intercultural mediators, awareness raising workshop for journalists on combating racism and xenophobia, festival for the celebration of migrant's day and organisation of a race, a football and a cricket tournaments among Greek and Third Country National teams are in accordance with active participation of TCNs in the society and enhance social cohesion.

* Effectiveness of the programme

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

15 lines maximum

Studying the effectiveness of the 2007 & 2008 annual programmes a total of 18 projects have been supported by the EIF. With regards to national strategy for social integration of TCNs, the above mentioned projects were integrated to seven (7) main areas of intervention:

1. Promoting educational programmes to defined target groups of TCNs (such as migrant mothers, potential immigrants from Moldova) and advisory services.
2. Promoting information to TCNs.
3. Enhancing cultural integration of TCNs.
4. Enhancing awareness raising of the host society.
5. Intercultural guidance to civil servants dealing with TCNs.
6. Provision of necessary tools for the assessment of migrants integration policies.
7. Furthering cooperation and synergy between different actors dealing with migration issues.

Having focused on these areas of intervention and following the reports submitted to the Responsible Authority by the final beneficiaries it is interesting to conclude that the results until 30th of June 2010 are consistent with the operational objectives of the Multi Annual Programme and compatible with the

specific objectives of each Annual Programme. In general, the majority of the objectives were accomplished and projects' operators were very positive about the realisation of the project activities.

* Efficiency of the programme

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

15 lines maximum

The management and selection procedures were well developed and in place. In terms of percentages most of the allocations were spent for the information of TCNs and the awareness raising of the host society (e.g. Project 1.6/08 "Media information campaign for third country nationals on the acquisition of the long term residence status", Project 1.2/07 "Information and awareness raising in the host society through a mass media campaign. Organization of a meeting with a view to prevent negative stereotypes, racism and xenophobia and to promote diversity and interculturalism in the Greek society"). Moreover, emphasis was laid on projects regarding the assessment of migrant integration policies ("Setting up of indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of actions related to the admission and integration of third-country nationals to the Greek society"). In general, all final beneficiaries completed their projects on time and programmes' objectives met the ones of the original planning at a reasonable cost.

During the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme one project (1.4/07 Innovative project for Greek language learning through music and songs for migrants' children (beyond the levels of the Greek educational system) undertaken by the Municipality of Ano Liossia has been recalled due to the fact that the final beneficiary did not comply sufficiently with grant agreement's terms and conditions. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the process of recall was completed before funding the project.

* Complementarity

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

15 lines maximum

The majority of final beneficiaries who implemented projects under EIF co-financing have also managed projects in the past with the co-financing of European Refugee Fund as well as the European Social Fund. With regard to overlapping and double funding issues the Responsible Authority established an on-going and constant cooperation and correspondence with the jointly competent Ministries (Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity –RA for the ERF and Ministry of Employment & Social Security-RA for the ESF). This cooperation provided useful information about special actions carried out in the framework of the European Social Fund and European Refugee Fund, as well as the actions to be carried out.

* Added value

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

15 lines maximum

i. Setting up a mechanism to reduce the negative effects and enhance the positive outcomes of migration

The outcomes of the projects took Greece one step closer towards social cohesion. Insofar, projects empowered migrants to contribute to development and achieve better quality of life.

ii. Increase capacity building for ensuring welfare and protection of migrants

Taking into consideration the requirements and needs identified within the framework of social integration of TCNs in Greece, projects implemented during the eligible period enhanced all efforts regarding information, assistance and advisory services, awareness raising of the host society, elimination of phenomena related to racism, xenophobia and marginalisation, provision of educational services, provision of cultural services, inclusion of integration in all public policies, as a mainstreaming principle, incorporation of the gender dimension, and the undertaking action in the countries of origin of T.C.Ns, in order to prepare them for their integration into host society by supporting pre-travel measures for the acquisition of the necessary knowledge and skills.

iii. Building channels of cooperation

All activities and achievements constituted a welcome effort and an opportunity to link experience, contacts and expertise of the civil society, public and private sector, so that they can all play a role by using their competences in the migration issue, through a mechanism of cooperation and collaboration amongst them.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

In total 2-3 pages maximum

Under this item please specify in particular:

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

Half a page maximum

Further guidelines may be given and possible programming examples as well as best practices from other Member-States.

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

Half a page maximum

Further guidelines and best practices from other Member-States may be given.

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

Half a page maximum

Further guidelines and best practices from other Member-States may be given.

End of the report