

**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)

Ireland

Date: 30 June, 2010

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

.....  
John Hurley, Principal Officer

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

Gerard Roughneen,  
e- mail: [gfroughneen@integration.ie](mailto:gfroughneen@integration.ie)

**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

No in-house evaluation expertise exists within the responsible authority or the delegated authority. The completion of this report was a collaboration between expert staff attached to both authorities. Outside expertise is being engaged to develop a monitoring and evaluation system appropriate to the European Integration Fund in Ireland.

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

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

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

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

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

Important remark

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

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

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

**CONTENTS**

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

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

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

Yes/No:     Yes

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

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

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

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

**I.2 - Calls for proposals**

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

- Programme 2007: 1 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: 1 (number of calls for proposals)

Please note that one joint call for proposals issued advertising the programme years 2007 and 2008.

- 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	41		29	70
Projects selected	10			10
Projects funded	8			8

The 2008 Programme was used to finance extensions of projects selected under the 2007 Call. At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme has not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

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

Yes/No: No

- If *No*, explain why:

Under the 2007 EIF call, projects were selected and offered funding subject to a range of pre-contract conditions. Two of the organisations selected did not proceed to contract.

One of the selected projects was unable to verify the availability of co-funding for the proposed project. The other organisation made an internal decision to withdraw its application from the EIF after a letter of offer was issued.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	8	<i>n/a</i>	<i>Not yet known</i>	
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	8			

The 2008 Programme was used to finance extensions of projects selected under the 2007 Call. At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme has not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

**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→	8		
<b>Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...</b>			
Priority 1	8		
Priority 2			
Priority 3			
Priority 4			

At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme has not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the Delegated Authority.

**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 →	8		
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)	8		
Category c)			
Category d)			

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

<i>Specific Priorities</i>
----------------------------

- 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→	8		
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	6		
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	2		

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

Projects were selected which promote the integration of TCN migrant workers at risk of poverty, social exclusion and discrimination through actions focused on mainstreaming, civic participation and interculturalism and which recognise integration as a two-way process.

Projects were also selected to develop and deliver introductory programmes which provide TCN support groups with the capacity and structural support to facilitate intercultural dialogue and to develop and deliver a pilot mentoring project aimed at newly arrived TCNs to enable them to acquire basic knowledge about Irish society, language, history, institutions, socio economic features, cultural life and norms and values.

Projects were also selected to provide information and support to TCNs to allow them to engage with mainstream services and thereby better integrate into the local community, including the development, publication and distribution of a single information resource, ‘Living in Ireland, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.’, in a range of formats and languages.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

**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*

No projects were funded under Priority 2

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

**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*

No projects were funded under Priority 3

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

**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*

No projects were funded under Priority 4

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

**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”.*

Not applicable

**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”.*

Not applicable

**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*

All 8 projects awarded funding under the 2007 EIF Annual Programme were originally due to end in December 2009. However, given the relatively short timeframe for project implementation and the availability of funds under the 2008 Annual Programme, it was decided to offer all groups an opportunity to enter an extension phase for the period January to June 2010. This allowed additional time and resources to assist groups to fully implement project objectives.

6 projects opted to participate in the extension phase with the remaining 2 projects ending as originally scheduled in December 2009.

In context of a changed economic climate and the challenges for projects trying to raise additional co-funding, an analysis of all project actions was undertaken. All projects entering in to the extension phase were found to demonstrate a strong match with various horizontal specific priorities and were deemed eligible to qualify for 75% funding.

All projects continued to be categorised under Priority 1 and the same category of actions but the categorisation of projects under a range of specific priorities was introduced for the 6 projects funded under the 2008 annual programme.

**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*

Not applicable

**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

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

**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*

<b>Organisation:</b> Clare Immigrant Support Centre (CISC)
<b>Reasons for Successful Project</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a database mapping queries at CISC’s locally based drop-in centre and its telephone service in Ennis has enabled CISC to improve the quality of its project monitoring. In addition, the database produces detailed information mapping the information and supports required by TCNs. The mapping of needs has been used as a tool to inform the work of local service providers and decision makers in Clare.</li> <li>• CISC operates its own homework club but <i>also continues to engage</i> with mainstream after- school programmes in Clare to promote inclusion of TCN children.</li> <li>• CISC is proactive in delivering an orientation programme for TCN families on attending primary school. CISC supports the families to register with local schools, meet teachers and provides information on requirements and expectations.</li> <li>• <b>Welcome Pack for Immigrants in Clare</b> – CISC consulted with a range of TCNs on their information needs, and appropriate languages. CISC conducted an audit of appropriate services. The pack is written in clear and simple language and is a user-friendly product, which has ‘pull-out’ sections relating to various topics. This also enables organisations using the booklet to photocopy relevant sections quite easily.</li> <li>• Training (based on the pack) was then delivered to TCNs as ‘peer information givers’. These community leaders can now use the orientation pack as a resource in provide information to newly arrived members of their local community.</li> </ul>

<b>Organisation:</b> Immigrant Council of Ireland (ICI)
<b>Reasons for Successful Project</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project demonstrates the benefit of integration at an inter-personal level between mentors (from the host community) and TCNs.</li> <li>• Based on the success of the pilot programme, ICI produced a <b>Guide to running a Mentoring Programme</b> – a resource for organisations who are interested in running a mentoring programme and designed a training course for NGOs planning to run their own mentoring projects.</li> <li>• ICI has demonstrated this is a replicable project that can be delivered by a wide range of organisations once appropriate information, training and support is in place.</li> </ul>

### **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*

<b>ORGANISATION:</b> Unnamed
<b>KEY ISSUES/LEARNING</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project had difficulties verifying co-funding after it was offered EIF support. The original co-funding confirmed for the project was deemed ineligible and the organisation was obliged to negotiate further with co-funders. This led to significant delays in starting the project and the project worker did not start work until March 2009.</li><li>• Given the new scope and late start for the project, the proposed objectives and actions were too ambitious. Actions in relation securing accreditation for its training programme and a conference to promote the project with key decision makers in mainstream agencies were unfeasible.</li><li>• This project highlights the length of time necessary to influence policy development. The proposed project originally had strong levels of support from the relevant statutory service provider. As the economic climate worsened in 2009 and 2010, this agency’s priorities changed. As a result, there has been limited success in engaging the mainstream service provider in relation to the project theme. This also highlights the importance of providing evidence based casework to present to mainstream service providers that clearly demonstrate the tangible benefits of the project work.</li></ul>

## **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*

Pobal, the delegated authority for the EIF in Ireland, used funding from the technical assistance budget to provide one-to-one and training support to funded projects. Training is provided at the commencement of projects in relation to the financial management, monitoring and evaluation requirements of the EIF.

Each project has a designated liaison person in Pobal in relation to budget and finance matters and in relation to project implementation. Both individuals are available to support funded projects on an ongoing basis.

Networking events are also organised by Pobal on an occasional basis to enable the sharing of information, learning and good practice between funded EIF projects.

Technical assistance was used in respect of costs connected to

- the advertisement of the European Integration Fund
- the selection of the projects for financing
- Seminars on the European Integration Fund
- Visits to projects
- Financial verification
- Monitoring and evaluation

## **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*

From the commencement of the programme in Ireland the visibility of the European Integration Fund was ensured through the advertising of the availability of the Fund, seminars and the use of the European Logo on materials associated with the Fund. Initially an advertising campaign was implemented in the national newspapers in Ireland to highlight the availability of the EIF and interested and appropriate organisations were invited to apply for funding from the Fund.

Pobal, the delegated authority for the EIF in Ireland, organised regional information meetings to promote the 2007 and 2009 call for proposals. These regional meetings play an important role in promoting the EIF and encouraging organisations to consider participating in the call for proposals. A seminar was held to set out the requirements of receiving co-financing from the Fund and the requirement on those organisations to advertise the fact that the projects in question were being co-funded by the EIF and also that the E.U. logo was to be prominently used on all posters, events and correspondence pertaining to the projects.

Material relating to the EIF is published on the website of the Responsible Authority ([www.integration.ie](http://www.integration.ie)) and on the website of the Delegated Authority ([www.pobal.ie](http://www.pobal.ie)).

Where appropriate, the Minister refers to the availability of co-financing under the EIF in speeches and interviews and in responses to Parliamentary Questions.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

*Maximum 15 lines*

- At the level of project beneficiaries

*Half a page*

At beneficiary level, the visibility of the EIF is ensured in a number of ways, for example, the use of the E.U. logo on the projects' stationery. Successful groups are requested to acknowledge the European Commission, the Office of the Minister for Integration and Plobal during the implementation of EIF funded actions. This is a contractual condition for groups.

The operation of the project itself also ensures the visibility of the EIF as well as through word of mouth. Funding by EIF is also acknowledged through seminars organised by the various projects, in the literature they produce and through their interaction with the various 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	€37,557	€95,955	59%
Programme 2008	€47,417	€26,232*	27%
Programme 2009	€62,600	Funds not yet committed	0%
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	<b>€647,574</b>	<b>€722,187</b>	<b>27%</b>

\* This figure cannot be fully verified until an analysis of Financial Returns, which are due to be submitted by 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2010 takes place. The final figure for the 2008 Programme can be confirmed in Mid-August when all returns are finalised and final payments are issued to the groups.

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

*Based on:*

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

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

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

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

The 2007 Annual Programme has been implemented broadly in line with the programme schedule. Funded groups have made a significant contribution to supporting the integration of newly arrived Third Country Nationals (TCNs) through a wide range of project activities.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Applicant groups have experienced challenges in meeting the co-funding requirements of the EIF. This has become more acute over the lifetime of the 2007 AP having regard to the general economic situation. There is a significant under spend in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes. As a result, funded groups who participated in an extension phase in 2008 were encouraged to address the various specific priorities under the Fund and were awarded a higher rate of funding on this basis.

Difficulties also arose from confusion related to the narrow definition of the target group and the so called five year rule limitation.

The administrative burdens arising from the complexities of the Implementing Rules and the Rules on Eligibility of Expenditure also discouraged some non governmental organisations from applying for funding.

To increase the take up of the Fund applications were sought from public sector organisations in the 2009 Call and organisations were encouraged to develop projects which addressed the Specific Priorities set out in the EIF Strategic Guidelines.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Not applicable as no revision was requested.

**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*

No. There was a significant under spend in respect of the 2007 programme. For further details, please see response to No. 2 above.

**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*

Please see response to No. 2 above. However, notwithstanding an overall under spend, projects that were selected for funding did exceed their expectations overall.

- 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*

Yes, the actions included in the Annual Programme 2007 were considered appropriate to the overall aims of the EIF.

## **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*

There was a significant underspend in respect of the 2008 Annual Programme.

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

*15 lines maximum*

As indicated at VI.I. No.2 above, applicant groups have experienced challenges in meeting the co-funding requirements of the EIF. This has become more acute over the lifetime of the AP. This has given rise to a significant under spend in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes. As a result, funded groups who participated in an extension phase in 2008 were encouraged to address the various specific priorities under the Fund and were awarded a higher rate of funding on this basis.

- 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*

Yes. A revised Annual Programme for 2008 highlighting that certain actions would attract 75% co-financing was submitted and approved by the European Commission. Projects were encouraged to undertake actions which addressed the Specific Priorities as set out by the European Commission.

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

*15 lines maximum*

No, there was a significant underspend to the 2008 programme.

- 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*

See response to VI.I No. 2 above. However, notwithstanding the overall underspend, projects that were selected for funding did exceed their expectations overall.

**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*

Yes, the actions included in the Annual Programme 2008 are considered appropriate to the overall aims of the EIF.

### **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*

At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Annual Programme has not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority. Details of the projects selected will be forwarded to the Commission as soon as contract arrangements are finalised.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Not applicable. At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme had not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

- 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*

Not applicable. At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme had not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

- 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*

At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme had not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

- 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?**

Not applicable.

- 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*

At the time of completion of this evaluation report, the 2009 Programme had not yet commenced as proposals for funding are currently being assessed by the delegated authority.

**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 Systems established for the implementation of the EIF has worked well and is considered to be efficient and effective.

Steps will be taken to develop a more flexible selection procedure and lessen the delays between the Call for proposals and the selection of projects.

**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*

No changes have been made to the Management and Control Systems. A more formal reporting agreement in relation to financial and project implementation was agreed between the Responsibility Authority and Delegated Authority in Autumn 2009.

However, as a result of recent changes concerning Ministerial responsibilities in Ireland, there may be a need to appoint a new Audit Authority for the EIF and ERF to reflect these changes. This is under consideration and the European Commission will be informed of developments in due course.

**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 European Integration Fund is a significant contributor of financial resources for the provision of services to the target group with regard to integration activities. The resources provided by the EIF have contributed in a significant way with regard to the overall aims and objectives of the EIF and significant numbers from the target groups have received assistance or other services from the participating projects. The overall impact of the integration projects is very positive and the contribution made by the EIF can be clearly seen. There have been very successful introductory programmes; access to education, healthcare, and other services by migrants; capacity-building among community leaders and ethnic groups; and personal development and confidence-building for individual members of the target groups. Many projects ran activities to tackle racism and increase intercultural activities and understanding in the local communities, with positive results.

These actions have contributed in no small way to the further integration of the target group into Irish society.

**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*

Ireland adopts a policy of mainstream service provision in the integration area while recognising the need for targeted initiatives to meet specific short-term needs. Overall, responsibility for the promotion and coordination of integration measures for legally resident immigrants rests with the Office of the Minister for Integration but, in general, the actual delivery of integration services is the responsibility of mainstream Government Departments. The availability of funding from the European Integration Fund plays a significant role in supporting the activities of non governmental organisations with regard to integration in Ireland.

**\* 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*

Mainstream services continue to respond and adapt to the needs of migrants. Our integration policy recognises that there is a need to promote measures which ensure that migrants participate more fully in the social, cultural and civic life of Ireland. The policies outlined in the strategy statement on Integration '*Migration Nation*' (published in 2008) continue to be implemented.

The key principles which inform and underpin Ireland's policy with regard to integration are as follows:

- a partnership approach between the Government and non-governmental organisations, as well as civil society bodies, to deepen and enhance the opportunities for integration
- a strong link between integration policy and wider state social inclusion measures, strategies and initiatives
- a clear public policy focus that avoids the creation of parallel societies, communities and urban ghettos, i.e. a mainstream approach to service delivery to migrants
- a commitment to effective local delivery mechanisms that align services to migrants with those for indigenous communities.

The policy identifies effective and equitable provision of core services as key levers in achieving integration objectives. It also emphasises the concept that integration is a two-way process requiring mutual adaptation. It states that everyone has a role to play in facilitating integration including the new communities, the host community, corporate sector, national and local government, trade unions, media and community and voluntary organisations.

\* 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 costs associated with the management of the European Integration Fund in Ireland in respect of the Responsible Authority, Certifying Authority, Audit Authority and Delegated Authority are estimated to be in the region of €300,000 per annum. This figure does not include the administrative costs of the projects funded by the EIF.

\* 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 Office of the Minister for Integration has a cross-Departmental mandate to develop, drive and co-ordinate integration policy across other Government Departments, agencies and services. The Minister's functions include the promotion of the integration of legal immigrants into Irish society, the establishment of new structures for this purpose, the management of the resettlement of refugees admitted as part of the United Nations Resettlement Programme and the administration of funding from national and EU sources to promote integration. The Office is also responsible for the distribution of National funds to local authorities, major sporting bodies and faith based groups for integration activities.

The Office is the responsible authority for both the European Integration Fund for Third Country Nationals (EIF) and the European Refugee Fund (ERF). It also a public beneficiary body in relation to integration activities in Ireland funded under the European Social Fund (ESF). The Office is represented on the Department of Finance National Committee for the co-ordination of EU Funds.

\* 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*

Irish national funding provided by the Office of the Minister for Integration is focused on local authorities who have the option of using it to assist groups in their area, major national sporting bodies and other national groups. The availability of funding from the European Integration Fund which is primarily used in supporting the activities of non governmental organisations with regard to integration in Ireland is a significant contributor to national integration supports.

### **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*

Ireland is currently a member of an European Refugee Fund Working Group which consisting of experts from 10 responsible authorities. The Group recently submitted to the European Commission a letter containing proposals in this area. Although the Group meets under the umbrella of the ERF, the proposals put forward in the letter relate to improvements that could be considered under all four funds coming under the programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'.

\* 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*

Ireland is currently a member of an European Refugee Fund Working Group, consisting of experts from 10 responsible authorities, who recently submitted to the European Commission, a letter containing proposals in this area.

Ireland welcomes the steps taken by the European Commission to reduce the burdens associated with the administration of the Fund.

The matching funding requirements and the complexity of the rules on the eligibility of expenditure have been identified as barriers to the take up of funding available under the EIF.

\* 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*

Ireland very much welcomes the time and effort that has been put into the development of the 'Manual of Eligibility of Expenditure' and the 'Manual on Programming'. However, we would welcome, in the future, if these tools were developed well in advance of overall programmes. Guidance on the role of the Certifying Authority would be welcome.

The existing programming system should be simplified as suggested by European Refugee Fund Working Group.

*End of the report*