

**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) Italy

Date:

30/06/2010

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

Angelo Malandrino
Responsible Authority for the European Fund for the Integration of third-
country nationals for the period 2007-2013
Direttore Centrale per le politiche dell'immigrazione e dell'asilo
Dipartimento per le libertà Civili e l'immigrazione
Ministero dell'Interno

.....

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

Maria Assunta Rosa
Mariaassunta.Rosa@interno.it
Tel. 06 46537502
Fax 06 46549564
Direzione Centrale per le politiche dell'immigrazione e dell'asilo
Dipartimento per le libertà Civili e l'immigrazione
Ministero dell'Interno

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**

Please note that under the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals 2007-2013 there are two selection and award procedures when the responsible authority acts as awarding body:

- Projects in which the responsible authority act as awarding body: “selection with call for proposals”
According to the art.7 paragraph 2 of the Commission Decision 2008/457/EC and in the manual setting out procedures concerning management and control systems approved on 27/10/2008 “the responsible authority acts as awarding body in cases where it implements the projects, as a general rule, on the basis of annual open calls for proposals”.
- Projects in which the responsible authority act as awarding body: “direct selection”
According to the art. 7 paragraph 2 of the mentioned decision and in the manual setting out procedures concerning management and control systems approved on 27/10/2008 “In duly justified cases, including continuation of multiannual projects in accordance with Article 13(6) of the basic act which were selected after a previous call for proposals, grants may be awarded without a call for proposals”.
The “direct selection” is used for projects proposed and implemented by public body and Central Administration due to their exclusive and specific competencies related to

the realization of specific actions in the frame of the Funds. (Da valutare se lasciare nel documento)

- 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: 94 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2008: 89,34 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2009: 88,90 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method

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: 3 calls for proposals
- Programme 2008: 3 calls for proposals
- Programme 2009: 3 calls for proposals

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Proposals received	405	373	523	1.301
Projects selected	171	145	350	666
Projects funded	41	28	38 ¹	69

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

Yes/No: No

- If *No*, explain why: Following the assessment process, the assessment Committee (Comitato tecnico di valutazione) funded all the best projects, on the basis of the evaluation chart, in compliance with the financing provided by the European Commission for each action.

¹ It should be considered that the related contracts have not been signed yet since the evaluation procedure has just been completed.

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	6	10	16 ²	32

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)	41	28	38	107
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	6	10	16	32
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	47	38	54	139

² 7 projects are scheduled to be signed within the following week

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→	47	38	54
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	42	35	50
Priority 2	3	2	
Priority 3	1	1	3
Priority 4	1		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 →	47	38	54
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	-	1	
Category b)	43	35	50
Category c)	3	2	3
Category d)	1		1

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

Specific Priorities

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	47	38	54
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	1		
Specific Priority 2 only	5	6	2
Specific Priority 3 only	16	2	
Specific Priority 4 only	1	9	19
Specific Priority 5 only	2	2	2
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	21	17	27
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	1	2	4

**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: YES

- If *Yes*, fill in Part II, pages 15 to 20.
- If *No*, do not fill in Part II, but go directly to Part III (Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method, 2007 through 2009) on page 21.

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

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

- Programme 2007: 6,00 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 10,66 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2009: 11,10 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method

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

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

- Programme 2007: 1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 5 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 2 (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	138	160	31	329
Projects selected	11	23	12	46
Projects funded	1	5	2	8

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

Yes/No: No

- If No, explain why: The call for expression of interest have been carried out in compliance with the art. 125 of the national law 163/2006.

On the basis of the provisions of the above mentioned article, the Responsible Authority adopts the following procedure:

- The publication of the call for expression of interest;
- The selection of the subjects to be invited for the submission of the technical and economical offer;
- The forwarding of the invitation letters;
- The selection of the subjects that submitted the offer for the implementation of the project.

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	6	5	3 ³	14

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)	1	5	2 ⁴	8
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	6	5	3 ⁵	14
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	7	10	5	22

³ 2 projects are scheduled to be signed within the following week

⁴ The related contracts will be signed in the next weeks

⁵ 2 projects will be signed in the next weeks

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 →	7	10	5
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	4	6	3
Priority 2		3	
Priority 3			
Priority 4	2	1	2
Priority 2-3	1		

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 →	7	10	5
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)	3	7	3
Category c)	2	3	
Category d)	2		2

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→	7	10	5
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	1		
Specific Priority 2 only			
Specific Priority 3 only		1	2
Specific Priority 4 only			1
Specific Priority 5 only	2	1	
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	2	6	-
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	2	2	2

**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

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Awarding Body. Among such projects there are some interventions carried out at national level by Central Administrations and other Public Bodies on issues they have specific competencies in such issues as young people, raising awareness, communication and information or capacity building development.

On the other hand, local Bodies, universities and public schools, associations, no-profit organizations, NGOs, foundations etc. have carried out some projects taking part to the calls for tenders procedures.

Such interventions are focused on the following issues:

- language training;
- civics;
- professional guidance and qualification;
- young people;
- cultural and social mediation supporting social inclusion processes.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Executing Body. Such projects have been carried out in collaboration with other Bodies and concern interventions related to the direct competencies of the RA.

The above mentioned projects are specifically related to raising awareness, information and communication, exchange of experiences and good practices as well as the use of innovative programs and methodologies. Among the main projects are:

- national convention on immigration, integration and good practices;
- definition of strategic guide lines standardizing at national level the professional profile of cultural mediators;
- cultural mediation services at the One Stop Shop for Immigration;
- a study on the Chinese community residing in Italy;
- a research on the definition of minority age.

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

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Awarding Body.

Among such projects there is only 1 intervention carried out at a territorial level, concerning the implementation of a multi-cultural centre in the province of L’Aquila.

On the other hand, central Administrations and Public Bodies have carried out some projects reflecting each own specific competences.

Such projects are focused on the following issues:

- analysis of the measures taken for the integration of immigrant women;
- implementation of indicators assessing the presence of third country nationals legally residing in each Italian province;
- setting up of a network for the exchange of information on the integration policies;
- a study on the basic data concerning immigration realized together with Regional Governments and Territorial Councils for Immigration;
- an analysis on the professional routes followed by third country nationals.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Executing Body. Such projects have been carried out in collaboration with other Bodies and concern interventions related to the direct competencies of the RA.

The above mentioned projects are specifically related to such issues as analysis and solution of problems linked to immigrants and their families, implementation of an assessment system for integration policies and interventions, third country nationals social and professional inclusion.

Among the main projects are:

- implementation of a model assessing the presence of third country nationals in the provincial territory of reference;
- drawing of a report on immigrants participation in local/national associations;
- setting up of a system of indicators on integration;
- establishment of an intercultural centre informing and supporting immigrants on daily activities.

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

In the “awarding body” method

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Awarding Body.

During the three year period of reference, all the projects have been implemented at national level by those Central Administrations whose specific competences were reflected by the activities envisaged by the projects themselves.

The main interventions entailed such issues as:

- analysis of the integration measures addressed to immigrant women;
- implementation of a set of indicators on the presence of non-EU citizens legally residing in each Italian province;

implementation of a network for the exchange of information on integration policies

In the “executing body” method

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Executing Body. Such projects have been carried out in collaboration with other Bodies and concern interventions related to the direct competencies of the RA.

The above mentioned projects are specifically related to such issues as analysis and solution of problems linked to immigrants and their families, implementation of an assessment system for integration policies and interventions, third country nationals social and professional inclusion.

Among the main projects are:

- implementation of a model assessing the presence of third country nationals in a specific provincial context;
- drawing of a report on immigrants participation to national and/or local associations;
- setting up of a system of indicators on integration;
- establishment of an intercultural centre informing and supporting immigrants on daily activities.

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

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Awarding Body. In particular, the project carried out by the Labour Ministry aimed at enforcing the information exchange among the personnel of Italian public bodies. An international workshop has been organized in order to discuss and get into details about the experiences and good practices concerning the immigrants reception measures and the professional inclusion. A summary document has been drawn up on the information and good practices exchanged.

On the other hand, the project of the Italian Department of juvenile Law (funded under 2009 AP) intends to implement an experimental project on information exchange to be carried out with France and Netherlands. The project has two specific goals: stepping up the exchange of best practices on social communication as well as enforcing cooperation among Member States.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Executing Body. Such projects have been carried out in collaboration with other Bodies and concern interventions related to the direct competencies of the RA.

The above mentioned projects are specifically related to such issues as information, experiences and good practices exchange among Member States.

The Ministry intended to implement a common policy with other Member States involving all those local Governments which have experienced innovative practices while enforcing existing good practices for the resolution of integration issues.

Among the main projects are:

- Publication of a research on integration statistics;
- Good practices on the management of vulnerable target groups;
- Convention on Integration;
- Comparative analysis on Italian and European regulation on citizenship

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”.

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been carried out at national level by Central Governments and other Public Bodies on issues they have specific competencies in, aiming at implementing coordinated and integrated interventions based on standardized models.

The type of interventions are: activities for the exchange of information on integration policies and good practices concerning entry, reception and guidance-to-work for immigrants (women as a specific target); integration indicators; institutional communication campaigns; study on immigrants’ professional routes; social and professional re-integration of minors detained in penal institutions.

Sport activities supported the integration of immigrants thanks to the valorization of origin countries’ typical sports.

Other interventions concerned the promotion of immigrants’ rights and duties, especially youngsters and women, as well as the implementation of measures for vulnerable immigrants’ occupability.

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”.

With reference to the implementation of the Annual Programmes 2007-2009, a number of projects have been selected in which the Responsible Authority (RA) acts as Executing Body. Such projects have been carried out in collaboration with other Bodies and concern interventions related to the direct competencies of the RA.

The above mentioned projects are specifically related to raising awareness, information and communication, exchange of experiences and good practices as well as the use of innovative programs and methodologies. Among the main projects are:

- national convention on immigration, integration and good practices;
- definition of strategic guide lines standardizing at national level the professional profile of cultural mediators;

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

- cultural mediation services at the One Stop Shop for Immigration;
- a study on the Chinese community residing in Italy;
- a contest for EU and non-EU students aimed at promoting intercultural dialogue through new technologies;
- a research on the definition of minority age;
- an analysis service of bank products aimed at meeting immigrants' financial requirements
- an implementation of television format aimed at promoting the knowledge of Italian language.

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.

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.

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 significant changes occurred.

In the “executing body” method

No significant changes occurred.

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

The association “Donne Nosotras” carried out a project called “Crisalide”, which stemmed from the need for immigrant women – who do not enjoy a family network in Italy - to be supported in the managing of their family and job. The project entailed: 1) a preliminary phase of reception; 2) activities designed to meet each participant’s needs and requirements; 3) a final phase focused on assessing and monitoring the participants’ integration process and problem solving.

The project’s objectives were reached thanks to 3 integrated measures: job orienting and social and professional inclusion; language, IT and civil law training; mutual help and individual support.

“Crisalide” involved 285 women and conducted 438 interviews, contributing to the wellbeing of 843 participants’ family members. A number of tailored interventions involved 70 women in activities focused on professional orienting, training, psychological support, self-help.

“Italiano in rete” is a project carried out by Venice municipality and focused on language and civic training addressed to vulnerable categories such as illiterate immigrants, women and newly arrived youngsters. The project provided the participants with flexible and tailored activities, as well as innovative techniques of training and support (intercultural mediation and babysitting, new technologies training, etc).

A network of public and private partners made it possible to constantly monitor the foreseen activities. The project entailed 20 training courses (duration: 30 to 50 hours), involving 319 participants (31% youngsters, 43% women). In addition, 10 illiterate immigrants took part in a specific 50 hour course. As to civic activities, 15 guided visits have been carried out throughout the territory.

The closing event of the project was a convention held in Mestre, during which the participants were given the certificates of attendance related to the various project’s activities.

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

Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there was a project which can be considered a failure story. Such a project, focused on language and civic

training, resulted in a failure since the objectives set out in the programming could not be fully reached.

The support of the municipalities made it possible to complete the interventions foreseen within the framework of the project, actually strengthening the activities to be carried out.

The lesson to be drawn by such a failure story concerns the importance of the participation of local bodies in the funded projects.

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

The Responsible Authority (RA) implemented a series of services necessary for activities such as managing and monitoring, control and information. Such services are aimed at strengthening the administrative capacity concerning the Fund's implementation.

Specifically, the RA identified the company responsible for the support to the technical assistance and the governance of the Fund, as well as the body acting as Audit Authority.

In addition, the RA carried out a series of activities underlying the preparation, selection and evaluation of the projects and, at the same time, took a series of measures concerning the actions taken so far (information, distribution, etc.). As a matter of fact, a number of publications have been released, together with a bimonthly review – *LibertàCivili* - focused on immigration issues with a specific insight on the activities of the Fund. Furthermore, several meetings have been set out among the final beneficiaries and stakeholders taking part in the Fund's activities at different levels.

Finally, an IT system supporting the management of the Fund is currently being implemented, while the RA has acquired the adequate IT equipment.

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

During the 2007-2009 period the Responsible Authority (RA) has carried out a number of interventions aimed at informing on the activities of the European Fund for Integration, such as:

- Implementation of a monthly newsletter on the interventions, opportunities and events linked to the EFI, aiming also at the exchange of information and good practices in accordance with the principles underlying the development of a common European policy on immigration;
- Release of a calendar displaying some of the most significant moments of the projects financed under 2007 and 2008 annual programs;
- Release of journalistic articles on the EFI activities published on *libertàcivili*, a bi-monthly review of the Ministry of Interior – Department for Civil Liberties and Immigration
- The Responsible Authority organized a conference for the dissemination of the results of the projects funded in the frame of the AP 2007-2008/ for each AP The Responsible Authority organized a conference for the dissemination of the results of the projects

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

The final beneficiaries have implemented various diffusion, information and publicity actions related to the EFI projects.

Such activities aim at spreading the integration issue as well as at raising awareness and informing institutions, citizens and, more generally, the whole territory on the projects carried out so far, on their content and their output.

Among the main actions are:

- Web sites, web radio and paper booklets and/or magazines;
- Press releases addressed to the relevant local media;
- Local media advertising;
- Sport and/or cultural events;
- Questionnaires and interviews for raising awareness among civil society;
- International anti-racist meeting.

**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	6.314.588,49	6.148.299,16	97,36%
Programme 2008	8.590.945,10	8.468.596,12	98,57%
Programme 2009	15.062.036,85	13.134.869,77	87,21%
TOTAL 2007-2009	29.967.570,44	27.751.765,05	92,60%

<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

The 2007 Annual Programme (AP) has been implemented as originally planned. The goals scheduled in the AP have been mainly reached, especially as for activities concerning literacy improvement and intercultural mediation.

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

15 lines maximum

A number of problems resulted from the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme (AP). The problems encountered concerns such issues as:

- Limited amount of time;
- The Manual on Eligibility Rules has been published only once the implementation of the AP had started;
- Calls for proposals and calls for tenders have been published in such a short time that prevented a reasonable evaluation activity;
- 2007 and 2008 calls for proposals have been joint together, making it hard to monitor and evaluate the projects.

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

15 lines maximum

No revision by the Commission has been necessary as for the 2007 Annual Programme.

4. Have you implemented the 2007 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

15 lines maximum

The 2007 Annual Programme has been fully implemented (with a short delay) in spite of the start of the SOLID Programme being deferred.

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

The 2007 Annual Programme (AP) foresaw the implementation of 8 Actions meeting the requirements of 4 general Priorities, within whose framework 54 projects have been carried out.

In particular, the AP envisaged the following implementation, impact and result indicators: n° of implemented projects; n° of immigrants (successfully) taking part in the projects; percentage of immigrants whose attendance to courses/activities/etc. is superior to 80%; development of the role of cultural mediators; improvement of the management of integration processes; improvement of integration policies, procedures and programmes; improvement of information exchange/distribution; enhancement of best practices exchange; enhancement of transnational cooperation.

On the basis of the assessment of such indicators, the RA is positive it has reached both quantitative and qualitative results expected within the programming.

- 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 Actions set out in the Annual Programme and submitted to the Commission were appropriate. The distribution of the funding was appropriate too, apart from Action 1 “Literacy Improvement”, whose funding was too limited.

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

The 2008 Annual Programme (AP) has been implemented as originally planned. The goals scheduled in the AP have been mainly reached, especially as for cross cutting Actions.

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

15 lines maximum

A number of problems resulted from the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme (AP). The problems encountered concerns such issues as:

- The expenditure eligibility period has been amended underway, from N+2 to N+2,5. As a result, we had to drawn up a handbook addressed to all the final beneficiaries.
- Limited amount of time;
- The Manual on Eligibility Rules has been published only once the implementation of the AP had started;

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

No revision by the Commission has been necessary as for the 2008 Annual Programme.

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

15 lines maximum

The 2008 Annual Programme has been fully implemented apart from the interconnection service, which is scheduled to be implemented as of the following years.

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

The 2008 Annual Programme (AP) foresaw the implementation of 8 Actions meeting the requirements of 4 general Priorities, within whose framework 50 projects have been carried out.

In particular, the AP envisaged the following implementation, impact and result indicators: n° of implemented projects; n° of immigrants (successfully) taking part in the projects; percentage of immigrants whose attendance to courses/activities/etc. is superior to 80%; enhancement of cultural exchange activities; enhancement of immigrants' education processes; immigrants' awareness of their own rights and duties in the host country; professional inclusion; support to the improvement of the management of integration processes; improvement of integration policies, procedures and programmes; improvement of information exchange/distribution; enhancement of best practices exchange; enhancement of transnational cooperation.

On the basis of the assessment of such indicators, the RA is positive it has reached both quantitative and qualitative results expected within the programming.

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 actions set out in the annual programme and submitted to the commission were appropriate. The distribution of the funding was appropriate too, since the resources have been evenly distributed among the actions foreseen in the Annual Programme.

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

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

15 lines maximum

The 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. The calls for proposals have been published on 23 November 2009, while the ranking of the projects submitted has been published on 24 June 2010.

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

15 lines maximum

The 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. See VI.3.1.

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

15 lines maximum

The 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. See VI.3.1.

- 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 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. See VI.3.1.

- 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

The 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. See VI.3.1.

- 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

The 2009 Annual Programme is currently being implemented. See VI.3.1.

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 implemented by the RA has proven to be efficient since it has provided specific and detailed procedures on the following steps:

CONTROL SYSTEM

The Management and Control System foresees two types of control:

1. Administrative and financial verifications;
2. On-the-spot checks.

The RA has decided to carry out the above mentioned verifications on the 100% of the funded projects. The Management and Control System describes the verification system and the body appointed to the carrying out of the controls.

PROJECTS SELECTION

The Management and Control System foresees detailed procedures for the projects' selection and approval, in particular, procedures for the projects selection under "awarding body" and "executing body" method.

IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION OF THE PROJECTS

The Management and Control System has defined detailed procedures for the projects implementation and execution. In particular, on the basis of the art. 10 of the EC Decision 2008/457, it has provided detailed procedures for the management of the projects, such as:

- the signature of the Subsidy Contract with the Final Beneficiary;
- the follow up of the project and/or possible modification of the Grant Agreement through a system of administrative monitoring of the projects (budget adjustment, exchange of communications, etc.)
- definition of the procedure for the selection of subcontractors.

MONITORING OF THE PROJECTS

In order to comply with art. 48 of the EC Decision 2007/435, the Management and Control System has defined detailed procedures and tools for data collection such as monitoring sheet, interim and final assessment.

PAYMENT AND CERTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE

The Management and Control System has defined:

- the Financial Circuit concerning the payments of the projects expenditures funded under the “awarding body” method
- the Financial Circuit concerning the reimbursement of the projects expenditures funded under the “awarding body” method
- the new procedure for the expenditure certification to the European Commission.

IRREGULARITY AND RECOVERIES MANAGEMENT

The Management and Control System foresees detailed procedures for the irregularity and recoveries management in compliance with art. 29 of EC Decision 2008/435.

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

During the 2007-2009 period the Responsible Authority (RA) and the Certification Authority have carried out a number of changes to the management and control system of the European Fund for Integration in order to improve the efficiency of the procedures.

Responsible Authority

Compared to the 1st description of the Management and Control System, the RA has redefined the organizational structure responsible of the management of the European Fund for Integration by allocating specific resources to specific tasks.

The RA has proceeded to a better definition of the procedures concerning the modalities of project selection, in particular it has updated the description related to the “awarding body” and “executing body” selection methods.

The RA has reinforced the procedure for checks implementation by, for example, the introduction of new tools such as the “Autorization to the payment” that has to be signed by those who are Responsible for the Service II.

Compared to a first schedule, the RA has introduced new monitoring tools in compliance with art. 48 of the EC Decision 2007/435, such as:

- monitoring bimonthly sheet, completed and sent to the RA by the final beneficiary
- informative database, for the account management and the project monitoring
- monitoring report, which summarizes the principal results from the control activity

Certifying Authority

The Certifying Authority (CA) has defined the new certification procedure.

Compared to a first schedule, the certification procedure foresees 3 different phases:

1. Thanks to the resources of the *Fondo di Rotazione*, the Responsible Authority (RA) provides the payment shares to final beneficiaries and/or subcontractors;
2. The Certifying Authority issues the Certified Declaration of Expenditure following the checks on the expenditures incurred by the RA;
3. The European Commission provides the RA with the community resources concerning the *Fondo di Rotazione*, managed by the Ministry of Economy, following the transmission by the RA of the second pre-financing request, the CA Certified Declaration of Expenditure and the submission of any other document foreseen by the reference rules.

**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

Throughout the 2007-2009 period, the implementation of the EIF has been significantly enhanced and, considering the limited amount of time and resources available, all the objectives have been reached.

First of all, the Responsible Authority (RA) managed to capitalize the good practices resulting from the projects funded under the EIF and to create a network ensuring the future sustainability of such initiatives, so that the above mentioned good practices would outlive the Fund itself, thus having a tangible impact on the territory.

In addition, the RA set out a successful synergy among central administrations (ministries, departments, national bodies, etc.) and local actors (municipalities, territorial associations, etc.): while the former provide standardized guidelines and framework of intervention (see integration agreement, language training, cultural mediation, etc.) at the national level, the latter actually take and put into practice such guidelines at the local level.

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

The programme's priorities and actions are linked to the needs identified by the technical working group, the Prefectures and the Regional Governments, and are thus in line with the territorial problems and demands.

The technical working group constantly monitor and discuss the programming (e.g. 2009 and 2010 annual programme; programmes focused on the Integration Agreement; programmes focused on new regulations).

However, the funding is too limited.

* Effectiveness of the programme

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

15 lines maximum

The programmes implemented so far have led to a better governance of the immigration phenomenon – both at the regional and local level – thanks to a joint management of the immigration process among the actors involved.

Given the available funding, the programmes focus on high quality projects, especially the ones providing the target groups with effective integration tools (i.e. language certification in line with the Common European Framework of Reference).

The programmes and the related interventions also focus on the dialogue between associations and public bodies, in order to enhance each one's contribution.

Special attention is given to communication and raising awareness on good practices and integration issues.

* 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

There are many administrative burdens, since all the programming, evaluation and control activities have to be carried out within a year period. The funding for the technical assistance has not been entirely addressed to the support of the Responsible Authority, since it will cover also evaluation, monitoring and communication issues.

With respect to the first framework of reference, the Responsible Authority's personnel has been enhanced in order to address such issues as monitoring and administrative checks.

However, an IT system has been implemented, resulting in limited costs and faster service and product delivery.

* 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 technical working group ensures complementarity thanks to a constant dialogue among the EIF Responsible Authority, the ERF Responsible Authority, the Labour Ministry and the Ministry for Social Policies – the latter being the Managing Authorities for the Italian ESF. Regional and provincial governments, together with Territorial Councils for Immigration, also take part in the EIF programming, which therefore entails each actor's needs and demands.

* 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

The European Integration Fund is one of the financial resources available at the national level for the integration of immigrants in Italy. Local bodies are experiencing a significant hardship because of the international financial crisis and the EIF is therefore a significant financial resource supporting and strengthening integration policies.

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

In order to improve the annual programming exercise of the Fund, we would suggest that:

- the Commission make the eligibility rules simpler;
- the Commission provide more room for the implementation of multiannual projects.

* 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

In order to improve the implementation of the actions / projects and the control mechanisms on the actions/ projects, we would suggest that:

- the Commission provide guidance documents concerning administrative and accounting checks;
- the Commission provide clearer rules on the selection procedure, since a number of difficulties arise from the verification of the projects carried out with the Executing Body method as well as those funded by direct selection.

* 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

In September 2009, the Commission gave forth to the guidance documents concerning the programming exercise. Since then, the Responsible Authority is waiting for such documents in order to take them in. the same goes for the evaluation process.

End of the report