

**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)

Republic of Latvia

Date:

30.06.2010.

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

.....M. Lazdovskis,
State secretary of the Ministry of Justice

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

.....D. Freimane,
Director of the Project department of the Ministry of Justice

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:

Results of projects completed until March 31, 2010 have been used for this evaluation. Results of projects not completed until March 31, 2010 we did use for evaluation as Responsible authority does not have finished to review reports in projects completed until June 30, 2010.

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: 74, 94 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2008: 81,11 %
- Programme 2009: no grant agreements until June 30, 2010

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
- Programme 2008: 1
- Programme 2009: 0 (until 30 June, 2010)

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	14	21	0	35
Projects selected	11	15	0	26
Projects funded	11	15	0	26

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

Yes/No: Yes

- If No, explain why: N/a

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)	<i>11</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>26</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>11</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>26</i>

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 →	11	15	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	4	12	0
Priority 2	1	0	0
Priority 3	6	3	0
Priority 4	0	0	0

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

By Category of Actions

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	<i>11</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>0</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Category b)	<i>4</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>
Category c)	<i>6</i>	<i>9*</i>	<i>0</i>
Category d)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

* One project in programme 2008 is counted as belonging to category c), but some of the activities could be classified as category b), too

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

Specific Priorities

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	<i>11</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>0</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>0*</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>2**</i>	<i>2***</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

* As programmes 2007 and 2008 were implemented in time period that partly overlaps, projects targeted at specific target groups were funded in programme 2008

** 1 project – specific priorities 3 and 4, 1 project - specific priorities 1 and 4

*** 1 project – specific priorities 2 and 4, 1 project – specific priorities 3 and 5

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No: 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: 25,06 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 18,89 %
- Programme 2009: no grant agreements yet

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

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

- Programme 2007: 0
- Programme 2008: 0
- Programme 2009: 0

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes/No:

- If *No*, explain why:

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

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

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

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	2	2	0	4

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)	0	0	0	0
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	2	2	0	4
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	2	2	0	4

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 →	2	2	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	1	2	0
Priority 2	0	0	0
Priority 3	0	0	0
Priority 4	1	0	0

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 →	2	2	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	0	0	0
Category b)	1	1	0
Category c)	0	1	0
Category d)	1	0	0

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 →	2	2	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 2 only	0	1	0
Specific Priority 3 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 4 only	0	1	0
Specific Priority 5 only	0	0	0
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	1*	0	0
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	1	0	0
* 1 project – specific priorities 2, 3 and 4			

**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

- 1) Project “**Development of the integration system of third country nationals**” (2007/1.1./7) – analysis of situation of third-country nationals in Latvia. In this research third-country nationals, policy makers, employers and service providers were involved. Report of this research will be used to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals.
- 2) Project “**Compass to life in Latvia for students – third-country nationals**” (2007/1.3./4) and project “**Research of needs of repatriates – third-country nationals**” (2007/1.3./5) – needs analysis of the third-country nationals who live Latvia and informative brochures were developed for third-country nationals with information that is necessary for this specific target group of the project.
- 4) Project “**Information and social contact centre in Līvāni – chance for third-country nationals to receive assistance**” (2007/1.3./132) – project ensured language training and specialists consultations for third-country nationals in Latgale region.
- 5) Project “**Educational activities for successful integration in Latvia**” (2008/1.2./6), developed distance learning integration courses (information about country, culture, political and social issues that is essential for life in Latvia) for third country nationals. Third-country nationals were involved in approbation of these courses;
- 6) Project “**Development of the competence of teachers in intercultural education**” (2008/1.4.2./7) – training programme was developed and published, 140 teachers were trained.

Three more projects of programme 2008 will be completed in June, 2010, so they are not included in this evaluation.

In the “executing body” method

- 1) Project “**Development of the National integration centre**” (2007/1.2./7) – this project provided chance for third country nationals to receive training to improve their professional skills, Latvian language training and integration courses. Consultations of specialists (lawyer and social worker) were ensured. Third-country nationals attended and discussed Latvian cultural events together; there was a possibility to come to centre with children. Internet resource for third-country nationals was developed.

One more project of programme 2008 will be completed in June 2010, so it is not included in this evaluation.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Project “**Improvement of the data processing process of the Residence permit information system**” (2007/2.1.1./6) - methodology and recommendations to improve Residence permit information system were developed.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/a

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

In the “awarding body” method

1) Projects “**Meeting place**” (2007/3.1./130), “**Lets go together! 2009 – Integration**” (2007/3.1./2), “**Raising capacity of the Latvian Red Cross to integrate third-country nationals**” (2007/3.1./3), “**Raising capacity of NGOs to assist third-country nationals**” (2007/1.3./126) – projects were aimed to improve capacity of Latvian NGOs to work with new target group - third-country nationals. Project “**Meeting place**” (2007/3.1./130) provided also a resource centre for third-country nationals, where they could receive consultations of specialists.

2) “**Hello, Latvia!**”(2007/3.1./131) – Newspaper for third-country nationals distributed in this project. Project was aimed to help third-country nationals and facilitate their integration in Latvian and European Society by providing them information. Project also developed the NGO as information centre for third-country nationals.

3) “**Development of the resource centre for immigrants from Ukraine**” (2007/1.3./129) - this project provided wide range of activities for Ukrainian

immigrants in Latvia. Improvement and certification of the professional skills for target group was organized. Project included cultural activities and integration activities. Internet resource for Ukrainians in Latvia was developed. Informative brochure was developed for Russian and Ukrainian speaking immigrants in Latvia. Final beneficiary also researched experience of Ukrainian NGOs in other European Union countries. Third-country nationals could receive consultations of specialists (lawyer, expert on taxes).

Three projects of programme 2008 under Priority 3 will be completed in June, 2010, so they are not included in this evaluation.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/a

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/a

In the “executing body” method

Project “**Acquiring of experience of other European Union countries how to integrate third-country nationals**” (2007/1.2./7) – visits to Finland, Slovenia, Hungary, Sweden and Netherlands were organized. Ministry of Justice invited wide range of state institutions involved in integration process and all NGOs that proposed their projects in call for proposals for programmes 2007 and 2008 to participate in these visits. Report with recommendations was developed and will be used to improve Latvian policy for integration of third-country nationals.

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

N/a

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

Project “**Development of the National integration centre**” (2007/1.2./7) – this project provided chance for third country nationals to receive training to improve their professional skills, Latvian language training and integration courses. Consultations of specialists (lawyer and social worker) were ensured. Third-country nationals attended and discussed Latvian cultural events together; there was a possibility to come to centre with children. Internet resource for third-country nationals was developed.

Project “**Acquiring of experience of other European Union countries how to integrate third-country nationals**” (2007/1.2./7) – visits to Finland, Slovenia, Hungary, Sweden and Netherlands were organized. Ministry of Justice invited wide range of state institutions involved in integration process and all NGOs that proposed their projects in call for proposals for programmes 2007 and 2008 to participate in these visits. Report with recommendations was developed and will be used to improve Latvian policy for integration of third-country nationals.

Two projects of programme 2008 will be completed in June, 2010 and are not included in this evaluation.

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

Implementation of the programmes 2007 and 2008 were started at the same time, so different priorities were set for each programme. There are no significant changes to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method over the period from 2007-2009.

Programme 2007 was targeted to start integration process with European fund of third-country nationals by raising capacity of NGOs, exchanging experience with other European Union countries, research activities etc.

Programme 2008 was targeted to reach third-country nationals and provides language and integration courses. Projects targeted at specific target groups (children, women, etc.) were also funded under Annual programme 2008. Teachers as a significant channel of information in Latvian society were trained about third-country nationals and intercultural education under Annual programme 2008.

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

Implementation of the programmes 2007 and 2008 were started at the same time, so different priorities were set for each programme. There are no significant changes to the distribution of the projects funded in the “executing body” method over the period from 2007-2009.

Development of National integration centre and exchange of experience with other European Union countries were part of programme 2007.

Promoting information about third-country nationals and developing educational program for children – third-country nationals is next step, so these activities are funded under Annual programme 2008.

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

Most projects are funded under awarding body method and involve state institutions and NGOs in integration process of third-country nationals.

In the “executing body” method

Projects that are essential for policy making in Latvia are funded in the executing body method.

Project “**Acquiring of experience of other European Union countries how to integrate third-country nationals**” (2007/1.2./7) was funded in executing mode because it allowed the widest possible range of state institutions and NGOs to participate in these visits and to gain experience. The Ministry of Justice has all information about NGOs working in the field of integration of third-country nationals. Project was also important to develop recommendations to improve integration of third-country nationals in Latvia.

Project “**Development of the National integration centre**” (2007/1.2./7) was a tool to develop measures for integration of third country nationals in Latvia, discussions between policy makers about improvement of policy for integration of third-country nationals also were part of this project.

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

Project “Compass to life in Latvia for students – third-country nationals”
(2007/1.3/4)

- Project was aimed to ensure integration of students – third-country nationals in Latvian society by providing necessary information to them, to promote their involvement in social networks and by promoting their communication with universities and state institutions
- Needs students - third-country nationals who live Latvia – were researched in these projects and informative brochures were developed.
- Project involved students themselves into research of their needs
- Project promoted involvement of students - third-country nationals in social networks. Electronic means (interest group in *Facebook*) were used not just to reach target group, but also to promote their mutual cooperation.
- 38 students were involved in project, 53 are active members of social network promoted by the project and 92 students received informative brochure developed during project. Informative brochure was also distributed to 8 universities and other higher education institutions in Latvia.

Project “Development of the competence of teachers in intercultural education” (2008/1.4.2./7)

– Training programme was developed and published, 140 teachers were trained;

- We see very high level of interest of teachers in intercultural education. Other projects in this field have been very successful, too. This is main reason why we consider this project to be a success story.

- Training was carried out in all regions of Latvia.

- Teachers are important information channel in Latvian society, so projects like this reach not just teachers themselves, but also pupils and their families, promoting awareness about third country nationals. Project improves knowledge of teachers how to work with children of third-country nationals, but also trains them how to teach about third-country nationals to Latvian pupils.

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

All projects were implemented and targets were reached, so we do not have projects that we consider to be failures.

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.

So far technical assistance has been used for developing annual programmes appraisal of projects under Annual programmes 2007 and 2008. Translation of the documentation related to the EIF was translated (as annual programmes, Control and Management system, etc.)

Specialists are employed to work specifically with the projects of the European fund for Integration of third-country nationals.

Participation in SOLID committee was ensured.

We plan training for specialists and buying necessary equipment to ensure work of the employees who work specifically with the projects of the European fund for Integration of third-country nationals.

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

Information has been published on website of the Responsible authority (www.tm.gov.lv).

There were seminars when call for proposals was launched for programme 2007 and programme 2008.

Responsible authority uses all forums where NGOs involved in field of integration gather together to distribute information about EIF, such as councils where NGOs and state institutions meet (organized by Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Education and Science), seminars for NGOs, etc.

During information campaign about third country-nationals in action 1.1. of programme 2008, that is implemented by Responsible Authority as executing body, we also distribute information not just about third-country nationals but also about EIF. Regional seminars were a good opportunity to meet regional municipalities and NGOs to inform about third-country nationals and accessible funding for their integration.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

All final beneficiaries according to the grant agreements are obliged to inform society about their projects. Information can be found on their websites, many used booklets and calendars to inform about their projects. Most projects had closing seminars to inform about their results they achieved. Many final beneficiaries informed about their activities in newspapers.

**Part V: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF
FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

Based on the Commission Decision approving each annual programme and on the information available to the Responsible Authority on the budget implementation of the programmes, please fill in the table below:

Annual Programme	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the annual programme Amount (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (2)	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	1 069 587,37	718 407,89	67,17%
Programme 2008	1 143 581,50	1 048 807,04	91,71%
Programme 2009	1 323 922,65	0	0*
TOTAL 2007-2009	3 537 091,52	1 767 214,93	49,96%

* Grant agreements not signed yet

<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

Programme 2007 has been implemented in line with the programme schedule. As European Fund for Integration of third-country nationals was a new opportunity for Latvian NGOs, state institutions and municipalities in 2008 when call for proposals was launched, not all funding of programme 2007 has been committed (reason – poor quality of the submitted project proposals), but we see improvement in programme 2008.

Despite that, projects that were approved and implemented implement programme 2007 fully and targets of the programme 2007 have been met.

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

15 lines maximum

Institutional reforms in Latvia during 2008 - 2009 lead to situation that programme 2007 was implemented by three responsible authorities. One developed annual programme and launched call for proposals, other evaluated the projects and signed some of the grant agreements. The Ministry of Justice took over the process when projects were approved and implementation started of some of them already started. The Ministry of Justice checked if the terms set for project submitters were met and signed remainder of grant agreements. This process provided a lot of challenge both to final beneficiaries and the Ministry of Justice as Responsible authority. Despite these circumstances projects have been implemented successfully.

As European Fund for Integration of third-country nationals was new for final beneficiaries, there were a lot of questions about correct implementation of projects, but they were solved by intensive work with all final beneficiaries on bilateral basis. Previous responsible authorities had not ensured explanation of implementation rules to final beneficiaries, but the Ministry of Justice through work on bilateral basis with each final beneficiary explained necessary information to them.

We would also like to mention that some interpretations of Implementing rules (the Manual) was changed in November when most of close to completion. These changes also created a need to communicate them to final beneficiaries.

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

15 lines maximum

No.

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

Yes, NGOs and state institutions involved in integration as final beneficiaries have succeeded to access even more third-country nationals than expected.

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

All actions set out in the programme have been implemented.

Action 1.1. Research was done according to the programme 2007.

Action 1.2. National integration centre was established in 2009, 203 immigrants received necessary assistance.

Action 1.3 380 third-country nationals were involved in social networks and had an opportunity to express their views about integration and needs of third-country nationals, 300 third country nationals received necessary assistance; integration process and service availability was facilitated.

Action 2.1.1. Methodology and recommendations to improve data processing system were developed and number of detailed information can be obtained about third country nationals, results of the project will also be used in further improvement of the data processing system.

Action 3.1. 9 NGOs are prepared to act as resource centre for immigrants, 198 immigrants received assistance. Starting position for integration of immigrants was improved.

Action 4.1.1. Information about 5 EU Member states was collected, best examples and conformity with situation was analysed and recommendations about innovative solutions were developed. 19 civil servants and 19 representatives from NGOs have gained experience (1 civil servant and 1 representative from NGO had to cancel their participation just before the visit because of urgent personal matters and there was not enough time to involve other persons in the visit).

- 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

Implementation of programme 2007 and programme 2008 were started in about same time and we see that programme 2008 financially was more successful as more quality projects were submitted for programme 2008.

Only action that could absorb more funding was action 1.1. of the programme 2007, we have taken this fact into account when we elaborated programme 2010 and planned funding accordingly for similar action. Other actions had enough resources planned for quality projects that were proposed to Responsible Authority.

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

Implementation of programme 2008 continues until 30th of June, 2010. We included in this evaluation 4 projects that were completed before 31st of March, 2010 as we have not received and approved final reports for projects completed in May or June.

So far we see that programme has been implemented broadly in line with programme schedule. Thorough analysis of implementation and results of programme 2008 will be done after completion of implementation of programme 2008.

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

15 lines maximum

Institutional reforms in Latvia during 2008 - 2009 lead to situation that programme 2008 was implemented by three responsible authorities. One developed annual programme and launched call for proposals, other appraised the projects and signed some of the grant agreements. The Ministry of Justice took over the process when projects were approved and implementation started of some of them already started. The Ministry of Justice checked if the terms set for project submitters were met and signed remainder of grant agreements. This process provided a lot of challenge both to final beneficiaries and the Ministry of Justice as Responsible authority.

As European Fund for Integration of third-country nationals was new for final beneficiaries, there were a lot of questions about correct implementation of projects, but they were solved by intensive work with all final beneficiaries on bilateral basis. Previous responsible authorities had not ensured explanation of implementation rules to final beneficiaries, but the Ministry of Justice through work on bilateral basis with each final beneficiary explained necessary information to them. We offer all necessary consultations and information required by final beneficiaries. This approach has allowed us to identify and address problems final beneficiaries faced during project implementation.

Necessity to revise programme 2008 delayed conclusion of some grant agreements, but prolongation of eligibility period for programme 2008 allowed completing all projects in time. We have no indications that some project will not be completed before 30th of June 2010.

We would also like to mention that some interpretations of Implementing rules (the Manual) was changed in November when most of close to completion. These changes also created a need to communicate them to final beneficiaries.

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, revision was necessary.

There was massive interest about action 1.4.2. from both project proposal applicants and teachers, so we increased amount of funding planned for this action. Necessary funding to increase funding planned for action 1.4.2. was gained from residual funding of other actions and from action 1.1.

In August, 2009 here was a discussion between Latvia and European Commission about action 1.1. (Information campaign). Programme 2008 was revised and action 1.1. was implemented with reduced funding. At this stage of implementation of programme 2008 we see that this reduced funding was enough to achieve targets of action 1.1.

- 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

Implementation of all actions approved in programme is in progress – projects have been selected and grant agreements have been concluded. 4 projects were finished before 31st of March; all other projects are completed in May-June.

- 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

At this stage we can not provide information about quantified results of programme 2008 as many of the projects will be completed in 30th of June, 2010.

- 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

In revised version of programme 2008 distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate. All quality projects received necessary funding and almost all available funding was committed to final beneficiaries.

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

Implementation of programme 2009 has been just started.

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

15 lines maximum

Implementation of programme 2009 has been just started.

- 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

Some changes that already have been discussed with European Commission will be necessary and will be submitted to European Commission in near future.

- 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

Yes.

- 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

Yes.

- 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

Yes, so far we do not have indications that distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was inappropriate.

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

Yes, it has been efficient for the implementation for the annual programmes so far. We adjusted the Management and Control System after reorganization of previous Responsible Authority, when Ministry of Justice took over duties of Responsible authority in 1st of July, 2009.

There is a system audit by external auditor (PriceWaterhouseCoopers) of the implementation of the Management and Control System. There have also been some structural changes within Certifying Authority and Audit Authority. Due to these circumstances we plan to update the Management and Control System after we will receive recommendations from the auditors.

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

We had to adjust the Management and Control System after reorganization of previous Responsible authority, when Ministry of Justice took over duties of Responsible authority in 1st of July, 2010. Revised Management and Control System was approved by the European Commission.

**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?

Implementation of the EIF in Latvia started in 2008 in accordance with Multiannual programme and annual programmes for 2007 and 2008 as a support for National level measures of integration policy.

Integration policy in Latvia was started in 1991- soon after reestablishment of independence of the Republic of Latvia as a policy targeted to affairs of national minorities.

With approval of State programme “Integration of Society in Latvia” many other issues were included to integration policy - social integration, regional integration, support of and co-operation with Diaspora organizations, support to civil society and migration policy issues. Later most of these questions were developed as specialized National policies and included in specialised programmes.

Integration of immigrants is a rather new issue of political agenda and till now it has been developed horizontally as a part of different policies – education, employment, health, development of civil society, promotion of tolerance, state language policy etc.

Implementation of EIF is an opportunity to map out more concrete measures directly targeted to third country nationals. Also these first steps of implementation very clearly have highlighted real needs of target auditorium and local society as well.

Real improvement has been achieved in a field of education, where were developed special education programmes for classes with immigrant children, special measures were designed and implemented for support of repatriates and for support of most vulnerable groups of third country nationals.

Meaningful was opportunity to organise study visits to other member states and to gain experience from countries with longer history of integration of immigrants. Also EIF gave an opportunity to develop first courses of civic orientation and state language specially designed for third country nationals.

For improvement of information were developed informative resources as web pages and printed materials as well.

Researches provided by EIF and improved system of data processing process of the Residence permit information system is a meaningful contribution for improvement of policy planning and development of evaluation system.

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**

Priorities chosen by Latvia are still relevant to the situation and identified problems and needs.

Priority 1. Implementation of actions designed to put the 'Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union' into practice is identified as most important for the situation of Latvia because the system of integration is just on the beginning of the development. Implementation of EIF is supportive for establishment of National system of integration of immigrants highlighting most actual needs and relevant measures to meet them.

Priority 2. Development of indicators and evaluation methodologies to assess progress, adjust policies and measures and to facilitate co-ordination of comparative learning – is also still actual. EIF is helpful to define most effective ways of policy planning and evaluation. Also it is important for achievement of recent decisions of European level – mainstreaming of integration policy on national level and designing of common evaluation system and development of common indicators.

3. Priority Policy capacity building, co-ordination and intercultural competence building in the Member States across the different levels and departments of government. Implementation of EIF activities discovered lack of knowledge and information at all levels public services and it means that actuality of the priority is still remains.

Priority 4. Exchange of experience, good practice and information on integration between Member States - also would have to be implemented for better understanding of different policy measures and effectiveness of them to choose the most effective ways for National level.

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?

* Effectiveness of the programme

Main operational objectives of Multiannual programme are:

- *To identify the deficiencies and challenges of the Latvian system for integration of immigrants;* Objective is partly achieved by project “Development of the integration system of third country nationals” (2007/1.1./7) – research of situation of third-country nationals in Latvia.
- *To promote integration of third country nationals legally residing in Latvia;* Developed at least 3 internet information resources and provided informative material for third country national students and policy makers. Printed newspaper for third country nationals “Hallo Latvia!”
- *To develop and implement national and regional integration systems for third country nationals, including facilitation of acquisition of language skills and emphasizing practical intercultural skills needed for effective adaption as well as the commitment to fundamental European values;* The key results - established at least 3 resource centres for immigrants in capital city and in regions. Developed at least 4 integration programmes and organised courses for immigrants and special courses for teachers.
- *To raise awareness of society about cultural differences and to promote tolerance towards third country nationals. Wide awareness raising campaigns and trainings about multi cultural communication, diversity and benefits of immigration should be carried out. Informal social relations should be promoted among the Latvian society and third country nationals by involving them into common activities developing mutual trust and understanding.* Progress and area of intervention will be evaluated when activity will be completed.
- *To strengthen the capacity and co-operation of state institutions and non-governmental organisations on the integration issues of third country nationals.* 38 representatives of wide range of Latvian state institutions and NGOs visited 5 member states for acquisition of experience.

* 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

1 725 695,85 euro total of EC contribution have been granted to final beneficiaries. 62 533,25 euro of the technical assistance have been spent and notified to the Responsible authority, which makes 3,62% of total costs spent for management. We consider these costs as reasonable.

* Complementarity

Activities were planned as supplement to the existing state policy and the foreseen activities in state level. They were developed, taking into account the following policy planning documents approved by the Cabinet of Ministers: Common Asylum and migration management system development programme for years 2006-2009, state programme "Society Integration in Latvia", Civic society consolidation programme for years 2008-2012, National tolerance promotion programme, Guidelines for Civic Society Facilitation Policy (years 2005-2014).

Annual Programmes 2007 and 2008 included activities that had been planned to implement by means of the European Union, Norway and European Economic Area financial instrument support programmes and European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund but they did not overlapped because other financial instruments have not been planned to cover needs of specified target group of EIF.

* Added value

The added value of implementation of EIF is indisputable. It is a first real opportunity for Latvia to activate discussions on integration of immigrants issues among wide range of involved parts, such as policy makers, local authorities, service providers and civil society.

Existing national programmes at current financial and economical situation are covering just the minimum of basic rights provision for immigrants, but implementation of EIF gave an opportunity to develop specialized and specifically targeted measures. For example in a field of education – Latvia has an experience of work within bilingual system of schools, also under Ministry of Education and Science is established Latvian language agency. EIF gave an opportunity to create an education programme within project “Development of the competence of teachers in intercultural education” (2008/1.4.2./7) – where by Latvian language agency was developed training programme and 140 teachers were trained.

Other meaningful value has an opportunity to involve civil society of Latvia for implementation of EIF. In accordance with Civic society consolidation programme for years 2008-2012, Latvia developing support system of NGO’s and managing measures for civic participation at policy planning and implementation. EIF gave an opportunity to encourage many of top level organisations to widen field of activities and participate in a process of integration of immigrants. EIF activated also immigrants living in Latvia to more proactive position of life.

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

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

N/a

* 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

We would like to stress that Implementing rules should be simplified and the wording of them should be improved as they may have different interpretations. European Commission updated the Manual but this did not improve the situation as most final beneficiaries already had their projects started and changing of interpretation of Implementing rules during implementation of the project created difficulties to both Responsible Authority and final beneficiaries.

We would also like to mention quality of translations of the regulatory framework as wording of the Latvian version sometimes differs from English and French versions.

* 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

Our cooperation with European Commission is good, we receive all required support.

We would like to suggest that if European Commission receives a question from a Member state and gives an answer to that question, the question should be communicated to all Member states as it may concern projects in several Member states.

End of the report