

**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)
Lithuania

.....

Date:
2010-06-

.....

Name, Signature (authorised representative of the Responsible Authority):
Vice-minister Audra Mikalauskaitė

.....

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

Gerda Mockaitienė

Chief specialist of Structural Support Management Division

Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania

Tel. No +370 5 2664 270

e.mail. GMockaitiene@socmin.lt

.....

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: Yes.....

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

- 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)

Having regard to the European Commission requirements for the evaluation report on the results and impacts of actions co-financed by the EIF Responsible Authority call a tender for the independent evaluators. Tender was published in the website of Public Procurement Office under the Government of the Republic of Lithuania. After all selection and evaluation procedures was selected the Public Policy and Management Institute as most experienced company (<http://www.vpvi.lt>).

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

Methodology is attached in Annex (Conceptual framework for evaluation).

Important remark

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

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

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

CONTENTS

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

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No: Yes

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

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

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

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

I.2 - Calls for proposals

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

- Programme 2007: 1 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: 1 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2009: 1 (number of calls for proposals)

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 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	17	14	27	58
Projects selected	16	13	16	45
Projects funded	16	12	12	40

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

Yes/No: No.

- If *No*, explain why: In 2007, all sixteen projects recommended to be financed have been funded. In 2008, one project was rejected due to insufficient benefit and quality of project. In 2009, four projects selected for funding were not financed due to insufficient funds.

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.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>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>40</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	-	-	-	-
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>40</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 →	16	12	12
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	10	7	9
Priority 2	3	3	1
Priority 3	3	2	2
Priority 4	-	-	-

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 →	16	12	12
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	-	-	-
Category b)	8	6	8
Category c)	7	6	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 →	<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	-	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	-
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	-	-	-
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	-	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>6</i>

**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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes/No:

- If No, explain why:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Priority

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

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

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

By Category of Actions

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

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

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

Specific Priorities

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

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

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

Explanations for this part:

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

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

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

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

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

(Explanations continue on the next page)

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

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

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

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

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Most projects, funded under Priority 1, had diverse activities, targeted to meet the goals of facilitating integration process. Among the 26 projects funded, various types of operations were focused directly on immigrants: preparation of educational programmes (of Lithuanian language, history, customs, political and economical situation); publication of informational guides; conducting online information courses; provision of information to third-country nationals (TCN) about the opportunities to receive public and private services; increasing of employment opportunities for qualified TCN (analysing the needs of employers, identifying problems, developing methodological material for both qualified TCN specialists and Lithuanian employers); analysing and facilitating the integration processes through consumption (dealing with everyday matters, buying goods and services). Operations with a focus on host society and interaction include: raising public awareness and reducing racism, xenophobia, discrimination through mass media, public events (concerts, informal/cultural events), joint creative initiatives (poster competition, movie/documentary making); building competences of teachers, educators, social activists, NGO members, people working in the service-provision area; publishing booklets for universities and private companies, encouraging acceptance and employment of students, scholars and scientists from third countries; preparing a number of qualified mentors.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

The call for Lithuania’s capacities to improve, implement, monitor and assess the policy and measures of integration of TCN had resulted in 7 projects funded under Priority 2. They include the following operations: observation and analysis of integration tendencies and legal regulation in Lithuania (e.g., TCN situation on the labour market); examining effectiveness and relevance (e.g., assessment of needs and opportunities of immigrants studying in Lithuania to integrate into labour market, examining the adequacy of policy tools and the needs of TCN); development of methodology for research of TCN integration (e.g., development and justification of research instruments of possibilities for TCN to enter the labour market); development of action programmes and proposing recommendations for increasing the adequacy between the TCN needs and integration tools; preparing lobbying strategies for integration; stimulating information and publicity (creating official websites, presenting research results); improving the access to information (creating interactive databases for sharing news, statistic data, related documents and formal regulations); fostering the dialogue between various governmental institutions related to the issues of TCN integration; exchanging information, best practices and promotion of cooperation with Member States.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Addressing the need of civil and governmental sector for increased awareness on TCN, 7 projects funded under Priority 3 were mainly focused on building policy and improving capacities and intercultural competences of civil servants, service-providers to immigrants and other specialists (e.g., specialists working with EIF funds, specialists in the specific professional/regional areas). The operations include: increasing professional capacities and competences, specific knowledge (legal issues, equality, diplomacy), building intercultural competence of civil servants, service-providers to immigrants and other specialists (e.g., specialists working with EIF funds, specialists in the specific/regional areas); development of a training programme for civil servants on intercultural competence building issues (e.g., organisation of test training); increasing information by various means of media and publication (e.g., “Manual on Implementation of Integration in Lithuania 2009”); creating and conducting programmes that facilitate TCN integration into Lithuanian labour market (e.g., improving methods and creating innovative methodical tools for capacity strengthening among various levels of the civil servants responsible for employment of TCN); coordination of integration policies; development of an informal network of interested parties (public authorities, business and non-governmental sector); stimulation of creation of regional, national, and international networks of partnership for mutual coordination and external expertise.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

There were no projects funded under Priority 4 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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”.

There were no projects funded without a call for proposals, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009.

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”.

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

Based on the data in Table I-6 there are no significant changes in the distribution of the projects by Priority throughout the years 2007-2009. There is a slight decrease in number of projects funded in general as well as of projects that belong to Priority 2 (Development of indicators and evaluation methodologies to assess progress, adjust policies and measures and to facilitate co-ordination of comparative learning).

In addition, as it was indicated in Table I-7, the only significant change in the distribution of the funded projects is a decrease in number of projects under the Category of Actions c) (Increasing of the capacity of Member States to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals). That change is attributable to a series of successful measures taken to develop research models, instruments,

methodologies, assessment principles of third-country nationals' integration in the previous years. Thirteen projects throughout 2007 and 2008 (and only three projects in 2009) were concerned with creating research tools and formulating principles for monitoring, assessing and improving the policy for integration of third-country nationals. Capitalising on newly developed tools and techniques for the assessment of integration of TCN, the annual work programme 2009 had increased its interest in awareness-raising campaigns, activities involving transnational interaction and communication, education programmes for immigrants etc.

There were no significant changes in the distribution of the projects by Specific Priority, over the period from 2007-2009.

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

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

There were no other significant changes to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method.

In the “executing body” method

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

1) “Lithuania. Meeting in Crossroad: Playback Theatre Method for Citizens of Third Countries” (2008) – the project intended for the third-country nationals (specifically, women and children) and implemented by The Studio of Self-Awareness and Self-Realization. Falling under Priority 1, the project aimed at developing and improving programmes and activities for introduction of newly arrived TCN to the Lithuanian society and knowledge about Lithuania. This project deserves particular attention firstly because it is **innovative**: the main goal – strengthening of primary integration skills of citizens from third countries – has been pursued through adapting and implementing a new in Lithuania measure for social-educational impact in social, psychological and consulting-work sector – Social Playback Theatre method¹. Secondly, the **bottom-up approach to the community building** facilitates the implementation of innovative artistic methods for social problems, that help people and communities to recognize their capacities and to find new ways for self realization, psychological adaptation and social integration, to increase level of their life-quality, positive relations with each other and satisfaction of mutual interaction through the drama art activities. Thirdly, the project proved to be an **attractive and effective method** to master skills and knowledge of TCN, promote social cohesion, enhance mutual understanding and empowerment of immigrants. Participants of the project (mostly students from universities, Russian-speaking pupils and their mothers) have acquired basic knowledge of Lithuanian language, history, ethno-culture; improved skills to communicate and express themselves in Lithuanian and have been encouraged to become active members of the local community. Finally, the **continuation** of the project – organisation of independent Playback theatre supportive group of women immigrants in Kaunas – is a definite sign of overall success.

2) The project “A feasibility study of integration of third-country nationals into the labour market to improve knowledge and collection of information about assessment of their needs” (2007) conducted by the Institute of Labour and Social Research falls under the action of creation and implementation of the systems dedicated to collect and analyse information on the needs of various categories of third-country nationals (Priority 2). The success can be measured by the scope and an overall impact that has been made to the field of integration

¹ This method is interactive, creative and supportive instrument based on non-traditional ways of learning and skill mastering through storytelling, when personal experience of the participants are reflected and analysed on the stage. Inter-cultural dialogue is significantly developed when values and attitudes are explored, traditions and ethnic peculiarities are accepted and exchanged.

researches and policies: **quality questionnaires and methodologies** for surveys of third-country nationals and employers (management of individual bodies) were developed, studies on different integration issues as well as innovative pilot projects conducted, improved basis for evidence based integration policies created. Moreover, implementation of the project **revealed the most relevant problems and difficulties** immigrants face on the daily basis (discrimination, unemployment, lack of information and linguistic knowledge). Finally, the **results of the research are perceived as beneficial and extensively used** by many social groups (politicians, policymakers, journalists, academics) as well as various institutions of the Republic of Lithuania². Furthermore, the representatives of third countries (embassies of Ukraine, Russia, Belarus) express their interest in results of the research regarding integration of TCN and are more eager to communicate and collaborate since.

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 were no implemented projects that proved completely impracticable or did not meet expectations. However, one approved project was cancelled before it entered actual implementation phase. On 2 July 2009, following the decision taken by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania, a grant agreement was signed by representatives of the Responsible Authority, Delegated Authority and final beneficiary – public enterprise X. On 19 August 2009, the public enterprise X requested to cancel this agreement. The main reason for refusing to undertake the actions of the project, as set out in the request of cancellation, was the lack of financial resources. Due to worsened economic conditions in the country, the public enterprise X recently had been working unprofitably and did not possess enough operating resources to proceed with the implementation of the project. Eventually, the funds allocated for this project have been returned to the Responsible Authority.

² Lithuanian Labour Exchange at the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, Department of Statistics to the Government, Migration Department under the Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs etc.

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

Technical assistance funds for the annual programmes 2007 through 2009 were provided to the authorities/bodies involved in the administration of the EIF programme in Lithuania. Technical assistance funds were used to finance the EIF programme development, management, monitoring, evaluation, information and control measures as well as the measures taken to build up administrative capacities for implementing all the above. The funds allocated for the technical assistance were used to cover staff expenses and activity-related expenses.

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

Responsible Authority has been implementing various Information and Publicity activities for specific audiences and general public each year. The main types are:

- 1) Events, co-organized with Delegated Authority (ESFA) – educational programmes for potential beneficiaries, open-door events, the conference “Priimti negalima atstumti – kur dėsime kablei?”, individual consultancy sessions for interested parties. Every year, at the beginning of annual programmes, the information presentation and networking event has been organized for current and potential applicants.
- 2) Information delivery systems on the Internet – the creation and regular updates of websites and information portals by Responsible Authority.
- 3) Measures for visual impact – distribution of EIF press information, informing general public, as well as specific groups (potential beneficiaries), representing programme activities in Lithuania, and providing examples of good practices and developments in the process of integration.
- 4) Press releases through news agencies, newspapers, radio, television, Internet and other mass media channels intended towards mass audiences and public relation agencies have been periodically informing about current status of the implementation of the programme. All the information about the achievements of the annual programme is distributed through Internet, and can be found on www.esf.lt.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

Final beneficiaries have organised various Information and Publicity activities within the framework and tasks of their projects. In each case, the most effective communication strategies vary depending on different factors, especially, content of the message and target audience. For information purposes community meetings have been effectively organised for local contexts, press releases have been distributed through local and national television and newspapers/magazines for general population. Internet sites have been established and regularly updated (e.g., <http://www.tja.lt/sveikiatyke>). Numerous print material (flyers, brochures, booklets) have been distributed, several press conferences presenting final outcomes of the projects have been organised. There were several articles and movies created for the purposes of advertisement and publicity. Promotion was administered by distributing informational objects such as pencils, coffee cups, ecological shopping bags, backpacks, postcards etc.

**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 (EUR) (1)	Total EIF contribution committed by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (EUR) (2)	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	668.283,68	668.283,68	100
Programme 2008	683.314,41	683.314,41	100
Programme 2009	683.193,50	683.190,85	100
TOTAL 2007-2009	2.034.791,59	2.034.788,94	100

<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 programme has been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

15 lines maximum

No problems on implementation of the 2007 annual programme were encountered.

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

15 lines maximum

There were no changes made to the 2007 programme by the Commission .

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 EIF annual programme 2007 provides for 3 priorities and 13 actions. After the selection of projects and signature of grant agreements, 3 priorities and 10 actions have been pursued because no application were submitted under three actions and subsequently no assistance was granted under these actions, i.e.: Action 1.1 “Improvement of procedures for preparation of admission procedure to ensure better integration process”, Action 1.3 “Development and improvement of flexible introductory programmes and activities allowing third-country nationals to work and study at the same time” and Action 1.8 “Development of other programmes and activities related to the objectives and actions established in the Communication of the Commission on a *Common Agenda for Integration: Framework for the Integration of Third-country Nationals in the European Union* and the Council Decision 2007/435/EC”. The final decision about the implemented actions was mainly determined by the project proposals received. All the actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission were fully implemented by the end of the 2007 programme.

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

According to Final Project Reports on implementation of annual programme 2007, all of the projects funded have been fully implemented by the end of the programme. Most of the expected quantitative results have been fully achieved and in many cases exceeded the initial targets. Based on the reports of all 16 projects, all the planned activities were successfully implemented, leading to development and improvement of the programmes for the introduction of newly arrived TCN to the Lithuanian society, establishment and maintenance of relations with specific groups of TCN, promoting the admission of high qualification and TCN nationals and supporting their integration process, strengthening the capacity of Lithuanian society to adapt to diversity, to maintain trustful relations with TCN as well as to strengthen the support for integration. The quantitative results of the some awareness raising and public relations’ activities drastically exceeded the initial targets. E.g. an extremely successful TV project appealed to almost three million Lithuanian TV watchers (3204% of its initial target). All the actions directed at creation, development and performance of research, indicators, and evaluation methodologies brought very positive results, reaching up to 420% of the initial targets. As it was stated by the project promoters in their reports and interviews,

the greater interest of Lithuanian society in the issues of integration, the growing awareness and tolerance towards newcomers, the active participation in the EIF programmes, the increasing competences of responsible institutions in dealing with integration issues can be perceived as initial qualitative achievements.

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

Regarding Lithuanian context, the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate. The biggest share of EIF funds was allocated to five actions under Priority 1. In Lithuania, where the flows of immigrants are relatively small and the integration policy implementations is relatively young, setting a firm base during the first year of the programme and distributing funds among “preparatory” actions – identification and analysis of situation, problems, and needs of TCN in Lithuania; provision of information to TCN; preparation of educational programmes; raising awareness of Lithuanian society – were highly appropriate. According to the integration model (Annex 1), fostering integration as a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States, creating the opportunities for the immigrants’ economic, social, cultural, and political participation,³ enabling immigrants to acquire basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and institutions, which are of a crucial importance in the integration process. Another area of similar importance is building a methodological background (Priority 2), whereas the list of actions and allocation of funds among them (performance and development of studies, researches, methodologies concerning TCN), were also completely relevant.

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 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule with some minor deviations.

³ Council Document 14615/04 (*Beyond the Common Basic Principles on integration: The next steps*. European Policy Centre, 15 April 2005).

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

15 lines maximum

No problems on implementation of the 2008 annual programme were encountered.

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

Responsible Authority submitted to European Commission the amendment of the Annual Programme 2008 of the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals on 7 September 2009. European Commission approved it on 30 October 2009 by the Decision. The Minister of Social Security and Labour in two consequent orders (2009 and 2010) introduced some changes to the programme. The allocation of funding for particular actions was revised and financial information was updated on the basis of the final results of project selection. For instance, for priority 1 action 2 (Development and improvement of the programmes and activities to promote the admission of high qualification and qualified third-country nationals and support their integration process) funding was reduced from 32,20% to 3.2%, and for priority 3 action 6 (Creation and improvement of the systems for cooperation, co-ordination and maintenance of relations of competent institutions and other interested parties) from 9.12% to 0%, as no projects for this action have been submitted. The total assigned budget and relative distribution between EC and Government funds remained intact.

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

Nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission could be implemented by the end of this programme, except one of the actions for the implementation of Priority 3 (Creation and improvement of the systems for cooperation, co-ordination and maintenance of relations of competent institutions and other interested parties), as no projects for this action have been submitted.

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

As set out in the 2008 programme approved by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania, the projects selected after the call for proposals in 2008 aimed for nearly all actions. Two thirds of all projects of the 2008 programme have been fully implemented and only four out of twelve are still in progress (extended until 30 June 2010). There were seven grant agreements concluded with final beneficiaries for implementation of actions designed to put the ‘Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union’ into practice, five of which, as stated in projects’ final reports, have already achieved 97% to 167% of their estimated quantitative results (the number of participants being bigger than expected). One project that aimed at creation of research and training methodologies was smoothly implemented and exceeded its planned results by expanding the volume of publications and broadening the variety of activities. Finally, two more projects fully reached their expected results in creation and implementation of the systems dedicated to collection and analysis of information on the needs of various categories of TCN as well as in training on the intercultural competence, capacity strengthening and diversity management for policy makers, servants and other persons working in the areas pertinent to the objectives of the EIF. Based on the progress reports of the rest of the projects and given an increased general interest in the activities of EIF programme, full completion of 2008 programme can be estimated by the end 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 the light of implementation of the 2008 programme, the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions can be considered appropriate. After financing 10 projects aimed at five different actions under Priority 1 in 2007, only three actions were targeted by the 2008 Programme. Seven of nine projects were selected under Priority 1 and were assigned the biggest share (52.87%) of overall funds. Only three project proposals were received under Priority 2 (all of them falling into category of the same action: creation and implementation of the systems dedicated to collect and analyse information on the needs of various categories of third-country nationals) and two proposals under Priority 3. Consequently, final decision about the distribution of funding among the actions was mainly determined by the project proposals received, and funds had to be redistributed accordingly.

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 programme has been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule.

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

15 lines maximum

No problems on implementation of the 2009 annual programme were encountered.

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

After a call for proposals financial information has changed.

At the moment the changes of management and control system are introduced.

A new management and control system –responsible authorities was approved by the Resolution of the Government No 554 on 19 May 2010.

After the changes of documents concerning the management and control system the revision of the 2009 programme will be submitted to European Commission.

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

15 lines maximum

It is reasonable to expect that all actions listed in 2009 Programme will be fully implemented. Firstly, due to valuable experiences and useful results from the past annual programmes (2007 and 2008) which were mainly very successful. Secondly, in 2009 a sufficient number of project proposals were received and selected for each category of actions, therefore all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission should be successfully implemented by the end of this programme.

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 results of actions, as set out in the 2009 Programme approved by the Commission, are expected to be fully achieved. Such expectations are based on the relatively high number and wide range of the applications received, which enabled the selection of the most competent project promoters and their projects with the highest expected added value.

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

In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme to date the distribution of EIF funding between the actions is partially appropriate. Most of the important aspects of Implementation of actions designed to put the 'Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union' into practice shall be successfully implemented in the course of nine projects under three categories of action (development and improvement of programmes for introduction of newly arrived TCN, promoting the admission of high qualification and qualified third-country nationals and support their integration process; development and improvement of the programmes and activities to strengthen the capacity of Lithuanian society to adapt to diversity).

Despite the crucial importance of those three actions, a broader range of actions (e.g., focusing on the needs of specific social groups, provision of various consultation services, facilitation of access to policy making/influencing and employment opportunities⁴) could diversify and expand the impact of the Programme.

Similarly, more attention is needed in the field of TCN participation in the democratic process, public-policy formation, more frequent interaction with the locals, inter-cultural dialogue, better evaluation of progress on integration, more effective use of previous experiences as well as exchange of information.

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.*

⁴ Penninx R. *The Logic of Integration Policies: an exercise in policy thinking*. Lecture at CEDEM, University of Liège, 29 January 2004.

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 of the European Integration Fund was designed in 2008. Clearly outlined and separated functions of the participating institutions had contributed to the effective management and supervision of the projects.

The formation of the Management and control system for the Integration Fund Programme in Lithuania was based on the system of administration of the European Refugee Fund II (2005–2007) and lessons from managing other European Union financial instruments (such as the ESF, EC initiative EQUAL etc.) were taken into account.

The Responsible Authority, the Certifying Authority and the Audit Authority are different divisions of the same Ministry (Ministry of Social Security and Labour) with clearly defined and separated functions. The Delegated Authority (European Social Fund Agency) has been established under the Ministry in order to assist it in ensuring transparency and efficiency of the mechanism of administering various EU co-financed programmes in Lithuania (the biggest being ESF operational programmes). The Project Selection and Monitoring Committee is formed of representatives of competent bodies (ministry representatives, key social partners), which ensures transparency of the process and relevance of the selected projects. The Committee takes part in the project selection process and conducts monitoring of the implementation of the Integration Fund Programme.

The management and control system in place ensures correctness of declarations of expenditures and the regularity of key transactions.

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

Half a page maximum

The new system with some minor adjustments is pending confirmation from the Commission, and should be operational in 2010. It has been slightly improved bearing in mind the experiences gained and lessons learned during the implementation of the annual programmes 2007 – 2009. The main change is that the functions of Certifying Authority are no longer performed by the Accounting and Accountability Department of the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania, and has been transferred to the European Social Fund Agency. Also, according the modified system, the functions of Responsible Authority are split between 2 ministerial departments – Structural Support Management Division of the EU Structural Support Department and Accountancy and Accountability Department. The new system in place will ensure the separation of payment function and the declaration of expenditure function.

The new system will provide the proper implementation of Council decision of 25 June 2007 (2007/435/EC), articles 25 and 27.

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

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

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

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

1 page maximum

The general conclusion is that the vast majority of the projects financed by the EIF were/are successfully implemented therefore Responsible Authority agree that EIF is enough effective and sufficient.

The resources provided by the Fund, in relation to the project to be implemented, are deemed adequate: majority of project managers consider that the results could not have been achieved with fewer resources and that the same means could not have achieved better results.

Generally speaking, the best results were achieved of those projects which carefully have planned:

- Preparatory steps (before projects submission they have analysed the real needs of target groups, general migration situation in Lithuania, what exactly they could do with their organizational capacities and competence, etc.);
- Indicators (quantity / quality) and;
- Expenditures (direct / indirect project costs).

Among all projects funded under the programme from 2007 to 2009 there were no implemented projects that proved completely impracticable or did not meet expectations.

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

In general the relevance of EIF programme's priorities and actions to our national programme is appropriate because projects seek to secure the main living conditions in Lithuania and integration issues while implementing EIF projects.

Lithuania does not have united strategy of immigrants integration. The reason can be that in Lithuania, the flows of immigrants are relatively small and the integration policy implementation is relatively young. Actions of the Fund were very useful and important helping to integrate migrants from third countries. This creates the basis to develop the policy and make decisions in this sphere. A broad variety of activities have been implemented within the 3 priorities of the Fund. With the support of the EIF in Lithuania according to 2007, 2008, 2009 annual programmes were supported 40 projects.

*** 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

In the Multi-annual programme of the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals (2007-2013) there are stated such objectives:

- to promote the integration of third country nationals legally residing in Lithuania;
- to increase the tolerance of Lithuanian society and assent to immigration and integration processes;
- to promote the capacity strengthening of competent institutions, companies and organisations and cooperation on the immigration and integration issues.

These objectives are realized through the different priorities (3) and actions (13). Not all actions planned in the annual programmes were implemented-this was mainly determined by the project proposals received. During the implementation of EIF 2007-2009 three actions were not implemented but this did not reduce the effectiveness of the programme. Although not all actions were implemented, all objectives were achieved.

* 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

In general, the use of allocation for the management of the programme (projects plus technical assistance) is considered as effective because it is used according to the sound-financial management principle and according to the real needs of target groups (for example, before submitting the application many project promoters surveyed the needs, expectations, etc. of the target group).

The results of 2007, 2008 projects show that the planned allocations correspond real needs.

* 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

Actions supported by the EIF supplemented the actions related to the European Refugee Fund Programme in Lithuania supporting the projects which aim at improving the admission conditions of refugees as well as asylum procedures by promoting the integration of these persons into the Lithuanian community.

Actions supported by the EIF also supplemented the EC initiative EQUAL and actions implemented by the European Social Fund. Main objective of the European Social Fund is to prevent unemployment and fight against it, to develop human resources and integration into labour market, to reduce social exclusion, to promote higher level of employment, to promote the implementation of equal opportunities for male and female. The European Social Fund finances the EC initiative EQUAL, which aims to promote the creation of new methods, testing and adaptation in labour market, to fight against all forms of discrimination and inequality, experienced by working people or jobseekers. Third-country nationals, in certain cases, fall within the target groups of these funds.

Department of the European Union Structural Support of the Ministry of Social Security and Labour and the European Social Fund Agency administered the implementation of measures for the Human resources development of the European Social Fund of EQUAL and measures of the European Refugee Fund. This ensured close co-operation between the staff administering different local institutional programmes and the exchange of information between different institutions.

* 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 added value of EIF is important because of the following reasons:

1. Lithuania does not have united strategy and policy for immigrants integration. Implemented EIF projects create the basis to develop the policy and make decisions in this sphere.;
2. importance of the funds - in the situation of financial and economic crisis EIF contributes to the support of people and integration in social life;
3. impact to the society.

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

The programme structure is too complicated and time consuming. We therefore suggest replacing the current system of multi annual programmes and annual programmes with one multi-annual programme for the whole period. The system of the structural funds may serve as an example.

* 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 consider that in order to ensure eligibility of expenditure we would like to have more detailed clarification of eligibility rules.

* 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

Generally speaking EU legislation was adequate but sometimes we missed a deeper explanation in order to avoid interpretation by MS.

End of the report