

**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)

The Netherlands

Date:

29 June 2010

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

Marilyn Haimé

Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment  
Director of Integration

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

MFA van Marken, Co-ordinator Programming Secretary European Funds  
Ministry of Justice  
Financial and Economic Affairs Department  
P.O. Box 20301  
2500 EH The Hague  
[m.f.a.van.marken@minjus.nl](mailto:m.f.a.van.marken@minjus.nl)  
(+31) 70 370 6052

Template

Evaluation report on Implementation of actions co financed by the Integration Fund

**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:*

Not applicable

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 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EIF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.*

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	5	12	16	33
Projects selected	3	9	6	18
Projects funded	3 (*)	9	6	18

(\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage.

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

Yes/No: YES

- If No, explain why: .....

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

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

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	3 (*)	9	6	18
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	3 (*)	9	6	18

(\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage.

**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 →	3 (*)	9	6
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	2 (*)	9	6
Priority 2	0	0	0
Priority 3	0	0	0
Priority 4	1	0	0

(\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage.

**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 →	3 (*)	9	6
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	2 (*)	9	6
Category b)	0	0	0
Category c)	0	0	0
Category d)	1	0	0

(\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage.

**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 →	3 (*)	9	6
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	0	0	0
Specific Priority 2 only	0	2	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	0	0	1
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	3 (*)	6	5

(\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage.

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

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

Yes/No:     NO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Definitions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes/No: .....

- If No, explain why: .....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*By Priority*

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

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

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

*By Category of Actions*

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

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

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

*Specific Priorities*

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

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

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

*Explanations for this part:*

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

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

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

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

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

*(Explanations continue on the next page)*

Template

Evaluation report on Implementation of actions co financed by the Integration Fund

*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 of the projects have been funded under priority 1 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. In the annual programmes 2007 through 2009 two actions were defined under this priority (1) Participation as an instrument for integration and (2) Intercultural dialogue at local or neighbourhood level aimed at long-term contact. These actions turn out to be the easiest for beneficiaries to comply with and to cope with the target group. Under action 1 most projects develop a methodology that –in the final stage- will be tested by members from the target group and by members not belonging to the target group. Under action 2 most projects aim for activities that bring the target group together with residential Dutch citizens. One project focusses at participation of parents in schools, while several other projects focus at young people or women.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

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

In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

No projects have been funded under priority 2 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009.

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

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

In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

No projects have been funded under priority 3 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009.

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Only one project has been funded under priority 4 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. In this project the beneficiary carried out a large number of activities ranging from organising conferences on a national level, participating in conferences on an international level, improvement of international co-operation and disseminating information.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

Not applicable

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

Not applicable

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

**Not applicable**

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

**Not applicable**

**III.9. Highlight any other significant change (other than the distribution referred to under points 7 and 8) to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method and in the “executing body” method over the period from 2007 to 2009**

*Maximum length: half a page*

In the “awarding body” method

A significant change is the increase of the commitment rate over the years (see also part V).

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable

**III.10. Description of two “success stories”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009**

*Please describe two projects (preferably under two different Priorities) which, in your opinion, deserve particular attention since you consider them as e.g. of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirement, or innovative, or a good practice, of interest for other Member States, etc. It is up to you to judge what projects deserve particular attention.*

*It is necessary to provide a very concrete description of the projects concerned and of the reasons you consider them “success stories”. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.*

*Maximum length: half a page*

**Not known by June 2010.**

### **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*

One beneficiary whose project was funded under priority 1 in the annual programme 2007 decided to end the project in a premature stage and withdraw it from IF-funding. Reason for this decision was the fact that the beneficiary received the grant agreement in a very late stage while most of the activities already took place in the years 2007 and 2008. To these activities the rules of the IF applied as well. Although the beneficiary was aware of this upon application it turned out to be a too big burden for the beneficiary and therefore the beneficiary decided to withdraw its project. The lessons learnt from this experience are a timely approval of programming documents, a timely start of the application procedures and discouragement to apply for projects retrospectively.

## **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*

In the Netherlands the four migration Funds are managed by the European Funds Programme Secretariat (PEF), which acts as the delegated authority. The technical assistance from the four funds is combined. All expense in relation to the management of the Funds is incurred from there. Where these costs clearly relate to one specific Fund, they are allocated to the technical assistance available for that Fund. Costs which do not clearly relate to one specific Fund are allocated to the technical assistance for all Funds according to a formula. This formula is based on the resources available for the year and the Fund involved.

Activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the RF annual programmes 2008 and 2009 are:

- the salary costs of the staff of the European Funds Programme Secretariat for the EIF (PEF), the Audit Authority and the Certifying Authority
- publicity costs (e.g the publication of the call for proposals in the Dutch Government Gazette and costs for the improvement of forms such as the application form, progress report form and final report form, costs for the information meeting held for potential final beneficiaries)
- travelling expenses in relation to project visits, participation in the SOLID committee and the EIF working group about fund management with other Member States in which the Delegated Authority participates.
- the costs for promotional material such as stickers, notepads, ballpoint pens, cardboard folders and the European flag that have been made.

Template

Evaluation report on Implementation of actions co financed by the Integration Fund

## **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*

The information and publicity activities implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009:

- one information meeting for potential beneficiaries before the opening of the call for proposals 2007 and 2008, which opened simultaneously in November 2008. This information meeting highlighted the multi annual programme as well as the annual programmes 2007 and 2008.
- a similar information meeting for potential beneficiaries before the opening of the call for proposals 2009, which opened in September 2009. This information meeting highlighted the annual programmes 2009.
- In all communications about the EIF the EU logo and the national defined slogan ‘EIF: Van EU naar lokaal. Ondersteuning van de integratie van nieuwe burgers in Nederland en Europa’ is included.

The website for the EIF<sup>1</sup> was developed and was operational in December 2007 and the required data for all annual programmes was published in the week before the opening of the calls for proposals 2007/2008 and 2009. When the funded projects were known a list of final beneficiaries was published.

### **- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries**

*Maximum 15 lines*

The obligations to be complied with by the project organisations with respect to communications relating the EIF are set out in the grant decision directly and through a reference to the conditions in the Implementing Rules.

So far most final beneficiaries have either organised meetings, developed information leaflets or digital information about their project or developed and implemented training courses. The European Funds Programme Secretariat (PEF) proactively communicates about the publication requirements and so far the final beneficiaries comply with the conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.justitie.nl/europesemigratiefondsen](http://www.justitie.nl/europesemigratiefondsen)

**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	€1.621.402,77 (*)	€743.399,57 (*) (**)	45,85%
Programme 2008	€1.812.068,83 (*)	€1.682.562 (*)	92,85%
Programme 2009	€2.113.053,67 (*)	€2.143.372,66 (*)	101,43%
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	<b>€5.546.525,27 (*)</b>	<b>€4.569.334,23 (*)</b>	<b>82,38%</b>

(\*) This figure includes the full amount of technical assistance.

(\*\*) One beneficiary whose project was selected and funded under the AP 2007 withdrew the project in a later stage; the amount funded to this project (€198.513) is *included* in this figure.

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

No, we received the approval of the AP 2007 by the end of 2008. That means that the call for proposals 2007 could open after that. We opened this call combined with the call for proposals for 2008 and most applicants chose to submit a proposal under that AP. At the opening of this call most of the eligibility period was already over by then. Only 3 proposals were submitted; this means that we have a large undercommitment for the AP 2007 (see Part V); furthermore one of the beneficiaries withdrew its project after approval.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The late approval by the Commission caused a late opening of the call for proposals. We did not want to open a call before that approval because of the uncertainty. This problem could not be solved by the Netherlands.

The same applies for the definition of the target group for the IF. This European definition did not meet the reality in the Netherlands. The definition of the target group is very limited and this problem could not be solved by the Netherlands.

Due to a lack of staff we have not been able to carry out monitoring visits to the projects. This problem could not be solved during the implementation-period of the AP 2007. New projects will be monitored from now on.

**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*

No, see previous sections for explanation.

**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*

No, see previous sections for explanation.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Yes, the actions were appropriate and so was the distribution of the funding.

## **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 same problem arised for the AP 2008 as for the AP 2007; the EC approved the AP 2008 by the end of 2008 and most of the eligibility period was over by then. Nevertheless we received more applications during the call for proposals.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The problem regarding the target group remained and will remain until the end of the programming period.

We did not receive any proposals under action 3.

Due to a lack of staff we have not been able to carry out monitoring visits to the projects. This problem could not be solved during the implementation-period of the AP 2008. New projects will be monitored from now on.

**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, we did ask for a revision of the AP 2008 and the European Commission approved this request. The reason for revision was the result of the open call for proposals; this caused a change in the division of allocation between actions (>10%).

**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*

Not yet known by September 2010.

**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*

Not yet known by September 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*

Yes, the actions were appropriate and so was the distribution of the funding.

### **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*

A large part of the allocation was reserved for the second phase of multi-annual projects. Only one third of the total allocation was available for the call for proposals. We were able to approve only six proposals; all the other 10 proposals were withdrawn or rejected.

Again no new proposals were approved under action 3.

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

*15 lines maximum*

See above, regarding the target group.

These projects will be monitored in the second half of 2010.

**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*

No.

**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*

Not yet known by September 2010.

**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*

Not yet known by September 2010.

**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, the actions were appropriate and so was the distribution of the funding.

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

*Based on:*

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

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

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

*Half a page maximum*

The Management and Control System for the Integration Fund put in place has been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far, although the Audit Authority and the Certifying Authority did not perform too much of activity yet. There is not so much I can say about the efficiency of those parts of the Management and Control System at this moment. The result of the audit on the Management and Control System carried out in spring 2010 by Unit A4 of DG JLS proves that the system works. A similar audit carried out late 2009 by the Audit Authority had the same result.

**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 European Commission has not yet approved the Dutch description of the Management and Control System. Since 2008 we have submitted several versions of this description after comments of the European Commission; the latest version has been sent to the European Commission in February 2010. The most important change is the designation of another institution as Certifying Authority.

Other changes were more like clarifications on the tasks of the different Authorities and on the separation of duties.

The audit of Unit A4 of DG JLS did not lead to a modification of the Management and Control System.

**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?**

(CONCEPT 24-06-2010)

The Responsible Authority (RA) as regards the EIF implementation in the Netherlands is the Directorate-general for Housing, Communities and Integration of the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment. At first when developing the infrastructure for the EIF implementation the RA had to face several start-up problems. Most of the start-up problems were caused by the fact that the strategic guidelines and the implementing order were coming into force after the start date of the EIF implementation.

One of the main problems the RA was and still is faced with is the limitation of the definition of the target group: the third-country nationals. The definition of third-country nationals provided by Article 2, section A of the Council Directive 2003/109/EC is not applicable to oldcomers and to citizens with dual citizenship. Due to this restriction the relatively small EIF budget cannot even be assigned to these migrant groups.

The EIF budget for the Netherlands ( $\pm$  2 million euros per year) is relatively small in proportion to the Dutch national budget for civic integration ( $\pm$ 500 million euros per year) and integration ( $\pm$ 80 million euros per year). Therefore, the additional value of the EIF budget has to be put in perspective.

The EIF system of open calls does not enable the RA to influence or determine the content of the project applications. Besides, project applications as regards the employment of third-country nationals consist of elements which the EIF can be applied to on the one hand and which the ESF can be applied to on the other hand. As regards these project applications it is not clear how grants could be assigned to these applications.

**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?*

See above, regarding the relatively small amount of the EIF budget.

\* 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?*

See above, regarding the relatively small amount of the EIF budget. Also the results of the programme are not known by June 2010.

\* 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.*

The costs of the management of the European Integration Fund are about ± 200.000 euros per year.

\* 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?*

See above, regarding the relatively small amount of the EIF budget.

Besides, project applications as regards the employment of third-country nationals consist of elements which the EIF can be applied to on the one hand and which the ESF can be applied to on the other hand. As regards these project applications it is not clear how grants could be assigned to these applications.

## 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.*

The problems with regard to the targetgroups, the alignment between EIF, ESF and ERF, the relatively small amount of the EIF budget and the administrative burden might lead in the future to a cost-benefit analysis of the EIF. The outcome of this analysis might lead to a re-evaluation of the meaning of the EIF for the Netherlands.

### **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*

At the moment the Member States are asked to write one multi annual programme and 5 annual programmes. I perceive this programme structure as needlessly complicated. I suggest to install a 3 years programme instead to enhance flexibility and a reduction of the administrative burden and expenditure for Member States and Commission.

Also I would like to suggest a reconsideration of the reasons for having to submit a revision of an annual programme.

The legal framework (basic act and implementing rules) should be finalised before the programming period starts. The approval of the multi-annual programme should be finalised before the programming period starts. The approval of an annual programme should be finalised before the calenderyear starts.

In the Strategic Guidelines for every priority so called “Specific Priorities” have been defined for which the contribution from the IF can be 75% in stead of 50%. This arrangement causes confusion and I suggest to either eliminate this possibility, or to admit 75% contribution from the EIF for all priorities and projects. I would like to draw your attention to the latter as I have noticed that due to the current economic climate the final beneficiaries (private and public) face difficulties in arranging cofinancing and sometimes this unfortunately prevents good projects from being carried out.

I stress that a better alignment between EIF and ESF is required; now under EIF projects that aim for placement in employment are excluded, while according to our national policy the best form of integration for third country nationals is work. A suggestion for the future could be to incorporate the EIF completely in the ESF.

Template

Evaluation report on Implementation of actions co financed by the Integration Fund

\* 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*

I would like to draw attention to the difficulties perceived by project organisations, my Delegated Authority and sometimes even by the Commission concerning the correct interpretation of the vast number of eligibility rules. I of course subscribe to the necessity of having to verify how the allocation is spent, but I doubt whether this can not be done in a less detailed and simpler way.

As the Migration Funds are under shared management I suggest that the Member States define the eligibility of costs according to national rules of course after approval by the Commission.

I support the suggestions the Commission has done for simplifying the implementing rules at the Solid meeting of 1 June 2010.

More detailed clarification should be given on the different roles and responsibilities of the Audit Authority and the Certifying Authority.

The definition of the target group in the legal framework is currently too strict and does not meet the reality in the Netherlands. For example, people with a double nationality (Dutch and of a third country) are now excluded from the target group although many of them could benefit from projects under EIF.

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

*Half a page maximum*

Refer to previous section.

*End of the report*