

**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)

Poland

Date:

.....

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

Jarosław Duda, Secretary of State

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

Eliza Przetak, tel. 0048 6611668, e-mail: eliza.przetak@mpips.gov.pl

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?

- Implementation of the 2007,2008 and 2009 Programmes in the “awarding body” method,
- Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, 2007 through 2009,
- Technical assistance – Information and publicity,
- Budget implementation of the EIF for the annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009,
- Assessment of the implementation of the annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009.

- 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)

Evaluation of 2007, 2008 and 2009 Programmes was accomplished by an Independent expert with sufficient experience in preparation, implementation, management, monitoring, supervision and evaluation of EU-financed projects.

Scope of work for the independent expert covered any aspects of external evaluation expertise, as specified in point 1 above, has been drafted in accordance with requirements of the template for the evaluation report for the European Fund for the Integration of third- country nationals.

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

The evaluation report has been drafted using the template for the evaluation report for the European Fund for the Integration of third- country nationals and is compliance with methodological notes included in the template.

During the evaluation all information on projects available to the Responsible Authority were used.

Following activities have been performed;

1. Analyzing of documents:
 - Multiannual Programme,
 - Annual Programmes,
 - Commission decisions related to the EIF Programmes implementation,
 - Projects' applications,
 - Financial agreements with annexes,
 - Reports on project implementation – quarterly and final,
 - Project monitoring reports
2. Interviews with the Head of the Immigrants and Social Integration Section of Implementing Authority for European Programmes (IAEP, Delegated Authority),
3. Interviews with Project Managers responsible of EIF Programmes implementation of IAEP,
4. Interview with Programming Officer from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy responsible of programming EIF Programmes, Department of Social Assistance and Integration (Responsible Authority),
5. Interview with a representative of Financial Department of IAEP,
6. Analyzing of the Programmes' data base,

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: 5
- Programme 2008: 5
- Programme 2009: 1

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	45	57	53	155
Projects selected	37	36	0	73
Projects funded	35	36	0	71

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

Yes/No: NO

- If *No*, explain why:

For calls for proposals organised for 2007 Programme, due to inability to provide public/private local co-financing the following selected applicants refused to sign grant agreements:

- Polish Legal Education Association (Polskie Stowarzyszenie Edukacji Prawnej),
- Youngs Diplomats Forum (Forum Młodych Dyplomatów).

For calls for proposals organized for 2008 Programme, due to inability to provide public/private local co-financing, the following applicant refused to sign grant agreement:

- Public Library Kraków (Biblioteka Publiczna Kraków).

Since the call for proposals for 2009 has been launched on 23rd December 2009, process of selection haven't been completed until the date of evaluation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3)	<i>35</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>71</i>
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	<i>35</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>71</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)

The Strategic Guidelines state that the Member States should target throughout the available Community resources under EIF to at least three of the available four priorities, among which priorities 1 and 2 are mandatory. Following this principle in the programmes 2007-2009 were targeted priorities 1-3 and the priority 4 was not used in those programmes.

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	35	36	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	35	16	0
Priority 2	0	13	0
Priority 3	0	7	0
Priority 4	0	0	0

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

By Category of Actions

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	35	36	0
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	6	3	0
Category b)	18	17	0
Category c)	7	14	0
Category d)	4	2	0

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)

Specific priorities are not identified in the annual programmes. Projects funded under the Polish national EIF Programmes are entitled to max. 75% of EIF co-financing. Therefore there is no need to gather data on the specific priorities.

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

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No: 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: N/A
- Programme 2008: N/A
- Programme 2009: N/A

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: N/A
- Programme 2008: N/A
- Programme 2009: N/A

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Projects selected	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Projects funded	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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 →	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Priority 2	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Priority 3	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Priority 4	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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 →	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Category b)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Category c)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Category d)	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

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→	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>

**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

According to the provisions of the Annual programme, in the 2007 EIF Programme edition, 35 projects, 100% of projects, were implemented under priority 1. 27 organizations- mainly NGO's – foundations and associations participated in the implementation of projects under priority 1.

All projects respected provisions of this Priority and were aimed to support and facilitate integration of immigrants mainly from countries of the former Soviet Union, Vietnam and Africa. Activities performed during projects' implementation referred to different aspects of everyday life in Poland and focused on, either educational issues like language courses, presentation of Polish culture, history and habits, providing knowledge and assistance in contacts with Polish institutions responsible for immigrants status or on very practical aspects of assistance like job seeking, medical care, solving of accommodation problems and providing practical legal consultation.

Vietnamese Association in Poland “Solidarność i Przyjaźń”, Autokreacja Association, Foundation of Teaching Foreign Languages, Armenian Foundation KZKO implemented 2 projects each and the International Migration Organization (IOM) and “Polish Centre of International Aid” Foundation implemented 3 projects each.

In the 2008 EIF Programme 16 projects, out of 36, were implemented under priority 1. Each project was implemented by different organization.

In the 2009 EIF Programme 12 out of 21 multiannual projects started to be implemented upon 2008 Programme and were implemented under priority 1.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

In the 2007 Programme there was no project implemented under priority 2.

In the 2008 EIF Programme, 13 out of 36 projects, app. 36%, were implemented under priority 2. Each project was implemented by different organization, mainly NGO's – foundations or associations.

All project respected provisions of this priority and referred to measuring and monitoring of policies and activities in order to create instruments and solutions be applied in the process of integration of immigrants on national, local and regional levels.

Activities performed during projects implementation included various types of surveys, studies and analyzes referred to a development of methods and methodologies in order to assess the progress and adjustment of polices and measures in the process of integration of immigrants in Poland.

Relatively high number of projects included general surveys and studies analyzing progress of integration of immigrants in relation to barriers of integration, discrimination and level of acceptance issues, keeping own identity in the new environment or measuring the public opinion on immigrants.

There were quite a few (4) projects touching more practical aspects of integration, like expertises related to integration of immigrants on labour market, access to medical care or education system in Poland, (as a case - project implemented by Centrum Badań Migracyjnych Uniwersytet A. Mickiewicza).

In the 2009 EIF Programme 5 out of 21 multiannual projects, started to be implemented upon the 2008 Programme, were implemented under priority 2.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

In the 2007 Programme there was no project implemented under priority 3.

In the 2008 EIF Programme, 7 out of 36 projects, app. 19%, were implemented under priority 3. Each project was implemented by different organization, mainly NGO's – foundations or associations. All projects respected provisions of this priority and referred to strengthening of capacity building and coordination of exchanging of information and experience related to different aspect on integration on a local, regional and national levels.

Activities performed during projects implementation covered various aspects of integration issues, in particular: postgraduate studies - exchange of experience on international migration - project implemented by the Warsaw University, creation of information forum - project implemented by Foundation Institute of Public Affairs, creation of regional network supporting immigrants - project implemented by Foundation Institute on Legal State. Regarding more specific aspects, we can present a project related to an adaptation of Polish medical system to the needs of immigrants that was implemented by International Humanitarian Action.

In the 2009 EIF Programme 4 out of 21 multiannual projects, started to be implemented upon the 2008 Programme, were implemented under priority 3.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

N/A

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

N/A

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

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”.

N/A

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

For the period from 2007 to 2009 the total number of projects implemented amounted to 71, however in the 2007 EIF Programme, according to provisions included in the Annual Programme for this edition, 35 projects funded, 100% of them, were implemented exclusively under priority 1.

In the 2008 EFI Programme in comparison with the Programme 2007, distribution of projects between priorities was tangible different. 16 projects, out of the total number of 71 were implemented under priority 1, however 13 were implemented under priority 2 and 7 projects under priority 3.

Generally, for both programmes the number of projects implemented under priority 1 amounted to 51, giving almost 72% of all project implemented.

In case of the Programme 2009, at the date of evaluation only multiannual projects funded for implementation in 2008 may be considered. Among them 12 were implemented under priority 1, 5 under priority 2 and 4 under priority 3.

Regarding category of actions, projects for Programme 2007 and 2008 were distributed considerably even between both programme editions. Nevertheless most of all projects were implemented under category of action b). – respectively 18 for 2007 and 17 for 2008 equals 35 out of 71 in total. (app. 49%). Distribution for other categories was as follows: category of action a). – respectively 6 and 3 (9%), category of action c). – respectively 7 and 14 (21%), category of action d).- respectively 4 and 2 (6).

Regarding distribution of projects among Beneficiaries, we can ascertain that 41 organizations participated in the implementation of both Programmes. Considering proportions of the total number of projects – 71 and number of beneficiaries, the ratio is 1,73 project per beneficiary. The highest number of projects – 4 were implemented by “Solidarność i Przyjaźń” - Vietnamese Association in Poland, International Organization for Migration (IOM), “Oprócz Granic” Development Foundation and “Polish Centre of International Aid” Foundation.

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

N/A

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

Maximum length: half a page

In the “awarding body” method

No other significant change to the projects funded over the period from 2007 to 2009 have been observed.

In the “executing body” method

N/A

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

Case no. 1

“Neighbours or intruders – survey on discrimination of foreigners in Poland”.

Project was implemented by Stowarzyszenie Interwencji Prawnej” (Legal Intervention Association) in cooperation with the Institute of Social Science of Warsaw University. Project continued previous activities based on the experience of both partners gathered during the implementation of survey, researching, training, coaching and advisory activities.

The project assumed executing a complex group of various and coherent activities:

- Sociological surveys among foreigners, officials and experts engaged in the issues related to integration and discrimination of foreigners in Poland,
- Provision of legal and social analyses on discrimination,
- Executing a test among employers referring to their truthful willingness to employ different categories of foreigners,
- Promotion of activities against discrimination of foreigners in Poland through support and cooperation during legislation process,
- Drafting of documents presenting knowledge and experience of elaborated problems and recommendations addressed either to Polish institutions or foreigners of third countries existing on Polish labor market,
- Seminars promoting project’s results.

Surveys, which covered 13 different kinds of tests and researches have been carried out among 360 foreigners representing third countries and 30 representatives of Polish public institutions responsible of formulation of the immigration and antidiscrimination policies. During the project implementation 30 various legal acts were analyzed and commented, based on that 2 essays were published and distributed in 1000 pieces.

Activities performed, through professional diagnosis of legal acts, effectively supported and provided an input to the formulation and elaboration of integration and antidiscrimination programmes in Poland.

Case no. 2.

“Because I was a newcomer ...- public campaign”

Project was led by Voluntary Center Association (Stowarzyszenie Centrum Wolontariatu) from Lublin.

The actions assumed to be executed during project implementation aimed at increasing of the level of acceptance of immigration as a process in the Polish society, particularly in the east part of Poland, on the territory of lubelskie, podkarpackie, podlaskie voivodships (regions). In order to achieve the above objective, comprehensive activities of a public campaign (television, radio, billboard promotion, internet) were launched, combined with direct communication with project beneficiaries - through providing a training for volunteers and seminars on culture of foreigners from third countries organized in schools and in local academic centers.

The project assumed executing following activities:

- 2 billboard campaigns (100) - 60 days each,
- Upon the TV campaign, 4 promotion spots, 30 second each were produced. In total 56 TV spots in the prime time of Lublin TV were broadcasted,
- Production and broadcasting of 17 broadcasts, 7 minutes each, on Polish Radio Lublin,
- Production of 13 minutes’ training film to be used during seminars and sessions on intercultural issues,

- Training for volunteers – 2 editions. The subject of those training covered elements of intercultural aspects, current situation in Foreigners’ Third Countries and also on regulations governing status of foreigners staying on the territory of Poland. Training aimed to prepare volunteers (30) to conduct sessions on intercultural issues and events in schools and in the academic centers,
- Information and promotion conference,
- An event – open air festival, in which app. 2,000 immigrants and Polish citizens participated .

All activities planned in the project were successfully completed and assumed objectives, i.e. wide information campaign and promotion of different intercultural aspects of immigration were met.

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

There was not a project that could be regarded as an important failure.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on technical assistance and on information and publicity available to the Responsible Authority;*
- *Any relevant national document and information available to the Responsible Authority in these matters;*
- *Any independent evaluation of the items addressed below, if available.*

IV.1. Technical assistance

Please provide a concrete description of the activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

15 lines maximum

The actions implemented under the Technical Assistance measure over 2007-2009 period, are:

- Publications of invitations for applicants in the national level newspapers Rzeczpospolita and Dziennik and on the web sites of the Responsible Authority and the Delegated Authority as well as on web sites frequented by NGOs,
- Training for applicants and beneficiaries – 5 trainings for potential beneficiaries organised prior to every call for proposals and training for beneficiaries already implementing projects on financial aspects and project management,
- Improvement of the human resources – courses on project management, training on Polish procurement law for services and supplies and specialised English language courses ,
- Outsourced monitoring activities (visits and reports) of selected projects implemented under 2007 and 2008 EIF Programmes,
- Information actions: conference promoting SOLID funds (including EIF) and preparation and publication of SOLID leaflets,
- Procurement of promotional materials with EIF co-financing visibility – rucksacks, caps, mugs, pencils,
- Participation in SOLID Committee meetings, conferences and other meetings, i.a. participation in the EIF informal group meeting in Vienna,
- Visibility of the European Integration Fund co-financing – the Delegated Body procured and distributed stickers and posters bearing the EU logo and a text informing on the source of financing with EU logo and information ; “This project is co-financed by the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals”,

- Provision of IT equipment, office supplies and office rental.

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

According to the agreement between the RA and DA the information and publicity activities are performed mostly by the DA. The actions implemented over the 2007-2009 programming period performed by the RA included information on EIF presented during numerous conferences and publication of the relevant information concerning the Fund on the RA web site and on web site frequented by NGOs. The activities performed by the DA included:

- preparation and publication of leaflets and posters bearing the EU logo and a text informing on the source of financing of the equipment and posters and stickers with EU logo and information ; “This project is co-financed by the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals”,
- conference promoting SOLID funds (including EIF),
- information on EIF presented during conferences, meetings and training sessions,
- Publications of invitations for applicants - invitations for the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Programme in the national level newspapers Rzeczpospolita or Dziennik and on the web site ensured prior every call for proposals,
- Visibility of the EIF co-financing placed on promotion materials, publications, training materials, presentations, etc.,
- The web page of the IAEP included detailed information on EIF, funding possibilities, conditions of implementation and results of selection procedures.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Maximum 15 lines

All projects' outputs, documentation and publications had to mention EIF co-financing information. The grant agreements provided for proper information and publicity of the EIF co-financing at the project level. All leaflets, posters and publicity materials produced in the project were examined whether there were placed the EU logo and indication of EIF co-financing.

All buildings, office spaces, internet portals and databases co-financed by the EIF were to be properly marked.

Beneficiaries ensured Programme co-financing visibility during workshops, training and other meetings and sessions related to Programme implementation.

During all EIF projects, the audience was to be informed of EIF co-financing.

Specific information was delivered also during training for beneficiaries and applying organisations carried out from the means of technical assistance. During the monitoring visits existence of appropriate information related to the EIF Programme implementation was verified.

Information on Programme co-financing was also very visibly mentioned in films, interviews and radio broadcasts produced during the projects implementation.

In order to support beneficiaries' efforts IAEP prepared and distributed among them stickers and posters bearing the EU logo and a text informing on the source of co-financing. Beneficiaries were obliged to place information on the equipment procured in the frame of project.

**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	EUR 1,209,620.00	PLN 5 035 236,95	102.49%
Programme 2008	EUR 1,733,891.06	PLN 6 443 157,65	91.49%
Programme 2009	EUR 2,159,084.20	PLN 0.00	-
TOTAL 2007-2009	EUR 5,102,595.26	11 478 394,60 PLN	55.38%

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

Based on:

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

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

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

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

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

15 lines maximum

Programme has not been implemented as originally planned. Due to the delay with endorsement of the Multiannual and Annual 2007 Programmes by the European Commission, a few months delay occurred with the launching the Programme - the first call for proposals was announced in November 2008.

Due to the delay with the Programmes' approval, calls for Proposals for 2007 and 2008 had to be launched simultaneously.

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

15 lines maximum

Some difficulties and problems raised during the implementation of 2007 annual programme. Mainly, problems were connected with:

- Due to the delays in the endorsement of the Annual Programmes by the European Commission, Programmes for 2007 and 2008 were implemented simultaneously. Considering shortage of staff and repeating of calls for proposals, this caused problems related to the efficiency of the Programme management.
- Transfer of funds to beneficiaries.
Temporary delays in transfer of funds occurred in a relatively high number of projects, which were a consequence of the complicated system of a provision of a Polish budget EIF pre-financing, especially in a crisis 2009 year.
- Shortage of staff.
In order to facilitate and speed up the process of the Fund implementation some back up to the Fund's staff capacity is desired. At this moment only 2 persons are responsible of attending all activities related to the Fund's implementation (editions 2007, 2008, 2009), plus 4 persons part-time. It should be also considered, that soon some additional activities related to information, promotion of the Fund and training are necessary to be undertaken.
- Number of Calls for proposals – cost; time and money,
Due to insufficient response from potential beneficiaries, relatively high number (5) of calls for proposals were launched in 2007 Programme edition. In order to strengthen dissemination of information, some promotion campaigns on Programme are desired to be undertaken (info meetings, promotion aimed directly to potential beneficiaries and trainings).

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

15 lines maximum

Revision has not to be necessary for 2007 Programme.

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

15 lines maximum

The 2007 Programme has been implemented fully, however some problems occurred. Distribution of projects by actions was comparatively uneven. The most popular action proved to be the Action 1 - Measures Aimed at third- country nationals - in total 21 projects were funded under this action. The second popular was Action 2 – Measures addressed to the receiving society, 10 projects were implemented under this action and under Action 3 – Measures aimed at building intercultural dialogue, only 3 projects were implemented. Nevertheless, due to low interest to participate in the programme manifested by potential applicants and in order to fully allocate the total values of the actions as set out in the programme approved by the Commission, additional calls for proposals had to be launched by the Delegated Authority.

Following the 1st call for proposals, 6 applications have been submitted, following the 2nd CfP, 3 applications, following the 3rd, 1 application, following the 4th, 11 applications were submitted and following the 5th 4 applications were submitted. Regarding activity no. 1, in total 26 out of 44 for all types of activities, applications were submitted resulting 59% of all applications, while for action no 2, in total 14 applications were submitted and for action no. 3 only 4 applications.

Finally total value of actions was successfully allocated.

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

Results analysis of each project proved, at the level of Programme implementation, as set out in the Annual Programme, that most of indicators assumed have been achieved. However there were a few indicators which were not achieved;

- Activity no. 1 - the number of third country nationals who took part in trainings – 2000 planned - achieved 1168,
- Activity 2 – the number of classes devoted to TCNs’ cultures and multiculturalism held in schools and other institutions – 500 hours planned versus 459 hours achieved,
- Activity no. 3 – The number of initiatives taken by immigrants’ organisations – 3 planned - achieved 2.

Reasons:

- Not sufficient interest to participate in projects among final beneficiaries,
- Delays with transfer of funds to Beneficiaries caused problems with implementation of actions in accordance with planned schedules,
- Not sufficient identification and selection of eligible training participants,
- Misinterpretation of importance and value of indicators in projects’ cycle management.

On the other hand there was a indicator which positively exceeded planned output;

- Activity no. 1 – the number of users of information materials – planned 2000 persons against 31 276 real users,

Reasons;

- Production and distribution of brochures, posters, leaflets, etc., as the easiest way of projects’ promotion.

Regarding evaluation of achieved results at the level of projects implementation, following observations were found out:

- In relatively high number of projects obligatory indicators for all or for individual activities have not been fulfilled,
- Instead of utterly defined (in numbers) indicators – narrative description,
- Using terms like “approximately” or value “between, from -to”,
- Changing of value of primary accepted indicators or introducing new ones,
- Overestimation or underestimation of planned results,
- Not using a standard template for project’s indicators.

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

15 lines maximum

The distribution between the actions was not appropriate enough. Considering, that Programme 2007 was the first edition of EIF Programme, programming of allocation per activities was made based on preliminary estimation.

During the submission of applications, the highest interest of Applicants relating to the Action 1 from the Annual Programme has been observed almost 60% of applications submitted. Analysing results achieved after projects completion, it was found out, that one of the indicators related to the Action no.1 – the number of users of informational materials very positively exceeded planned output and reached 31,276 users against 2,000 planned. This shows, that applicants are mostly interested in preparation and dissemination of information related to different aspects of integration issues, assuming no active participation of the representative of the third country nationals in the projects implementation. On the contrary, an indicator related also to Action no.1 - the number of third country nationals who took part in trainings – has not been achieved. Some measures to promote projects including proactive approach of immigrants should be taken in the future projects.

We have to note, that in order to fully allocate the total values of the actions as set out in the programme approved by the Commission, additional calls for proposals were launched accordingly –the total value of the action 1 has been allocated after the 3rd call and for the actions 2 and 3 after the 5th call.

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

Programme has not been implemented as originally planned. Due to the delay with an endorsement of the Multiannual and Annual 2008 Programmes by the European Commission, a few months delay occurred with the launching the Programme - the first call for proposals was announced in November 2008.

Due to the delay with the Programme approval, calls for Proposals for 2007 and 2008 were simultaneously launched.

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

15 lines maximum

Since both programmes, for 2007 and 2008, were implemented simultaneously, exactly the same difficulties and problems arose during the implementation:

- Due to the delay in an endorsement of the Annual Programme by the European Commission, Programmes for 2007 and 2008 were implemented simultaneously.
- Transfer of funds to beneficiaries,
- Shortage of staff,
- Number of Calls for proposals – cost; time and money.

A relatively high number (5) of calls for proposals were launched in 2008 Programme edition.

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

Revision has not to be necessary for 2008 Programme.

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

15 lines maximum

In comparison to the Programme 2007, distribution of projects for the 2008 Programme by actions was comparatively more balanced. Similar number of projects were implemented under both Action 1 - Measures aimed at third- country nationals and Action 2 – Research into the situation and need related to integration in Poland – respectively 18 and 14 projects, and under Action 3 – Measures for creation of the institutional system - 5 projects were implemented.

Nevertheless, due to a low interest to participate in the programme manifested by potential applicants, additional actions, i.e. call for proposals, had to be undertaken by the Delegated Authority.

Following the 1st call for proposals 9 applications have been submitted, after the 2nd 7 applications have been submitted, after the 3rd 11 applications were submitted, after the 4th 17 applications were submitted and finally after the 5th 13 applications were submitted. In total 45 applications were received.

Finally total value of actions was successfully allocated.

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

Results analysis of each projects proved, at the level of Programme implementation, as set out in the Annual Programme, that most of indicators assumed have been achieved.

However there were a few planned indicators which were not achieved:

- Activity no. 1 - the number of third country nationals who took part in trainings – 2100 planned - achieved 384,
- Activity 2 – Support for the establishment of the specialised organisation – 1 planned – 0 achieved,
- Activity no. 3 – Personnel training – 500 people trained versus 39 achieved,
- Activity no. 3 – Number of training hours – 5 000 hours against 32 hours achieved.

Reasons:

- Not sufficient interest to participate in projects among final beneficiaries from third countries and Polish personnel,
- Delays with transfer of funds to Beneficiaries,
- Not sufficient identification and selection of eligible training participants,

- Misinterpretation of importance and value of indicators in projects' cycle management.

Exceeded planned outputs:

- the number of users of information materials for all activities,
- Activity no. 2 - number of studies carried out – 3 planned versus 68 achieved and number of third country nationals who have participated in the studies – 150 persons planned versus 375 persons participated.

Reasons:

- Production and distribution of brochures, posters, leaflets, etc., as the easiest way of projects' promotion,
- Effective identification and selection of third countries nationalities participated in the studies

Observations regarding evaluation of achieved results at the level of projects implementation are specified in VI.1.5 above.

It must be however noted that at the time of evaluation the 2008 programme was still under implementation.

6. In the light of the implementation of the 2008 programme, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?

15 lines maximum

The distribution between the actions was comparatively even.

During the submission of applications, the highest interest of applicants relating to the Action 1 and 2, respectively 19 and 20 applications, from the Annual Programme was observed. Referring to action no. 3 8 applications were submitted.

Similarly to the 2007 Programme edition, after projects completion, indicators achieved that referred to the number of users of information materials exceeded planned output for all actions. More sophisticated indicators related to proactive attitude of immigrants in the integration process, i.e. number of immigrants participated in trainings or transfer of knowledge - personnel training - were not achieved.

Due to a low interest from potential beneficiaries and in order to fully allocate the total values of the actions as set out in the programme approved by the Commission, additional calls for proposals were launched accordingly.

Total value of the action 1 has been allocated after the 4th call and for the actions 2 and 3 after the 5th call.

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

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

15 lines maximum

Implementation of 2009 Programme is carried out within 2 approaches:

- continuation of multiannual projects selected under 2008 Programme and,
- project selection based on call for proposal launched on the 23rd December 2009.

Under 2008 in total 21 multiannual projects have been selected.

Following the call for proposals 53 applications have been submitted. Administrative compliance check is being carried out at this moment.

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

15 lines maximum

Since the 2009 Programme projects are selected as a multiannual projects under the 2008 programme, similar difficulties and problems arose during the implementation, they are specified in point VI.2.2.

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

Revision has not to be necessary for 2009 Programme so far.

- 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

N/A

- 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?**

N/A

- 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

N/A

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?

Level of the Delegated Authority.

On the daily basis EIF Programmes are managed by the Immigrants and Social Integration Unit as well as Financial and Accounting Unit. Units are respectively employed by (ISIU) the head of the unit and a senior expert and a junior expert, and (FAU) head of section and a junior expert. There are clear distinctions of responsibilities between members of the units of IAEP. Regarding any financial aspects of the Fund's implementation Units closely cooperate, all approved procedures related financial aspects of Fund's implementation were applied. Due to shortage of staff some delays regarding current assisting of projects occurs.

1. 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

In the Management and Control System approved by the European Commission following change was introduced the: Audit authority – the role of audit authority took over on the motion of previous audit authority (Department for Protection of EU Financial Interests at Ministry of Finance) the General Inspector of Treasury Control.

**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?

The first EIF call for proposal was published ca. 17 months ago, while the submission of proposals and start of some projects took place ca. 15 months ago. The 2009 calendar year ended with a publication of a call for proposals under the 2009 programme. In the previous financial perspective there was no specific financial instrument for a support of an integration of third-country nationals not covered with the international protection. Under the new financial perspective the necessary coordination with ESF was performed, setting clear division of areas of interest between ESF and EIF.

Taking into account the annual allocations and comparatively small number of legal immigrants in Poland EIF may be seen as an important tool to support integration needs of the third country nationals.

At the moment the EIF in Poland is in its preliminary phase, first projects have or are being completed. Apart from delivering the results they also provided necessary expertise for numerous NGOs in implementation of both large scale projects (in comparison with previous activities of these NGOs) and in support for the EIF target group. In 2009 the RA and DA struggled to commit 2007 and 2008 APs' allocations. In contrary, the 2009 AP's allocation will be (most probably) committed following only one call for proposals. This shows an increased popularity of EIF and the area covered by EIF intervention.

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?

Due to the delayed start of the EIF and with an endorsement of the Multiannual and Annual programmes by the European Commission the 2007 and 2008 AP were to be implemented during the same period (only in mid 2009 a decision was taken to extend the eligibility of the 2008 AP's expenditure till 30th June 2010). Therefore when designing the programmes it was decided to divide the activities identified in the Multiannual Programme between the two annual programmes.

However, in the course of implementation it could have been observed that more complex projects are preferred by the applicants, as a wider range of activities could create an added value for the target group. That view was expressed in the 2009 AP, where five actions from both 2007 and 2008 APs were merged in three activities, reflecting the division between priorities. In fact 3 actions of 2007 AP were merged into one action, combining measures aimed at third-country nationals, measures addressed to the receiving society and measures aimed at building intercultural dialogue. This action was then assigned with majority of funds, as the interest of the applicants was focused on it.

At this initial stage of implementation no evolution of the situation in Poland has been observed in the scope that would require a reshaping of the intervention.

*** 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?

2007 programme projects have already been completed. The results of these projects show that the planned results (expressed by indicators) have been achieved in majority. Some indicators have not been fully achieved, but since these were the first years of implementation of a new fund some discrepancies are fully justifiable.

The strategy presented in the multiannual programme is being implemented, with a visible emphasis (put by beneficiaries) on the studies of the immigration phenomenon. Since the immigration is a comparatively new issue in Poland this emphasis provides necessary foundations for more informed and structured actions in future, at the moment maintaining a proper balance between direct support for the target groups and actions supporting the system approach.

* 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.

In theory, due to the size, the cost of the management of the EIF is relatively high. For annual allocations of 2-2.5 million euro it was required to create a system composed of 3 authorities (responsible, audit, certifying), plus a possibility to establish a delegated authority. In practice in Poland the system is functioning at a lower cost, due to financing most of the (not numerous) staff from the budgets of relevant authorities. If added the actual costs would (plus other costs covered by TA) roughly meet the 7% plus 30 000 EUR TA allocation. If reduced in future to 4% plus 30 000 EUR, without an increase of allocation per country, the amount may reduce management activities.

The programmes objectives are developed at a reasonable cost. Poland has introduced a budget co-financing for projects run by NGO, but limited to 10%. A combined EIF and budget financing is 85% which leaves the remaining 15% to be covered by the beneficiary or third parties. This necessity is an effective tool to moderate the costs planned and declared by the beneficiaries.

* 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?

During the establishment of the multiannual programme a series of coordination meetings took place. The meetings were participated by EIF, ERF and ESF authorities and resulted in a creation of border lines between the funds, especially between ESF on one hand and ERF and EIF on the other. These were further expressed in the ESF specific programming documents, leaving relevant areas for EIF and ERF intervention, specifying however that employment services' staff may benefit from ESF funded projects increasing their competences in supporting clients from EIF and ERF target groups.

* 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.

EIF is the only financial instrument directed at a specific and comparatively new phenomenon, i.e. legal immigration to Poland. Thanks to EIF not only the target group is being supported but also the Polish society is increasingly aware of this issue. Numerous projects include studies that will create a basis for a more structured and knowledge based approach. Finally EIF will surely contribute to a mainstreaming of immigration issues into the state policy.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

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?*

The experience has shown that the most important programming document is the multiannual programme, the annual programmes being an exercise that merely repeats the activities and adds numbers (allocations) to them. A time-consuming and complex procedure of approval and modification of programmes should be seriously simplified.

We therefore suggest replacing the current system of multi annual programmes and annual programmes with one multi-annual program for the whole period. The system of the structural funds may serve as an example. The advantage would be increased efficiency and effectiveness as well as reduction of the administrative workload.

The administrative requirements for the progress report are too complex. We wish to reduce the administrative workload. In this context the payment modality of the pre-financing should be changed as following: The first pre-financing payment to each member state should be increased. This would allow member states allocate greater resources at the initiation of projects thus increasing overall efficiency and the capacity of projects to achieve their programmed objectives and programmed spending.

** 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?*

The most important modification that is desired is a serious simplification of the cost eligibility rules. The switch from general eligibility of necessary expenditure, with some areas

regulated in detail (ERF I and II, currently ESF) to a closed catalogue of eligible expenditure (only expenditure listed in categories of annex 11 to the implementing rules are eligible) creates constant problems with interpretation of the EC eligibility rules, creating an unnecessary risk of attributing necessary expenditure to improper categories or removing from direct costs expenditure that can not be attributed to any of the categories of eligible direct expenditure.

Late approval of the legal basis resulted in majority of project closing at the final date of eligibility. An introduction of 3 autohrites – responsible, audit, certifying complicated the process of a preparation of final reports. When these two factors are combined it becomes very difficult for a Member State to respect the 9 month period for the submission of a final report. This period should be prolonged to at least 12 months.

Project expenditure from 5000 euro should be based on a competitive procurement procedure. It should be limited to direct costs only. Indirect costs include costs that are often outsourced, like accounting services and office rental, but from the practical point of view necessary to be provided by the same service provider.

The administrative operating expense for the EIF is extensive. Due to the increased administrative burden on the Member States arising from additional tasks such as increased performance monitoring evaluation, Art. 53 declarations (annual summaries), etc. it is suggested that Technical Assistance should be maintained at 7%. A reason to maintain the 7% Technical Assistance is also that the framework of the EIF is unclear and that the Commission modifies the conditions of application, causing much extra work for the Member States.

** 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?*

The desk officers are responsive and support the Member States in implementation of the funds. The Commission also organizes training sessions during the SOLID Committee meetings. However, these meetings are attended by Member States personnel on different level, sometimes far from practical experience with the trained rules. It would be more than welcome that separate training sessions are organised participated by personnel performing trained tasks.

Taking into account many issues connected with the implementation of the Fund which have to be discussed with the EC and other MS the common Committee "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows" should meet more frequently.

End of the report