

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN FUND FOR THE INTEGRATION OF
THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONALS**

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: (Member State)

PORTUGAL

Date:

30 June 2010

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


Filipe Santos Fernandes da Costa

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

Teresa Ribeiro

Email: teresa.ribeiro@emgfc.mai.gov.pt

Phone Number: (+351) 21 358 37 35

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?

Parts I to VI.

External evaluation expertise

The Evaluation Report on Implementation of Actions Co-financed by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals for the periods 2007, 2008 and 2009 was carried out by the IESE – Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos (Institute for Social and Economic Studies).

The IESE – Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos (Institute for Social and Economic Studies) has developed relevant curricular experience in the following domains inherent to the nature of the Evaluation of the Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals Programme, namely: (i) evaluation of public policies; (ii) studies in the area of employment and educational training; (iii) sector studies of diagnosis, prospecting and planning; and (iv) social and economic studies. That experience contemplates the different stages of the evaluation cycle (*ex-ante*, mid-term and *ex-post*) and integrates a set of methods and techniques (opinion polls, surveys, interviews and case studies, among others) that have been validated by contracting entities, namely management entities, sector leaders and the European Commission.

– **Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise**

This evaluation always had as its basis the model specified by the European Commission (Doc SOLID/2009/37 from the European Commission).

The work methodology to be used is based on collecting information on the implementation of the Programme and on its subsequent critical analysis in such a way as to respond to the analysis dimensions defined in the guide manuals of the European Commission. Thus, the proposed methodology respects the guidelines from the Commission and also the application of complementary methodologies of information collection considered relevant given the evaluation objectives, namely, the need to bring the evaluation close to the implementation profile of the projects carried out according to the perspective of the promoting entities.

Thus, the methodology used consisted of resource to a diversified set of information collection and analysis, namely:

- (i) **document analysis** (including national and European Community legislation, Multi-annual Programmes and Annual Programme Plans, documentation on implementation of projects and financial information, among other kinds of relevant information);
- (ii) **semi-directive interview** to the Task Force for the Management of Community Funds (EMGFC);
- (iii) **survey** addressed to the promoting entities with the objective of comprehending the global view of the beneficiary entities about the adequacy of the projects to the programmes and profile of achieved results and of contributing with specific elements to the strategic points of the evaluation;
- (iv) **case Studies**, which assume a central status in the proposed work model, given the relevance of collecting qualitative elements about successful and badly executed projects from the main participants directly involved in their implementation (see Part 3).

The selection of Case Studies was carried out by comparing information obtained using Document Analysis, listening to the EMGFC – Estrutura de Missão para a Gestão de Fundos Comunitários (Task Force for the Management of Community Funds) and the beneficiary entity ACIDI, I.P – Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Diálogo Intercultural. Thus, as a result of this analysis, the following projects were selected:

- *Intercultural mediation in public services*, because it responds to the strategic needs of the country to: prepare intercultural mediators who can be integrated into public services or private entities that are in contact with immigrants; create a referential system/profile of the intercultural mediator to be integrated in the National Catalogue of Qualifications and that afterwards can be transformed into a Bachelor's degree (level V).

This project takes in the experience of other projects, namely from the Supply of Trainers, the National Support Centres for Immigrants (CNAI – Centros Nacionais de Apoio ao Imigrante) and Local Support Centres for the Integration of Immigrants (CLAII – Centro Local de Apoio à Integração de Imigrantes), and from another similar project implemented in Madrid, having the advantage of being an added value that can be used in other member states. In relation to sustainability, the project already shows a concern with involving public services (the Amadora Sintra Hospital, Regional Health Administration services – ARS, and others) with a view to partnership that will ensure the integration of the mediators in their own services.

- *Municipal council projects to promote interculturalism*, as it is considered essential to equip partner entities, at local and regional levels, with resources in order to develop activities in the areas of Education and Employment, initial reception of immigrants, sensitization of public opinion and participation in the local community (in a decentralized and appropriate way to the specific populations in the area of intervention). The capability of local and municipal bodies, as

well as the instilling of a proactive spirit of these entities to act in the near future in an independent way from the Fund's financing, are some of the advantages of this project that sets out, above all, to create conditions for sustainable development of the entities that are developing projects for the immigrant population.

However, other projects could be selected:

- *The promotion of insertion in active life and immigrant entrepreneurship*, because it has as its aim to recognise and make use of one of the main characteristics of immigrants – the risk initiative – to encourage them to be entrepreneurial and set up their own business. This project learns from the experience of others, that of K-Cidade for example (K-City), developed with funding from EQUAL, and from the experience and knowledge that Immigrant Associations and other civilian bodies have about the needs of immigrant communities. The project is carried out in partnership with the same entities and with a Danish entity that is developing a similar one, thus functioning as a benchmark in collective learning.
- *Diagnostic studies of the characterisation of the immigrant population and the identification of its problems and its contributions for the dynamics of development of municipalities* demonstrate that the financing of the Fund can produce projects that, though not innovative, show the high level of contribution to the understanding of the communities and their realities, which permits the perspective of “know more in order to act better”.

**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

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.

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).

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

| | Number of calls for proposals |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme 2007 | 3 |
| Programme 2008 | 3 |
| Programme 2009 | 1 |

I.3 PROPOSALS RECEIVED, SELECTED AND FUNDED AFTER CALLS FOR PROPOSALS

| | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 | TOTAL 2007-2009 |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Proposals received | 13 | 12 | 3 | 28 |
| Projects selected | 12 | 12 | 3 | 27 |
| Projects funded | 12 ¹ | 10 | 3 | 25 |

¹ One of the financed projects gave up its financing.

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

No.

If no, explain why.

In the 2008 Annual Programme twelve projects from the technical team of the Task Force for the Management of Community Funds and approved for financing by the Mixed Commission were chosen, of which only ten were financed. This situation is due to the fact that two of the projects were withdrawn before the signing of the Acceptance Agreement.

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).

| Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 | TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| 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 ... | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 | TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table I.3) | 12 | 10 | 3 | 25 |
| 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 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 25 |

I.6 - DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD 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)

| | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→ | 12 | 10 | 3 |
| Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ... | | | |
| PRIORITY 1 – Execution of initiatives destined to put in practice the “common basic principals for the politics of integration of immigrants in the EU” | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| PRIORITY 2 - Development of indicators and methodologies of evaluation to gauge progress, adjust policies and measures and facilitate the coordination of comparative learning | 2 | 2 | - |
| PRIORITY 3 - Strengthen political capabilities and improve coordination and competences in Member States at all levels as well as in government services | 3 | 4 | 2 |

I.7 - DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD – 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)

| | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→ | 12 | 10 | 3 |
| Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ... | | | |
| CATEGORY A) Ease the development and application of admission procedures that may be relevant and support the process of integration of citizens from third countries | - | - | - |
| CATEGORY B) Development and application of the process of integration of third-country citizens just arrived in Member States | 2 | 3 | - |
| CATEGORY C) Reinforce the capacity of Member States to define, apply, accompany and evaluate policies and integration measures of citizens of third countries | 2 | 3 | - |
| CATEGORY D) Exchange of information and of good practices and cooperation within each Member State and among different Member States with respect to the definition, application, accompanying and evaluation of policies and integration measures of citizens of third countries | 8 | 4 | 3 |

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)

| | Programme 2007 | Programme 2008 | Programme 2009 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→ | 12 | 10 | 3 |
| Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority... | | | |
| SPECIFIC PRIORITY 1 ONLY –Participation as a way of promoting the integration of citizens of third countries in society | - | - | - |
| SPECIFIC PRIORITY 2 ONLY – Specific target groups | - | - | - |
| SPECIFIC PRIORITY 3 ONLY –Innovative, introductory activities and programmes | - | - | - |
| SPECIFIC PRIORITY 4 ONLY –Intercultural dialogue | - | - | - |
| SPECIFIC PRIORITY 5 ONLY – Participation in the host society in the process of integration | - | - | - |
| Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities | - | - | - |
| Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority | 12 | 10 | 3 |

N.B.: In the Annual Programmes (2007, 2008 and 2009) no Specific Priorities were defined.

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

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.

N.B.: According to what was defined in the Model Document of the Description of the System of Management and Control, *the Accountable Authority is a totally independent structure specifically set up by an Act of Government – subscribed by the Prime Minister – to secure, exclusively, the technical, administrative and financial management of the Framework Programme.*

According to the legal act that created and defined the respective functions, the Accountable Authority is completely prohibited from acting as co-financial communitary beneficiary or from carrying out projects, even in situations of mere partnership or association.

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

III.1. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER PRIORITY 1 IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

In the “awarding body” method

The following chart systematizes the main activities developed, by type of objectines:

| Implementation of the measures previewed in the Plan for the Integration of Immigrants: |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Creation and preparation of a team of intercultural mediators for entrepreneurship;▪ Mobilization and preparation of partner institutions for the promotion of immigrant entrepreneurship;▪ Training and preparation of immigrant entrepreneurs;▪ Training and placement of intercultural mediation officers in public services to advise the immigrant population, in order to improve the efficiency and quality of public relations;▪ Celebration of 25 Cooperation Protocols with the purpose of making functional the activities at local and regional levels in the areas of designated intervention (Education, Labour Market, Initial Reception of Immigrants, Sensitizing public opinion, participation in local life) through the creation of public relations structures and services, informational material, websites and carrying out informational/ awareness initiatives. |
| Support for development of projects, at local and regional levels, directed to reception and integration of immigrants, encouraging the participation of municipalities, civil society and the immigrants themselves: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Production of radio and television programme broadcasts;▪ Organization and promotion of a television show marking the end of the European year of intercultural dialogue, with an exhibition of lusophone culture and the various communities present in Portugal, interviews and individual life stories;▪ Production of a DVD about the network of services provided by the ACIDI, the diverse initiatives and respective communication supports;▪ Organization of a Seminar to talk about the integration of immigrants in the host country, through education and qualification and construction and distribution of a Good Practice Guide and Recommendations in this context;▪ Publication of books;▪ Information campaigns about CNAI Lisbon;▪ Support with the maintenance and development of the activities of the UVIDRE – Unidade de Apoio à Vitima Imigrante e de Discriminação Racial ou Étnica (Support to the Immigrant Victim and Racial or Ethnic Discrimination Unit). This unit offers, in a personalised, qualified and free way, emotional, informational and legal counselling, psychological accompaniment and social orientation. |

III.2. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER PRIORITY 2 IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

In the “awarding body” method

The four projects implemented in this Priority try to respond to the objective of supporting initiatives of accompaniment and the evaluation of policies and activities related to the integration of immigrants, through the following activities:

- creation of a system of evaluation and accompaniment that deepens the results of the instances of evaluation of the CNAI, that focus on specific aspects therein and that appraises changes undergone

meanwhile (SWOT perspective), taking in the SOS Immigrant Helpline and the Telephone Translation service.

- creation of a system of evaluation and accompaniment of activities developed by the CLAI;
- presentation of intermittent reports of monitoring and accompaniment of the Plan for the Integration of Immigrants (PII); printing of brochures translated in Portuguese and English from the PII, to be distributed to strategic partners that are part of the Focal Points Network, in the CLAI and Immigrant Associations, as well as in other organizations in Civil Society with a role to play in the area of immigration; and, availability of PII and respective evaluation reports for downloading from the ACIDI website.

III.3. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER PRIORITY 3 IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

In the “awarding body” method

The eight projects implemented in this Priority try to respond to the objective of supporting initiatives of modernization and operational strengthening of equipment, the structures and services that are involved in immigrant integration, through the following activities:

- establishment of an agreement with the CNAI and two meetings of the CLAI, focussing on information and the seeking of articulated, transversal and multi-sector answers, in relation to reception and integration of immigrants;
- investing in both external and internal communication in the CNAI and CLAI Network: identification and informational supports for cultural identity;
- production and dissemination of an Information Bulletin, directed at a diverse public – government institutions, NGOs, immigrant associations, municipalities, schools, among others, with information on: current national and international news, interviews, opinion articles, in depth articles on relevant topics, event coverage, among others, and maintenance and updating of 5 sites;
- production of 21 local diagnostic studies that contribute to a greater understanding of immigrant communities living in different councils and their needs, conferring, in this way, sustainability to future interventions in the area of reception and integration. This initiative further permits the reduction of asymmetry in this material (indicators: population volume, main shortages, demographic, socio-professional, cultural and geographical characteristics, among others).

III.4. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER PRIORITY 4 IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009

This priority was not adopted by the Member State in the 2007 Annual Programme.

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

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

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

Analysis of projects approved for financing, in the context of each Annual Programme, concludes that, throughout the three-year period, there was a reduction in the number of approvals:

- Priority 1 – in 2007 seven projects were financed; four in 2008 and one in 2009 (this project is the continuation of one approved in 2007). The number of financed projects in the AP framework for 2008 and 2009 has not yet been stabilized because, in the case of 2008, a reprogramming is underway and, in the case of 2009, there are four potential candidatures not yet concretized.
- Priority 2 – two projects were financed in 2007 and two in 2008 (this project is the continuation of one financed in 2007). The AP framework of 2008 and 2009 is not yet stable with two potential candidatures not yet concretized in the AP for 2009.
- Priority 4 – three projects were financed in 2007; four in 2008 (two projects are the continuation of projects financed in 2007); and two in 2009 that are the continuation of projects financed in 2007 and 2008.

III.8. REFERRING TO TABLES II-6, II-7 AND II-8, EXPLAIN ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD, BY PRIORITY, BY CATEGORY OF ACTIONS AND BY SPECIFIC PRIORITY, OVER THE PERIOD FROM 2007 TO 2009

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

In the “awarding body” method

The analysis of the projects approved for financing, in the context of each Annual Programme, permits the observation that there are some differences between the years 2007 and 2008²:

- **Priority 1 – execution of actions destined to implement the basic common principles of the EU policy for the integration of immigrants:** the values approved in 2007 and 2008 present significant variations, with the value approved in 2008 registering an increase above 23%.
- **Priority 2 – development of indicators and methodologies of evaluation to determine progress, adjust policies and measures, and ease the coordination of comparative learning:** in the 2007 AP an eligible investment of 76,663.14 Euros was approved, a value that had a reduction of only 1.5% in the 2008 AP.
- **Priority 3 - reinforcement of the political capacities and of the improvement of the coordination and competences of Member States at all levels, as well as in government services:** regarding the 2007 AP an eligible amount of 371,445.18 Euros was approved to finance the projects in this Priority. However, this financing registered an increase superior to one third in the 2008 AP.

III.10. DESCRIPTION OF TWO “SUCCESS STORIES”, AMONG ALL THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES OVER THE PERIOD FROM 2007 TO 2009

The project *Intercultural mediation in public services* can be considered a success story. It represents the development of a pioneer project in Portugal and is an innovation in the European Union. The project is highly sustainable for the future, in the sense that mediation offered by public services will be maintained and consolidated after its termination from which the construction of a level III profile and training reference system to be integrated in the Catalogue of National Qualifications and/or at a higher level to be adopted by the universities will emerge.

This is a partnership project: a team from the ACIDI, I.P., (Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Diálogo Intercultural, I.P. - High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue) from the Reserve Supply of Trainers of ACIDI, I.P., from the public services that host the project (25), from mediators (28), from other partners (11) and from the Universidade Autónoma (Autonomous University) that will secure the consultation and training functions. In summary, it is now possible to see preliminary results: the carrying out of training initiatives, integration of mediators in institutions and the practice of intercultural mediation.

² It is not possible to carry out this analysis for the year 2009 because the process of analysis of candidatures is still taking place, for which reason it is not possible to determine what is the approved investment eligible by priority. However, it is expected that is superior to that of previous years, in so far as the eligible investment programmed in 2009 is 43% superior to that of 2007 and 23% in relation to that of 2008.

Municipal projects for the promotion of interculturalism bring together interesting characteristics that make them a success story. On one hand, it is a priority to make resources available to the partner entities, locally and regionally, so that these develop activities in the priority areas of Education and Employment and, transversely, in the areas of initial reception of immigrants, awareness of public opinion and participation in the local community. The preparation of local and municipal entities, as well as a pro-active spirit to act in the near future independently from the financing of the Fund make up the added value of this Project that wishes, above all, to create conditions for sustainable development of the network of entities that are developing projects for the immigrant population.

More specifically, the Project is structured in a total of 25 projects developed by 24 CLAI and one Association that represented the development of 135 activities (88% of those previewed). One of the final products of special relevance consists of the preparation of a Manual of Good Practices that functions as a reference work for the accompaniment carrying out of the initiative by the technicians and coordinators of projects to be developed.

III.11. DESCRIPTION OF ONE “FAILURE”, AMONG ALL THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES OVER THE PERIOD FROM 2007 TO 2009

The EMGFC as well as the entity promoting projects did not identify a project that brings together sufficient characteristics to be considered as badly executed. However, in an exercise of evaluation and learning, the beneficiary shows some elements that can be understood as less positive:

- Monitoring of the projects was carried out *a posteriori*;
- Projects that involved a network of many partnerships, implying a large investment at the level of management and monitoring of the activities of all the partnerships.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

IV.1. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Activities carried out in the context of Technical Assistance Measures had as their specific objective to promote efficiency and effectiveness in implementation, management and execution of annual Programmes, contributing to compliance of the publicity rules, visibility, accompaniment, control and evaluation of projects financed by the Solidarity and Management of Migratory Fluxes Framework Programme. In this context, the working costs associated with with some activities were financed, namely:

- salaries of human resources of the Responsible Authority (EMGFC) that carried out: a) ongoing management initiatives and accompaniment of projects regarding technical and financial issues, with a view to checking compliance of community and national norms; b) preparation and accompaniment of level 1 control initiatives to the projects, carried out by subcontracted entities; c) drawing up of midterm reports of implementation and requests for payment to the European Commission; and, d) transference of community funds to the Beneficiary Entities;
- the costs of publicity and information;
- the costs of an independent audit to carry out the control of 1st level projects; and
- the costs related with equipment and consumable material necessary for the activity of the Responsible Authority.

IV.2. INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

The activities developed centred around the distribution and publicizing of the Programme to potential beneficiaries, namely:

- Creation and maintenance of the site of the Responsible Authority: <http://fundoscomunitarios.mai.gov.info/>;
- Preparatory meetings of the Annual Programmes, with the contribution of potential beneficiaries;
- Information activities carried out in person, by phone and through the EMGFC site;
- Opening of two Calls for Proposals (2008 and 2009) for the presentation of candidatures, through advertisements in a newspaper with a large national circulation (*Diário de Notícias*), on the MAI and EMGFC sites;

- Analysis and selection of candidatures; and
- Publication, on the EMGFC site (in July 2009), of the list of approved projects with reference to the final beneficiaries and respective amount of public and community financing.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

In this domain, the promoting entities of the projects complied with the norms of presentation of logotypes and other elements, as stated in Article 34 (Functions of final beneficiaries as regards information and publicity directed at the public) of the Commission Decision (2008/456/CE) of March 5, 2008. These norms were integrated in the Regulation annexed to the Protocol signed between the ACIDI, I.P. and the 25 partnership entities, to guarantee that the latter would enforce the norms of distribution and provision of information of the European Commission.

Additionally, in the case of projects promoted by the ACIDI, I.P., the dissemination was carried out through radio programmes, newsletters, local newspapers, posters, leaflets, films, courses, awareness activities, an Informational Bulletin and the ACIDI and I.P. sites, among others.

All these documents and materials produced will become an integral part of a file of identification to be given to the participants of the CLAI network and available on the ACIDI and I.P. sites.

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) | Contribution committed by the Responsible Authority for the Programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010 Amount (2) | Budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available) Percentage (3) = (2) / (1) |
|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Programme 2007 | 1.234.522,71 | 821.641,63 | 66,6 |
| Programme 2008 | 1.640.869,65 | 246.790,05 | 14,9 |
| Programme 2009 | 2.170.721,00 | 0,00 | 0,0 |
| TOTAL 2007-2009 | 5.046.113,36 | 1.068.431,68 | 21,2 |

Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009

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?

The 2007 Annual Programme, approved by a Decision of Commission C (2008) 6193 final October 29, 2008, lasted for three years (from January 2007 to December 2009). The delay verified in the approval of the Programme (final trimester of the 2nd year of availability had consequences in its implementation in that a delay was caused in all processes associated with Project management, namely: i) placing of advertisements for the opening of candidatures, ii) analysis, selection and approval of the same, iii) accompaniment, monitoring, control of approved projects; and iv) availability of approved financing. This situation did not interfere with the date of the beginning of the projects that date from January 2007. However, it did interfere in the physical and financial execution of the projects, as the financing was received almost two years late.

2. HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED PROBLEMS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007 ANNUAL PROGRAMME? IF SO, WHAT MEASURES DID YOU TAKE?

The confirmed problems came from, on one hand, the late approval of the Annual Programme (in the middle of the third trimester of the second year of availability of the Annual Programme), and, on the other, the lack of execution of the amounts programmed in the Annual Programme. This panorama can be justified due to the withdrawal of some of the beneficiary entities that had submitted candidature intentions to the Responsible Authority, to the fact that the amount of approved projects did not exhaust the programmed budget and, to the lack of financial capacity of the beneficiary entities to carry out the projects without receiving public financing and community funding from the European Fund for the Integration of Citizens of Third Countries. This situation led to the opening of a call for proposals for presentation of candidatures three times, so that the programmed amount of the Annual Programme was exhausted.

The implementation of the Annual Programme was, equally, affected negatively in relation to technical and financial management activities, accompaniment and monitoring of projects in good measure due to the lack of human resources.

3. HAS A REVISION OF THE 2007 PROGRAMME BY THE COMMISSION BEEN NECESSARY? IF SO, WHAT WERE THE MAIN CHANGES?

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)

The opening of three calls for the presentation of candidatures contributed towards securing the total implementation of the Annual Programme. However, and in accordance with the map of accompaniment of the financial execution of projects financed by the Annual Programme, dated March 31, 2010, only 3 of the 7 projects approved in Action 1 (Priority 1) used the total amount of approved financing. The remainder have execution levels that vary between 19% and 83%.

In relation to Action 2 (Priority 2), of the two financed projects, one has a rate of execution of 97% and the other 100%. In the case of Action 3 (Priority 3), however, it was found that of the three financed projects, one has a level of execution of 100%, another 92% and the third 25%.

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?

The analysis of the reports of final execution of financed projects showed that the indicators are being achieved.

Though in the Annual Programme the outlined indicators have not been quantified, it is important to state, in general terms, what the main results of the approved project are:

| Actions/Indicators previewed in the AP | Actions/Results achieved |
|---|---|
| Priority 1 | |
| Information and education initiatives designed to familiarize immigrants with the host society | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Practical guides with information about the host country, distributed by Portuguese Consular Posts (mainly in the PALOP); - Radio programmes "People like Us" and television programmes "Us"; - Television show to mark the end of the European year for intercultural dialogue; - 5 literary/historical works that celebrate and disseminate intrinsic national multiculturalism. |
| Civic orientation initiatives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3,000 bilingual DVDs about the network of services, projects, initiatives and means of communication of the ACIDI. |
| Meetings and information and awareness sessions, promoted by competent entities in the realm of immigrant integration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seminar for reflection and evaluation about the practical guides initiative; - Seminar "Education/Qualification" for the Cape Verdean community that led to a Guide of Good Practices and Recommendations for state and civil society organizations. |
| Participants and entities involved in each one of the projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30 professional work experience places for young entrepreneurs in companies associated with ENGAGE. |
| Priority 2 | |
| Reports produced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of local and national immigrant help centres, the |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | immigrant SOS helpline and the telephone translation service. |
| Number of PII copies | – 7,000 in Portuguese and other languages |

| Actions/Indicators previewed in the AP | Actions/Results achieved |
|---|------------------------------|
| Priority 3 | |
| Number of sites with specialized information on immigration | – 5 |
| Number of information bulletins distributed | – 11 leaflets (6,000 copies) |

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?

The definition of initiatives contemplated in the Annual Programme in each priority and the distribution of financing by the same stems from the candidature intentions registered in working meetings between potential beneficiaries and the Management Authority, through the diagnosis of needs carried out to them.

The annual programming and distribution of financing to the various initiatives was the most appropriate to needs identified either for the country or for the entities that operate in the considered area of Integration of Citizens of Third Countries, in so far as these allowed the financing of a wide range of activities fundamental in the policy of immigrant integration (this adjustment is highly valued by the ACIDI, I.P.):

- initiatives that reinforce and improve reception and integration of immigrants;
- initiatives of accompaniment and evaluation of policies and activities related to integration; and
- initiatives of modernization and operational reinforcement of equipment, structures and services that are involved in the area of immigrant integration.

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?

The 2008 Annual Programme, approved on December 15, 2008, established the period of eligibility of the Programme from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009. However, in fact, candidate projects were only approved in the 2nd semester of the 2nd year of availability of the 2009 Annual Programme (July 2009). In this way, the beneficiaries began receiving financing towards the end of the availability period of the Annual Programme. This situation resulted in the European Commission extending the eligibility deadline of the Annual Programme to June 30, 2010.

In turn, the fact that the projects are being carried out before being approved creates some constraints both for the Responsible Authority, that can not carry out the accompaniment and monitoring from the

initial stage, and for the beneficiary who has to start the activities without receiving any kind of financial support. Given that the beneficiaries do not have the financial capacity and find themselves financially dependent, some activities do not begin on the date previewed, a situation that creates delays in carrying out the projects and can compromise the implementation of the Annual Programme.

2. HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED PROBLEMS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2008 ANNUAL PROGRAMME? IF SO, WHAT MEASURES DID YOU TAKE?

The late approval of the Annual Programme (last semester of the Programme) meant that the Projects began many months before their approval. As the beneficiaries do not have the financial capacity to secure the development of the Projects without the transfer of pre-financing, some projects were abandoned. Those that were abandoned freed up financing for the Annual Project, making it necessary to open another call for proposals for the presentation of candidatures. To deal with the identified problems, the EMGFC prepared a document that systemized the reprogramming of the 2008 Annual Programme, and a request for a deadline extension of eligibility for the Annual Programme was submitted (and approved) to the European Commission. The extension was granted until June 30, 2010.

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?

Effectively, given the difficulty in execution of the projects by the beneficiaries and in order to overcome an eventual deficit situation of Action 3 of the 2008 Annual Programme, it was necessary to reprogramme the Actions at the level of distribution of money awarded. This reprogramming consisted in transferring 33.244,31 € from Actions 1 and 2 to Action 3 and in the approval, in Action 3, of the last project that reached the EMGFC (2008/FI/A3/04), depending on the availability of funding.

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)

The 2008 Annual Programme is still being implemented and underwent a reprogramming that led to a deficit of 17.566,51 €, in relation to the original Annual Programme for 2008. The budget distribution of each of the initiatives is set out as follows:

- the reprogrammed value for Action 1 (Priority 1) will not exceed by 1 percentage point what was initially established (1.032.165,42 €);
- the reprogrammed value for action 2 (Priority 2) will not exhaust the investment of the Fund initially programmed, not exceeding 76% of the value (56.596,85 €);

- the reprogrammed value for action 3 (Priority 3) is higher than initially programmed in the 2008 AP, leaving this Action with a deficit of 14% (424.757,08 €).

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?

As the Programme is still being carried out, and was reprogrammed in such a way as to include the integration of a new project to the list of the 10 approved, it is not possible to answer this question conclusively.

However, with regard to the analysis of the fulfilment of the programmed objectives in relation to expected results by the approved projects, it is confirmed that established targets are in line with programmed/executed objectives in most cases.

| Indicators | | Established targets | |
|------------|---|---------------------|----------|
| | | AP 2008 | Projects |
| Priority 1 | Number of information initiatives directed at immigrants | 25 | 170 |
| | Amount of informational material distributed | 15.000 | 18566 |
| | Amount of informational material produced | 45.000 | 9075 |
| | Number of beneficiaries | 7.500 | 8306 |
| | Number of entities involved | 125 | 60 |
| | Number of cultural mediators involved | 25 | 28 |
| | Number of people with expertise involved | 250 | 478 |
| | Number of municipalities involved | 25 | 14 |
| | Number of schools involved | 20 | 177 |
| | Number of projects from immigrant entrepreneurs presented | 13 | - |
| | Number of programmes produced for television and radio | 90/year | * |
| Priority 2 | Number of reports produced | 1 | 2 |
| | Number of entities involved | 20 | 50 |
| | Number of participants in meetings/workshops | 200 | 100 |
| Priority 4 | Number of sites with specialized information on immigration | 5 | 5 |
| | Material directed at opinion makers, politicians, experts and association leaders | 75.000 | 76.250 |
| | Number of meetings/workshops | 2/year | 2 |
| | Number of participants in meetings/workshops | 260/year | 336 |
| | Number of studies conducted | 25 | 21 |
| | Number of entities involved in the studies | 200 | 21 |

* The Project that will implement this indicator has not been approved yet.

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?

The definition of initiatives contemplated in the Annual Programme in each priority and the distribution of financing by the same stemmed from the intentions of candidatures registered in working meetings

between the potential beneficiary entities and the Management Authority, through a diagnosis of needs carried out to those same entities.

In similarity with the implementation of the 2007 Programme, the programming and distribution of financing to the various initiatives was the most appropriate to the identified needs, either for the country or for the network of entities that work in the area of Integration of Citizens of Third Countries, in so far as they allowed the financing of: initiatives that strengthen and improve the reception and integration of immigrants, initiatives of accompaniment and evaluation of policies and activities related to integration and initiatives of modernization and operational strengthening of equipment, structures and services in the area of integration of immigrants.

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?

The 2009 Annual Programme was approved in July, 2009, and has a period of availability of two years (January 2009 to December 2010). In the context of this AP, three candidatures were approved and there are 7 intentions of candidature. The three projects approved are functioning without accompaniment, monitoring or transference of funds from the Fund for beneficiaries.

The fact that the process of analysis and selection of candidatures is still ongoing highlights a delay in the implementation of the Programme that can even have, in a similar way to what happened in the previous APs, consequences in the physical and financial execution of the Projects that began in January 2009.

2. HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED PROBLEMS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2009 ANNUAL PROGRAMME? IF SO, WHAT MEASURES DID YOU TAKE?

The Annual Programme, though now in its second year of availability, is still at an initial stage, with the selection of candidatures still going on, so that a delay in the execution of projects can be expected, because its functioning depends on financing, i.e. the transfer of funds by the EMGFC.

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?

Presently, the reprogramming of the 2009 Annual Programme is not anticipated.

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)

The Annual Programme is still at the beginning, with the proces of reception and analysis of candidatures ongoing. In this context, the EMGFC confirms the existence of 7 intentions of candidature. However, up to this point, three projects were approved, one related to Priority 1 and two to Priority 4. Thus, in Priority 1, the project approved will take up about 25% of the eligible investment through the Fund. As to Priority 4, the two projects approved will need about 76% of the eligible investment through the Fund.

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?

The Annual Programme is still at the beginning stage with the process of reception and analysis of candidatures ongoing. Thus, the analysis of the execution of the programmed objectives in the Annual Programme is premature. However, the gauging of expected results of the two projects approved in Priority 3 permits the estimation/estimating that the programmed indicators of the Annual Programme will be attained.

| Indicators | | Established targets | |
|------------|---|---------------------|----------|
| | | AP 2008 | Projects |
| Priority 3 | Number of sites with specialized information on immigration | 5 | 6 |
| | Number of site visits per year | 500.000 | 500.000 |
| | Material directed to opinion makers, politicians, experts and associative leaders | 75.000 | 76.000 |
| | Number of meetings/workshops | 2/year | 6 |
| | Number of participants in meetings/workshops | 260/year | 392/year |

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?

The definition of initiatives contemplated in the Annual Programme in each priority and the distribution of financing by the same stemmed from the intentions of candidature registered in working meetings between potential beneficiaries and the Management Authority and from the diagnosis of needs carried out.

In a similar way to the implementation of the 2007 and 2008 Annual Programmes and the distribution of financing by the various initiatives was the most appropriate to the needs identified either by the country or by the network of entities that operate in the area of integration of Citizens of Third Countries, in so far as they permit financing: initiatives that strenghten and improve the reception and integration of immigrants, initiatives of accompaniment and evaluation of policies and activities related to integration and, initiatives of modernization and operational reenforcement of equipment, structures and services that act in the area of immigrant integration.

VI.4. THE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL SYSTEM OF THE EIF PROGRAMMES AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007 THROUGH 2009

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?

The structure of human resources of the Responsible Authority, in 2008, was adequate to the needs, though previewing, however, its reenforcement at the time of implementation of the Programmes, after their approval by the European Commission.

Although this structure has been reenforced with the beginning of implementation of the Programmes, the initial limit previewed of 10 people was not reached, thus showing a staff shortage in relation to the amount of work.

From December 2009 the Task Force for the Management of Community Funds (EMGFC) underwent significant changes, at the human resource level, that consisted of a process of substitution of the vast majority of its team members, including the managerial organs (e.g. manager and advisers), registering simultaneously an increase in the number of collaborators, so that at present there are nine elements. However, the tasks of control and monitorization of projects continue to be secured by only one person. This lack of human resources has as a consequence a certain difficulty in completing functions attributed to the EMGFC on time, namely the approval of candidatures and monitorization and effective control of the projects.

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

No changes of any kind were made to the System of Management Control. However, there remains the possibility of perfecting it in relation to the organigram, in order to optimize the human resources connected to the SOLID Programme.

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 implementation of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Annual Programmes of the European Fund for the Integration of Third Country Nationals suffered some delays due to their late approval, namely as a consequence of the long period of negotiation of the 2007 Annual Programme with the European Commission services and its respective approval that only occurred on October 29, 2008, and also due to the long period of negotiation of the Integration Fund Multiannual Programme for the 2008-2013 period that was also approved by the European Commission on the same date.

One of the implications of these delays was reflected in the development of the projects that, being already in a phase of implementation at the time when the approval of the Annual Plan took place, demanded an added financial effort on the part of the beneficiaries. On the other hand, monitoring of project execution, that should have been carried out since the beginning of its physical realization, was also jeopardised, as well as, in its sequence, the process of the certification of expenses and respective payments.

In order to reduce the effects of these situations, the Responsible Authority has been developing an additional effort in the accompanying of the two beneficiaries, ACIDI – Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Diálogo Intercultural, I.P. (High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue) and SEF – Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras (Services for Foreigners and Borders) and their respective projects, providing clarification on the questions raised and promoting working meetings about concrete situations of the phase of execution of the projects, during which orientation adequate to the attaining of planned results was conveyed. This Action allowed reaching an execution of the 2007 Annual Programme close to 67%, and attaining the objectives initially proposed for each of the projects developed in the context of the respective Programme, namely, the projects relative to Action 1 (Reinforcement and Improvement of Reception and Integration of Immigrants) and Action 2 (Support to accompanying initiatives and evaluation of policies and activities regarding integration), whose physical and financial execution was 81% and 97%, respectively.

As for the 2008 Annual Programme, it has an execution of only approximately 15%, as of March 31, 2010, due to the late approval of the Annual Programme (December 15, 2008) that delayed the implementation of some of the approved projects and the abandonment of others, given that beneficiary entities do not have financial autonomy to ensure the development of projects since they are very dependent on pre-financing in order to initiate the respective project to be developed. In order to address the objectives of the respective Programme, it was necessary to extend the deadline for its execution until June 30, 2010, and a supplementary effort is being carried out on the part of the beneficiaries, in such a way as to reach a physical and financial execution closer to 100%, for which reason, and in order to fulfil the objectives initially proposed, a reprogramming at the level of budget provision of the Actions was necessary, namely, the transfer of 33.244,31 € from Actions 1 and 2 to Action 3. As to the 2009 Annual Programme, it is still premature to reach a conclusion on its implementation, given that only three projects of this Programme have been approved, two of which have already started their activity and obtained a pre-financing of 15% of the respective Fund financial provision. Candidature intentions to 7 new projects have been declared but they have not been formalized so far.

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?

The sharp increase in immigration in Portugal has increased awareness regarding the need to implement specific measures and services that eased the integration of those citizens in the Portuguese society and, in that sense, we consider that the distribution of financing from the Annual Integration Fund programmes among the various initiatives is the most adequate to answer the needs identified both for the country and for the entities that operate in the area of Integration of Third Country Nationals, given that they allow financing a wide group of activities essential in immigrant integration policy, namely:

- Actions that reinforce and improve the integration of immigrants;
- initiatives that monitor and evaluate policies and activities regarding integration;
- initiatives for modernization and operational reinforcement of equipment, structures and services that act in the area of immigrant integration.

*** 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?

From the implementation of the Integration Fund Programme and in the context of the 2007 Annual Programme, the realization of the following projects stands out:

- the weekly production of the TV programmes “Nós” (“Us”) and the radio programmes “Gente como nós” (“People like us”), the contents of which are addressed to the immigrant community, and which try to promote their closeness to the host society, choosing themes as diverse as: culture, music, real life cases, gastronomy, sports, useful information, cultural agenda, among others (physical and financial execution: 83%);
- production of a TV show broadcasted live on RTP 1 on December 18, 2008, repeated on January 10, 2009, in which the closing of the European Year for Cultural Dialogue was commemorated, with the objective of promoting the closeness of the immigrant community to the host society, showing the new artistic values of this community, valorising the wealth of cultural diversity under the motto “Together in Diversity” (physical and financial implementation: 100%);
- publication of a collection of 5 works for the promotion of multiculturalism, with the aim of demonstrating, based on historical benchmarks, the presence and intertwining of peoples and cultures within Portuguese identity (physical and financial execution: 100%);
- evaluation and continuous monitoring of the services provided and procedures adopted by national and local centres of support to the immigrant (CNAI and CLAI), SOS immigrant helpline and telephone translation service, in such a way as to promote the exchange of information, experiences and good practices regarding reception and integration of immigrants, thus ensuring support for the continuous adaptation of the centres, having in view their better adjustment to the objectives of the National System of Support to the Immigrant, in all its components (physical and financial execution: 97%);
- realization of meetings between collaborators of the CNAI (National Centres of Support to the Immigrant) and the CLAI (Local Centres of Support to the Integration of Immigrants), having in view preparation of services and exchange of information and good practices, thus contributing to the motivation for networking, aiming at the continuity of dispensed services (physical and financial execution: 100%).

*** 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.

As for the Integration Fund management, it is perfectly adequate to the context of the planning presented in the respective programmes. However, emphasis should be given to the difficulty of the

financial implementation of the approved projects, for the reasons mentioned above, that makes the carrying out of the proposed objectives difficult.

Thus, we can conclude that the main difficulty in carrying out the objectives of the Integration Fund Programme is related to the lack of execution of the Programme itself and not to the financial allocation available therein. In this way, the actual estimate of the efficiency of the Programme is presently difficult to define. However, the indicators of financial control show that the objectives are being developed within the previewed cost.

*** 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?

Not applicable.

*** 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. Not applicable.

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?**

With no recommendations.

*** 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?**

With no recommendations.

*** 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?**

With no recommendations.

End of the report