

**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 ROMANIA

SCHENGEN DIRECTORATE, within MINISTRY OF ADMINISTRATION
AND INTERIOR

Date:

20/06/2010

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

Mr. Florin SAGHI, Director of the Schengen Directorate

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

Mr. Cristian IONUS, Head of the External Funds Unit at the Schengen
Directorate

Tel. +4021 2060936

Fax +4021 2060905

e-mail: pro.eu@mai.gov.ro

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, external evaluation expertise for chapters 1-6 of the present report.

The Gallup Organization was selected by public procurement to carry on the evaluation of the implementation of the actions co-financed by the European Fund for the integration of third-country nationals.

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

The methodology was designed in accordance to the current template and is based on document analysis (multiannual programme, annual programmes, Commission's decisions, internal procedures, legal documents, proposals, progress reports, final reports, other internal documents) and collecting data by consulting with representatives of the Delegated Authority, Responsible Authority and beneficiaries.

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

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

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).

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| - 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

The number of calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual EIF programmes in the “awarding body” method.

- Programme 2007: 4
- Programme 2008: 5
- Programme 2009: 1

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Proposals received	<i>5</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>36</i>
Projects selected	<i>3</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>15</i>
Projects funded	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for proposals been funded?
No.

One project has been submitted by a nongovernmental organization (in 2007) and within its proposed budget there were non-eligible costs. As the parties could not reach an agreement, the contract has never been signed.

Two projects were submitted by IOM: in 2007 and 2008 programmes. IOM has its own internal procedures which were in contradiction with the Programme procedures. Some examples are the costs which have no direct impact on the project (like terminal emoluments, overheads), own acquisition procedures and disagreement on the right of the Audit Authority to control all premises and databases. The disagreements could not be solved in a timely manner for programmes 2007 and 2008, therefore contracts have not been signed.

I.4 - Projects funded 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>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</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>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12</i>

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

By Priority

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

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

By Category of Actions

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)		<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>
Category c)	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
Category d)			

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

<i>Specific Priorities</i>

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only		<i>1</i>	
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
Specific Priority 5 only			
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities			
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority		<i>5</i>	<i>3</i>

**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)?

No

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

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.

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| - Programme 2007: | 0 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method |
| - Programme 2008: | 0 % |
| - Programme 2009: | 0 % |

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

The number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar organised for the implementation of the yearly EIF programmes in the “executing body” method

- Programme 2007: 0 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 0 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 0 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Proposals received	0	0	0	0
Projects selected	0	0	0	0
Projects funded	0	0	0	0

There is no such procedure available for Romania. Therefore, no projects have been neither received nor selected.

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	0	0	0	0

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>Total Prog. 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method (see table II.3)	0	0	0	0
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	0	0	0	0

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

By Priority

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

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

By Category of Actions

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

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

<i>Specific Priorities</i>

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

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

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

In the “awarding body” method

There were created tools for the dissemination of information to the third country nationals (TCN) such as guides for introducing TCN to Romanian legislation, institutions, norms and values and offering practical advices for an active participation to community life. A guide has been drafted based on a qualitative research on the TCN’s needs for integration in Romanian society, which it is by itself an important outcome. In the same area of disseminating information, a newly signed project will support the creation of a network of 15 information centres.

It was developed an infrastructure for learning Romanian language: a methodology for teaching adults Romanian language and introducing Romanian culture, training teachers, creating manuals to be used in class or for self learning. As a follow-up, these types of outcomes have been used as an input for projects aiming to directly provide TCN’s with opportunities to learn Romanian language.

There are projects that provide direct assistance to TCN’s such as counselling, obtaining professional qualification, direct support for the integration on the labour market, for accessing medical services or integrating children in education, but this type of intervention has been implemented in 2008 programme only at local level.

In the “executing body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

In the “awarding body” method

The project funded under Priority 2 aims to increase the knowledge and understanding of the TCN’s integration process by carrying on a study. The complex research consists of three components: a survey on the host society, a qualitative research on TCN and a qualitative research focused on the most efficient methods for disseminating information. The research report will be disseminated among policy makers, law enforcers and part of the results are addressed to the general public.

In the “executing body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Under priority 3 there were two approaches implemented. The first one focused on developing mechanisms for consultations with TCN’s representatives. The consultative mechanisms consisted in seminars which brought together both TCN and public authorities, and thematic working groups which aimed at identifying problems and solutions in several specific domains: legislation, education and culture. The seminars were held in cities with highest numbers of TCN. Also, a National Focal Point for TCN has been established in Bucharest, as this is the city with the highest number of TCN.

The second approach was to train main stakeholders (TCN, public servants, NGO representatives) in inter-cultural communication. In order to accomplish the training seminars, manuals and informative materials have been designed.

All projects aiming to develop communication and cooperation between TCN and public authorities had a component of promoting outcomes online and even to continue some activities online (e.g. thematic discussion forums).

In the “executing body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

In the “awarding body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

In the “executing body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

No projects have been funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals.

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

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

A comparison between programmes 2007 – 2009 is not feasible as there are three distinct situations: in 2007 programme, from 4 calls for proposals only one project was funded; in 2008 programme there were 5 calls for proposals and 7 projects funded while for 2009 programme only one call for proposals was held until present report and 4 projects have been funded.

Still, in 2009 programme, compared to 2008 we can conclude that there is a higher interest towards the actions funded: in just one call there were received 16 proposals while in 2008 programme there were submitted a total of 15 proposals in 5 rounds of call for proposals.

Also, the diversity of the priorities addressed by the projects has increased year by year, and in 2009 programme there are projects for three priorities proposed in the annual programme.

In terms of categories of actions, since 2008 programme, the projects are focused on two categories of actions which correspond to the actions defined in Decision 2007/435/EC: (b) development and implementation of the integration process of newly-arrived third-country nationals in Member States; and (c) increasing of the capacity of Member States to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals.

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

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

An important change is the extension of the area of intervention. Some beneficiaries (NGOs) started with projects addressing local level and are currently continuing at a larger scale the interventions that proved successful: they are moving from local to national projects. Also, in 2009 programme IOM has been granted a project that is covering an entire action of the annual programme.

Another aspect that should be stressed is the change of attitude of the beneficiaries which have already implemented projects. As the Delegated Authority organized periodical meetings with the interested NGOs discussing about the needs of the TCN, programming and project implementation, the beneficiaries gained a better understanding of the annual programmes and the contribution brought by each project to the multiannual programme. As a consequence, several projects submitted in 2008 and 2009 programmes are using the outcomes of the previously implemented projects in order to build further interventions. We could conclude that part of the beneficiaries is moving from an approach focused on individual intervention to an approach focused on complementary interventions. The Delegated Authority is supporting and promoting this type of approach in order to avoid duplication of interventions and ensure long-term results.

In the “executing body” method

No projects have been funded in the “executing body”.

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

One “success story” is the project which developed a guide for the TCN based on the research on the integration needs. The arguments sustaining the qualification as “success” are related to the quality of the methodology used (results of the research were used to draft the guide, the content of the guide was discussed with TCN representatives and revised accordingly), the novelty of the

project and multiplication opportunities as this guide can be accessed online after the end of the implementation period or could be reprinted.

The second project which is considered “successful” is the one which created a mechanism for consultations with TCN. It was the first project which tried to involve TCN as active partners in the implementation of the project and not to approach them as simple recipients of the assistance. TCN took part in seminars and thematic working groups along with representatives of the public authorities and NGOs. The project built the confidence of the TCN representatives in “external interventions” and ensured further access to their communities. During the project, it was compiled a database with contact data of the TCN’s representatives, and this is an important outcome as the main barrier in designing projects addressing directly the TCN was the lack of contact with such communities. Other reasons for considering it successful are: the project created a network of stakeholders which could be the base for further projects; the project raised the awareness of the TCN integration among other NGOs with capacity to design projects, and increased the visibility of the European Integration Fund among those NGOs participating in the programme.

III.11. Description of one “failure”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes over the period from 2007 to 2009

All projects funded so far have been implemented/are implemented according to their proposed objectives; therefore we cannot offer an example of a failure.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

IV.1. Technical assistance

The role of the technical assistance is to support the activities of the designated authorities in the implementation of the EIF. The activities implemented under the Technical Assistance have been in most cases common for the three Funds: European Integration Fund, European Return Fund and European Refugee Fund. In cases of common activities the part of the budget corresponding to each Fund was estimated based on the impact each activity has on the implementation of the multiannual programmes.

The activities developed under the technical assistance are the following: publication of the calls for proposals, consultations and trainings for the potential grant recipients, periodical consultations with grant recipients, monitoring visits, trainings for the designated authorities' teams, study visits, working visits within the Commission.

Also, a service contract has been signed for reviewing the working procedures for the Delegated Authority and Responsible Authority. Within the service contract there will be designed a complex electronic system for collecting data on the implementation of the programmes, on financial management, monitoring, control and the evaluation of the projects/programmes under the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'. Furthermore, the contractor has to provide training, monitoring activities, consultations with the beneficiaries and study visits.

IV.2. Information and Publicity

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

On 21st January 2009 it was held the first conference for launching the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'. The conference had the role of informing institutions and organizations about the European Refugee Fund, European Return Fund, and European Integration Fund. 105 representatives of Ministry of Administration and Interior, embassies, county authorities, representatives of ministries, NGOs, international organizations, and bilateral commerce chambers.

On 6th and 7th October it was organized a consultation with potential beneficiaries on the implementation of 2008 programmes. 15 representatives of NGOs and local administration participated at the meeting.

On 28th September – 1st October the conference “We manage migration together” reunited 135 representatives of public authorities, NGOs and ministries. The aim of the conference was to inform about and to familiarize with the calls for proposals for the three funds.

At the beginning, the calls for proposals were posted on the site of the Romanian Immigration Office and the dedicated website for the General Programme, the Official Journal of Romania, newspapers. The range of media used for publicizing the funding opportunities was further extended to websites and forums dedicated to NGOs and other potential beneficiaries.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

The final beneficiaries had specific activities for promoting the projects' objectives and outcomes. There were organized launching press conferences, closing-up conferences or events for launching publications. The activities reported until the present report was compiled include 9 press conferences. Three projects informed the media about the activities implemented through press releases, a total 10 press releases reported. The press releases were used for informing stakeholders about the start of the projects, about important activities (seminars, trainings), but also in the end of the project in order to disseminate the results.

Also, in all activities, the visibility of the EC funding was ensured: EU logo was placed on offices, equipments, presentations, dossiers and all informative materials. The monitoring visits had an important role in ensuring the visibility by explaining grant recipients all the rules and by verifying the implementation of the visibility rules.

**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	761,525.37	220,898.59	29
Programme 2008	780,702.90	491,833.76	63
Programme 2009	804,797.29	690,507.89	85
TOTAL 2007-2009	2,347,025.56	1,403,240.24	59

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

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 implementation of the Annual Programme 2007 started with the adoption of the Financing Decision by the Commission, respectively on 28 November 2008. The implementation deadline for 2007 programme was 31st December 2009.

There were four calls for proposals organized and only one project has been funded. The project aimed and succeeded in covering all the expected results for action 4 of the annual programme: development of a consultation mechanism with the TCN communities.

For action 1 – Awareness public campaigns - two NGOs submitted projects. One was selected, but due to disagreements regarding the eligible costs that can be included in the budget the contract has never been signed. The other project didn't meet the minimum quality criteria. In case of action 2 – development of programmes on cultural orientation, social counselling and learning Romanian language, only one project was received, selected, but not funded. It was a project submitted by IOM and the reasons for not signing the contract are presented in chapter I.3. Regarding the action 3 – research study on the situation of TCN in Romania - there were no projects received.

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

The interest for the call for proposal for 2007 programme among potential beneficiaries was very low and although 4 calls have been organized, only one project has been funded. There were several reasons for the low interest such as: the publicity of the funding opportunities at the beginning didn't use the most popular media for NGOs; short remaining time for implementation (approximately 8 months), and novelty of the subject and target groups for the

potential grant recipients. The NGO sector didn't have experience in approaching TCN' communities, hence the time for effectively implement such a new project had to be longer. Three more calls have been further organized but without the estimated result.

As concerns the implementation of the project, the selected NGO had difficulties in meeting all administrative requirements, because they are time consuming and would have required additional personnel. Also, the implementation of the project was very short and the approach was innovative for this field of action, therefore inherent delays appeared and had to be dealt with by the implementation team.

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

No, there were no revisions.

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)

No, just one action out of four has been implemented. Action 4 – development of a consultation mechanism with the TCN communities - was fully implemented through one project. For the other actions, no projects were carried on.

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?

In case of action 4 which has been implemented, all quantitative results have been accomplished:

- Creation of a National Contact Point for the TCN communities;
- Creation of a database with minimum 500 TCN
- Organizing 5 local workgroups on integration in 5 cities of Romania;
- Organizing national workgroups, with interaction on forum and within a seminar, identifying solutions for problems to be addressed by national institutions;

- Creation of a web page with information on the integration of TCN;
- Publishing a magazine in 5 editions, in 2000 copies, and its distribution at national level, as well as providing its accessibility on-line

In terms of quality, the feedback from beneficiaries was positive and the project is going to be developed within the 2009 programme. The involvement of the TCN increased during the participation to the project' activities and during the last meetings it was noticed that many of them had in their speeches referrals on their responsibilities towards their communities.

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?

Yes, the distribution of the funding was appropriate between actions and was referring the needs and barriers in TCN integration. The European Integration Fund has no component of implementing actions under “executing body” method. Therefore, the success of the 2007 programme depended on the interest and performances of a third party: NGOs and international organizations.

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 first call for proposal was launched in December 2008, immediately after the Commission adopted the financing decision. The deadline for the implementation is in line with the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules: 30th June 2010.

The implementation followed the objectives and actions originally planned. There were 5 calls for proposals, the first one being launched in December 2008 and the last one in February 2010. In terms of projects received, the proposals addressed all 5 actions, but not all of them have been selected nor funded. In the first call, there were three proposals, all of them have been selected but only two have been funded.

The third one was proposed by IOM and the same barriers were encountered as in the 2007 programme. In the second call for proposals, there were 5 projects and only two selected and funded. In the third round no project was received while in the fourth it was recorded the highest number of proposals: 6 out of which two were granted.

In the last call only one project was submitted, and funded, probably due to the very short time remaining for the implementation (less than 4 months). Although it was a higher interest and the proposals addressed all actions, there is one action which remained totally unimplemented: action 4 – development of procedures and evaluation tools in the field of integration of TCN.

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

Problems encountered in the implementation of the 2007 programme are applicable also for the implementation of 2008 programme: NGOs had little experience in approaching TCN's community. Therefore, for action 1 – effective performance of integration programmes for vulnerable categories of TCN's (women, children, elderly and TCN with disabilities) reaching these groups at national level was perceived as too difficult for a short-time project. Only a small scale project (addressing 35 beneficiaries) has been submitted and funded. The action has been included in further calls for proposals, but no other projects have been submitted.

For action 4 – development of procedures and evaluation tools in the field of integration of TCN, there were submitted only two proposals in 4 calls but they did not meet the minimum requirements for funding.

As for the projects' perspective, the main problems encountered were related to administrative requirements and the period of implementation, as mentioned in case of the 2007 programme. A specific difficulty encountered within a project aiming to develop manuals and teaching Romanian language to TCN. During the implementation, a Ministry Order has changed the regulatory framework thus requiring adapting the tools and activities within the project to the new provisions.

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?

Yes. During the implementation of the technical assistance it was noticed that some of the results were ambiguously defined and needed further clarification.

Therefore, the 2008 programme has been revised, but without affecting the actions. The revised programme was sent to the Commission for approval in the first semester of 2010.

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)

As a general overview, 3 actions out of 5 proposed in the annual program have been fully implemented.

The projects had results that exceeded the planned outcomes of the three actions: action 2 – enhancement of capacity building of government structures in the field of learning Romanian language, action 3 – enhancement of the dissemination of information to TCN, and action 5 – enhancement of the relevant skills and knowledge on the intercultural communication.

For action 1 – effective performance of integration programmes for vulnerable groups only a small proportion of the target group has been reached (approx. 11%). Action 4 – development of procedures and evaluation tools was not implemented. As the deadline is 30th June for this programme, we can conclude that these last two actions will remain unimplemented.

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?

For three of the actions of the 2008 programme the results achieved exceed the estimated ones. For action 2, which is focused on opportunities for learning Romanian language and culture, besides the 100 beneficiaries of Romanian courses and 100 beneficiaries of cultural orientation, there were additional results which are important for the programme. Thus, 40 teachers were trained for carrying on classes for adult TCN.

In case of action 3, aiming to create guides for the TCN. Such instruments were created addressing different categories of TCN, which were printed in almost a double number of copies than proposed one. In addition, the research report which was the base for one of the guides was disseminated on CD and online. Another additional result is a dedicated web-site.

As for action 5, more than a double number (compared to the expected indicators) of public servants were trained (as one project is ending on 30th June, the final indicators are not available at the time of the present report).

In case of actions 1 and 4, neither the quantitative indicators nor the qualitative ones will be achieved by the end of the programme.

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 distribution of the funding between actions was appropriate. For actions which were implemented, results were achieved within the proposed budget.

For action 4 – development of procedures and evaluation tools -we could state that potential beneficiaries were not prepared to carry on such intervention. As for this programme, no projects are allowed under “executing bodies” method, we can conclude that it could have been a solution to delay the implementation of action 4 in a future year in order to allow stakeholders to gain experience in the field of services offered for the integration of TCN.

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 first call for proposals has been launched in December 2009, although the estimated time for the initiation of the projects was 30 November 2009. It was recorded an extremely high number of proposals: 16, addressing all four actions defined in the 2009 programme.

Two actions have raised the highest interest of the beneficiaries: action 1 – creation of information and counselling centres (6 proposals were submitted) and for action 3 – research on immigration in Romania (5 proposals).

Although the calls for proposals started in December 2009 the activities planned for achieving the objectives of 2009 programme will be implemented until the end of the programme.

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

As previously mentioned, the implementation period was shorter with one year.

The selection process was longer than estimated because the number of proposals exceeded the capacity of the evaluation commissions. In just one call there were more proposals than the number of proposals received in all calls from 2008 programme.

IOM submitted a project with national coverage, which was addressing all objectives defined in action 1 – creation of 15 information and counselling centres throughout the country. As in previous programmes, the incompatibility between programme's procedures and IOM's was a barrier in signing a contract agreement. After 6 month of negotiations, IOM accepted Commission's provisions and the project will be implemented starting 1st June.

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?

No revision has been necessary until the present report. Depending on the implementation process of action 2, which is not totally covered by the granted project, a revision will be taken into consideration.

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)

In three of the four actions, the granted projects aim to achieve all objectives proposed in the 2009 programme for the specific action. Therefore we can expect that these three actions will be achieved.

For action 2 –effective implementation of integration programmes for TCN – the selected project covers approximately 75% of the results action 2 proposed. The remaining results refer to 300 TCN benefitting of vocational training. In July 2010 the Delegated Authority plans to organize a new call for proposals.

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?

In terms of quantitative results, it is expected that 3 actions will be 100% implemented. In the case action 2, there are chances to achieve the expected results, but estimations regarding the percentage of target groups that will be reached within the programme are not possible at this moment.

As for qualitative results, there are indications that support a positive estimation.

In case of action 1 – creation of information centres, IOM has been granted a project that will create the national network of 15 centres. Along the experience of the beneficiary in dealing with migrants' needs of information, all centres will be organized following the same methodology. This is important as TCN will have access to same information and counselling services no matter what region of the country they are.

Action 2 and action 4 are building their actions on the outcomes and experiences of the previous projects: manuals and teaching methodology for Romanian language and cultural orientation, mechanisms for consulting TCN communities.

Action 3 – study on the immigrants' needs – is implemented by a NGO which developed a component of qualitative research for a guide for TCN. Hence, they have the background and a sound understanding of the concepts and TCN needs.

- 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 actions and the proportion of the budget allocated to each of them were defined in accordance to the TCN's integration needs. As presented before, for three of the actions, we expect full implementation. As for action 2, it is possible that the NGOs would not have the capacity to reach the target group, therefore the distribution of the budget will be a matter to discuss and further analyze.

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 Management and Control System has been designed for the entire General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'. Although a final version was not yet approved by the Commission, a set of procedures were adopted by a Ministry Order and is in force. As the Audit Authority concluded after auditing the management and control system, the system is functioning but needs improvement. Audit Authority's recommendations have been taken into consideration by the designated authorities, analyzed and implemented.

Both beneficiaries and representatives of Delegated Authority stress that there is need for a standard manual of eligible costs based on the Commission instructions and taking into account the restrictions from Romanian legislation. If beneficiaries would have a better understanding on the eligible costs the whole procedure of approving financial reports would be more efficient. Also, the contract agreement should be standardized and more detailed, especially regarding the chapter of sanctions. Also, the procedures of approving the payment documents should be simplified in order to ease the implementation process.

The Audit report also shows that designated authorities need additional human resources in order to efficiently fulfil their responsibilities but the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 34/2009 suspends filling any job vacancy in public institutions.

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

The Management and Control System has been changed in several steps. In March 2009, due to reorganizing process within the Ministry of Administration and Interior, Schengen Directorate became the Responsible Authority instead of General Directorate for European Affairs and International Relations. The changes were transposed in the Management and Control System.

The Audit Authority made several recommendations regarding working procedures which were implemented by the designated authorities. The procedures of the Responsible Authority and Delegated Authority now under revision within a service contract in order to make it more efficient and improve it based on the previous experience in Romania but also in other Member States.

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

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

The implementation of 2007 – 2009 programmes recorded progress in achieving the objectives established for each of the three priorities. Although 2007 programme was launched very late and raised little interest, 2008 and 2009 programmes show that most of the objectives of the multiannual programme are achievable.

There are several quantitative indicators showing that the implementation of the EIF improved during 2007-2009 programmes. The number of proposals increased from an average of 2 proposals/ call, to 4 proposals/call in 2008 programme and 16 in the first round of 2009 programme. The number of projects addressing one action as a whole has increased in 2009 programme. As a consequence, the requested budget of each individual project is bigger.

The budget implementation is also an indicator showing that the implementation is improving. In 2007 programme, the EIF budget implementation rate was 29% and for 2008 programme this rate increased to 63%. For 2009 programme, the rate of the community budget committed is 85%.

From the qualitative perspective, the proposed projects are shifting from a “local” approach to a broader approach, targeting groups at regional or national level. NGOs are sending proposals developed with partners, thus increasing their capacity to address the objectives. All these are the results of the efforts of the Delegated Authority which is constantly consulting and informing the potential grant recipients.

In terms of qualitative results, it was developed the network of partner NGOs which increased their capacity of developing larger scale projects. The projects implemented in 2007 and 2008 created an infrastructure that is further developed or used in 2009 annual programme: the consultation mechanisms, the National Focal Point, the guides for the newly arrived TCN. Within 2009 programme an infrastructure for informing and counselling TCN is going to be developed: 15 information centres.

As weak points of the implementation we could mention the lack of interest of the local administration in accessing these funds and developing projects. Although local administrations have been informed about these opportunities,

their response is missing. The explanation for this lack of initiative is most probably the lack of human resources for implementing the projects. Another weak point is related to the limited NGO's capacity to provide direct services to TCN, but taking into account the progress it is estimated that this barrier will be surpassed.

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

Although the migratory flows are dynamic, there are no significant changes in migrant's needs which would require at this moment a reshaping of the intervention. The migrant's needs are still related to obtaining quality information, learning Romanian language, accessing medical and educational services, integrating on the labour market and participating in the civic life. All these needs have been identified during the research activities carried on so far and during the consultations with TCN representatives.

The programme is addressing the integration needs of the TCN by developing actions addressed to all stakeholders: campaigns targeting the host population, direct services for TCN, campaigns and trainings for public servants and public workers, increasing the level of knowledge of policy makers. The actions implemented in 2007-2009 programme created a basic infrastructure for integration policies.

Still, it is expected that the financial crisis will impact the migratory flows and also the labour market in Romania. As a consequence, the objectives and actions of the multiannual plan will have to be revised according to new trends and progress achieved in the implementation of the programme.

* Effectiveness of the programme

The results of the implementation of annual programmes improved year by year. In 2007 programme, a national mechanism for consulting TCN was created with a National Focal Point in Bucharest. It was very important as it allowed

Romanian Immigration Office to become more visible and gain the trust of the TCN communities.

In 2008 programme there were created important documents for information campaigns addressing both TCN and public servants. These are the guides for newly arrived TCN, which are disseminated in hard copy and online. It is estimated that around 10.000 guides have already been disseminated. Also training manuals on inter-cultural communication were compiled. Based on these manuals, more than 250 public servants were trained.

Another result that has a great contribution to the objective of enhancing the opportunities for learning Romanian language is the elaboration of a manual of Romanian language, approved by the Ministry of Education and the training of a network of 40 teachers, which will conduct Romanian classes for adults.

All these results are consistent with our proposed objectives but efforts have to be made in order to increase the participation rate to the calls for proposals.

* Efficiency of the programme

The cost of the management of the implementation of 2007 and 2008 programmes of EIF it is estimated to represent approximately 7.8% of the total costs. These figures are not final as the 2008 programme is ending on 30th June 2010. In the first year of the implementation of the programme, the technical assistance represented 17.9% of the total costs, and for 2008 programme the provisional figures show that the management cost decreased to 3.4%.

All actions implemented so far did not exceed the proposed budget, although, as mentioned before, achieved better quantitative results.

* Complementarity

The Responsible Authority and Delegated Authority maintain permanent communication with the Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection and the General Directorate for Development of Administrative Capacity within Ministry of Administration and Interior. The authorities mentioned above signed a protocol (no. 72737/29.08.2008) on prevention of overlapping of funding from European Integration Fund, the European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund. This protocol specifies that representatives of all ministries involved will meet before any call for proposals or if the situation requires.

As regards the governmental measures implemented by RIO for the integration of TCN, this consists mostly counselling within the subordinated regional

offices, but the human resources involved in this activity are totally insufficient compared to the needs: in total there are 5 persons responsible with providing direct support to TCN.

The designated authorities are also ensuring that there is no overlapping between the projects implemented: a special attention is paid during the selection and implementation of the projects, when more projects are implemented for the same action.

* Added value

Most of the issues addressed by the European Integration Fund represented a novelty for the policy regarding the integration of TCN in Romania. Therefore we could state that each of the projects represent added value. Still, the added value of the EIF implementation is that created outcomes that are the base for future interventions and allows Romania to build immigrant's integration policies even in a period of financial crisis and budgetary reduction.

The framework for teaching TCN Romanian language has been adapted to the new categories of TCN in Romania and the problems they confront with: a new manual for learning Romanian language was created, new teaching methodology was defined, and teachers were trained to teach Romanian language to adults.

Also, it was created the framework for training the public servants in order to better understand and address cultural diversity. For the first time, it was developed a mechanism for permanent consultations with TCN's representative.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

* 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 approval of the annual programmes or of their revisions should not depend on any other factors like modifications to the management and control system etc. The only aspect that should be taken into account when revising the annual programme is the content of the amendments.

* 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 urgent suggestions are related to the need to clarify and to make more flexible the Implementing rules.

Staff costs - there should be no distinctions between public servants and other categories of personnel

Transport and subsistence - the same rules should apply to all persons involved: project team, administrative personnel, participants etc.

Equipment – the rules for purchasing equipment should be more flexible by extending the period for acquisition to more than 3 months and by increasing the price accepted for each item above 1000 Euro.

Subcontracting - there is need for clearer definitions of subcontracting as currently some of costs might be included in different budget lines

Indirect costs - within the budget indirect costs should be presented as a flat rate, because it is very hard to make a realistic estimation of such costs.

Costs made by partner NGOs from third countries should be considered eligible if these costs are necessary for the implementation and have direct impact on the project.

For the technical assistance, the diversity of consumables, services and equipments should be increased and detailed.

In cases when costs have been included in wrong budget line, the Commission should allow modifications and consider those costs as eligible.

The Commission should consider, at least temporarily, supporting the salaries and financial incentives for the staff of the Delegated Authorities dealing directly with the management of the General Programme from the technical assistance, according to the working time dedicated to the programme.

* 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?

One recommendation that would facilitate the implementation of the management and control system is to define more clearly the concept of “segregation of the functions” which applies both to designated authorities and their staff.

End of the report

