

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

(Report set out in Article 48, 2 (a) of Council Decision 2007/435/EC)

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

The Slovak Republic

Date:

24 June 2010

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

Martin Čatloš, Permanent State Secretary of Ministry of Interior of SR

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

Zuzana Kerestešová

EIC coordinator

Mail: [zuzana.kerestesova@minv.sk](mailto:zuzana.kerestesova@minv.sk)

Phone num. : +421 2 509 44 437

Fax: +421 2 509 009

**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?*

**No**

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

**Not applicable.**

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

**CONTENTS**

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

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

- *Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions;*
- *Revision of the annual programmes 2007 and 2008 as approved by the Commission*
- *Grant agreements to 25 projects, in particular project description and budget*
- *Documentation to 3 calls for proposals SK 2007/2008 EIF, SK 2/2007/2008 EIF, SK 2009 EIF*

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**

- Programme 2007: 91,97 % 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**

- Programme 2007: 2 (number of calls for proposals) – joint call for proposal for AP 2007 and AP2008
- Programme 2008: 2 (number of calls for proposals) – joint call for proposal for AP 2007 and AP2008
- Programme 2009: 1 (number of calls for proposals)

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

<b>Number of ...</b>	<b><i>Programme 2007</i></b>	<b><i>Programme 2008</i></b>	<b><i>Programme 2009</i></b>	<b><i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i></b>
Proposals received	<i>14*</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>39</i>
Projects selected	<i>10*</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>25</i>
Projects funded	<i>10*</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>25</i>

\* Among the 14 proposals received under the call for proposals of the 2007 programme, 8 were proposed for funding in part under the 2007 programme and in part under the 2008 programme. Among the 10 projects selected and funded under the 2007 programme, 4 are funded in part under the 2007 programme and in part under the 2008 programme. In this table as well as in the following tables, the 4 projects funded from both the 2007 and 2008 programmes are included under the 2007 programme only (for the purpose of these tables).

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

Yes/No: **Yes**

**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>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>25</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>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>25</i>

NB: In this table as well as in the following tables, the 4 projects funded from both the 2007 and 2008 programmes are included under the 2007 programme only (for the purpose of these tables).

**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>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>
Priority 2	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
Priority 3	<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>
Priority 4	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>

**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>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions			
Category a)	<i>5</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>4</i>
Category b)	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
Category c)	<i>2</i>		<i>3</i>
Category d)	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>

**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>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 3 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	<i>10</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>10</i>

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

- *Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions;*
- *Revision of the annual programmes 2007 and 2008 as approved by the Commission*
- *Grant agreement to 1 project, in particular project description and budget*
- *Documentation to submission and evaluation of project proposal*

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:    **Yes**

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

- Programme 2007: 8,03 % 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**

- 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	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects selected	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects funded	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

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

Yes/No: **NA**

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

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>

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

Number of ...	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>Total Prog. 2007-2009</i>
Projects funded after calls for interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method (see table II.3)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>

**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→	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 2	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 3	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Priority 4	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

**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 →	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Category b)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Category c)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Category d)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

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

*Specific Priorities*

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

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

- *Annual Programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions;*
- *Revision of the annual programmes 2007 and 2008 as approved by the Commission*
- *Grant agreements to 26 projects, in particular project description and budget*
- *Interim monitoring reports of final beneficiaries*
- *Final monitoring reports of final beneficiaries ( as available)*

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

In the “awarding body” method

Project activities under Priority 1 can be categorized into two groups: activities providing various services for the target group and activities enhancing multicultural dialog among the target group and the Slovak citizens. Activities within the first category provided legal and labour counselling, requalification courses, courses of Slovak language and courses of social and cultural orientation within the country. Instruments used to reach the greatest possible flexibility and coverage were mostly individual and group courses and online or face-to-face counselling. The second category activities provided various cultural events enhancing the active participation of the target group. The projects were aimed at opening the dialog on different aspects of migration and promoting positive image of various migrant communities through, seminars, conferences, workshops, discussions at schools, sport and cultural events. The second group of activities has been marked for highest active participation of migrants themselves. The planned target values of indicators were reached and even exceeded (for more details see part VII.2). The demand for activities under this priority has been most clearly stated by the target group (as reported from final beneficiaries and through project monitoring).

### In the “executing body” method

The only project in the executing body method was targeted to creation of the first conceptual document on national level regarding integration of third country migrants into Slovak society. Its creation has been identified in MAP as crucial to further implementation of EIF due to lack of conceptual framework setting priorities and measures in migrants integration. The project entailed discussions with all relevant actors and in-field experts including NGO sector and representatives of various migrant communities, who commented on the actual content of the document and thus increased its quality. The project output is a strategic document “National Concept on Integration of Migrants into the Slovak Republic” approved by the government in May 2009. The Concept acknowledges the integration as mutual two-way process and identifies key issues and measures to be taken in different areas of state administration. As regards the financial crisis, the creation of supporting financial instruments has been postponed. Since the absence of the strategic framework, its creation is very significant for development of further steps in the integration policy.

The supporting activities of the project were focused on informing the public on approval of the documents and its key issues. These activities cover media such as press, TV and radio. The conference entitled “Integration of Foreigners in Slovakia: from Concept to Implementation” took place on June 29, 2009 in Bratislava. Its goal was to present the CFI document and discuss the subsequent practical steps and the implementation of integration measures in Slovakia, in the context of modern European migration and integration policy. Approximately 70 participants met at this conference. In addition to representatives of state administration, self-government and NGOs, experts and representatives of the communities of foreigners living in Slovakia, experts from the institute Migration Policy Group with its seat in Brussels and the Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic also delivered speeches. The press conference took place on May 12, 2009 at the MoLSAF SR with the participation of representatives of the print and broadcast media. The press materials provided to the journalists also incorporated a written overview of the basic information on the NP EIF and its main activities.

After its approval, the document has been used for the programming exercise by the responsible authority and as a reference source for final beneficiaries when designing the project proposals.

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

### In the “awarding body” method

As defined in MAP, complex research has absented in the field of migration and especially integration of citizens coming from third countries into the Slovak Republic. Projects under priority 2 implemented various researches focused on analyses of migration trends after the accession into EU and attitude of public towards migration and integration. Several projects implemented highly specific researches either focused on particular segment of the target group such as underage unaccompanied children or particular area of integration such as gender and family issues or integration of migrant children into Slovak vocational system.

Economic aspects of integration are the thematic topic of AP 2009 and implemented through one project. Beside the research projects, two projects have worked with indicators, their identification in terms of Slovak society and consequent testing. Projects' outputs, publications with recommendations in this respect, have been disseminated to relevant actors through seminars, workshops and conferences enabling as well mutual exchange among final beneficiaries. Methodologies used varied from analysis of public policy documents, through quantitative research to qualitative research of semi - structured interviews.

#### In the “executing body” method

Not applicable.

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

Projects implemented under priority 3 focused on building capacities mainly for bodies of state administration involved in the process of integration at various levels, e.g. departments of alien and border police, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs and labour offices. The trainings received as well students at Police academy, self-governmental offices and NGO 's. The trainings were provided both by in-field Slovak and foreign experts or based on study visits in more-experienced EU countries consequently sharing the best practice through workshops. The target values as planned in APs and followed in particular projects have been fulfilled. Very positive proved to be the active participation of migrants themselves at workshops whereas the mutual exchange of views and issues was enabled.

#### In the “executing body” method

Not applicable.

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

Actions under Priority 4 are designed as networking and comparative researches with application in pilot projects and exchange of experiences. There are two projects implemented within 2007 through 2009 annual programmes. One focused on exchange of experiences concerning the practical use of integration indicators. The project has been designed as short term and main outputs are recommendations published in a publication and disseminated to relevant actors. The second project aims at gathering experience of other member states in regional integration, in particular in terms of role of regional self-governments in the process. The project output is expected to bring best practices with recommendations for their application in the Slovak Republic. The fourth priority implementation is considered rather as

supporting with the lowest assigned allocation in annual programmes and is not meant to provide wide and deep researches but rather bring new ideas and solutions.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable.

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

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**

Through AP 2007 -2009 only one project in the executing body method was implemented and is described in part. III.1 of this report.

**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**

Any changes to the distribution of the projects **funded** in the “awarding body” method, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009 were not necessary.

**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**

Any changes to the distribution of the projects **funded** in the “executing body” method, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009 were not necessary.

**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

There has been no change to projects after launching their realisation. Two projects were modified after being successful in the selection process and before the grant agreement has been signed.

The need for such modification was raised by questionable possibility of revision of AP 2007. The launch of projects successful in the second joint call for proposal (joint call indicating simultaneous implementations of AP 2007 and 2008) had to be interrupted until the official decision enabling the revision of APs 2007 has been made by the Commission. Thus two projects have been modified to 4months implementation (the project proposals were designed for longer projects). However, the second call for proposal has accounted the short time for implementation and thus was opened for actions that could be implemented even in this condition (mainly cultural, information activities, networking and exchange of experiences) and the respective two projects have been implemented successfully.

### In the “executing body” method

Not applicable.

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

The first success story is a project implemented under Priority 1. The project was short term with activities spread over 4 months. The project delivered 8 different types of events such as Days of Islamic Culture, thematic seminars “Living Among Us”, public information meetings, multicultural seminars for women, interactive creative workshops for children, Ramadan celebration, sport events and cultural presentation through culinary workshops. The activities were planned, prepared and realised by the representatives of the Islamic community itself, ensuring the authenticity of **positive self-presentation of the community in the Slovak society**. The variety of provided events managed to cover broad spectrum of the target group such as, migrants, migration experts, representatives of public authorities, women, families and wide public. Overall through realisation of 24 events during four months the final beneficiary managed to create short but intensive multicultural campaign.

The second successful project was implemented under Priority 2 and is good example of a research project **with practical output tested in “real-life” situations**. The project focused on integration of migrant children into Slovak vocational system at elementary schools. The analytical/research part consisted mainly of qualitative researches among teachers and migrant children as to gather information about actual needs, challenges and constraints in education in terms of cultural and ethnic difference. Based on the research, the teaching modules/ work sheets (for multicultural dialogue enhancement and fighting the xenophobia and stereotypes) were elaborated and selected teachers were trained through series of workshops. The trainings required active participation of teachers, who could consult their interim progress. The teachers highly appreciated the prepared material and trainings, since the neither market nor official vocational documents cover the topic for the respective target group. Teachers reported continuous use of the material at their work.

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

None of projects implemented under respective annual programmes could be identified as failure; all of them achieved expected results and objectives. Assessment of 2009 projects is not known by June 2010.

However the lessons can be drawn from a project, that focused on analysis and creation of recommendation in the area of qualification validation for third country citizens. This area of focus is of great importance due to complexity of process necessary to obtain the validation of documents proving a person’s qualification. The analysis was decent and recommendations well formulated, however one of project activities was creation of advisory brochure for migrants in order to help them orientate in legal requirements. **The brochure has been elaborated providing correct and relevant information and in various language mutations, however the text itself has been written using rather difficult law terminology and thus very hard to read by the target group.** As well, case studies presented in the brochure could be elaborated after discussions with migrant themselves to address the real challenges. Overall, the project outputs were very relevant for various authorities of state administration.

## **Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY**

### **IV.1. Technical assistance**

As long as in Slovak Republic the common management and control system for all four funds of the general programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows has been established, the expenses for technical assistance for annual programmes concerned for each fund were entirely merged in accordance with article 14 of Implementing Rules for each fund and a simple and representative apportionment formula for allocation among annual programmes was applied (see tables below). The responsible authority implements TA based on “Technical Assistance Plan” elaborated for the general programme Solidarity and Management of Migration flows for each annual programme.

As of implementation of AP2007-2009 the following measures have been covered by the technical assistance in terms of EIF:

- *expenditure relating to preparation, selection, appraisal, management and monitoring of action e.g. purchase of computing equipment and consumables, preparation and translation of programming documents MAP, AP2007, AP 2008;*
- *expenditure relating to audits and on-the-spot checks of actions or projects; e.g. two monitoring visits per project by the responsible authority*
- *expenditure relating to publicity; e.g., printing of information leaflets and materials,*
- *expenditure relating to information, dissemination and transparency in relation to actions, e.g. publishing 3 calls for proposals in daily newspaper; organisation of two conferences concerning the status quo in implementation*
- *expenditure relating to monitoring visit, informal meetings with other member states and meetings in the framework of implementation of actions e.g. travel expenditures for EIF informal meetings held in Vienna, working meeting with EIF counterpart in Poland, expenditure relating to functioning of the Monitoring Committee for general programme Solidarity and management of Migration Flows;*
- *expenditure relating to salaries including all social contributions in the following cases i.e. expenditure on salaries for special internal employees of Ministry of Interior of SR and Ministry of Finance of SR, carrying out duties exclusively related to implementation of annual programmes – programming, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, financial management, controls and audits, expenditure on external consultants carrying out tasks related to preparation of internal management regulations for responsible, certifying as well as audit authority);*
- *expenditure relating to education of employees, traveling of employees for the purposes of the programme e.g. training in project cycle and project management, training in financial audits, training in changes of legal act concerning financial control and auditing etc.*

*The apportionment formula for TA Plan 2007/ 2008*

Fund	Annual program	Allocation of technical assistance	Share on total budget
TA EBF <sup>[1]</sup>	2007	120 160.35 €	21.27 %
	2008	90 000.00 €	15.94 %
TA EIF	2007	70 698.11 €	12.52 %
	2008	72 137.16 €	12.77 %
TA ERF	2008	125 216.37 €	22.17 %
TA RF	2008	86 598.31 €	15.33 %
<b>Plan 2007/2008</b>		<b>564 810.30 €</b>	<b>100 %</b>

*The apportionment formula for TA Plan 2009*

Fund	Annual program	Allocation of technical assistance	Share on total budget
TA EBF	2009	100 000.00 €	26.96%
TA EIF	2009	72 442.83 €	19.53%
TA ERF	2009	106 175.04 €	28.63%
TA RF	2009	92 291.22 €	24.88%
<b>Plan 2009</b>		<b>370 909.09 €</b>	<b>100 %</b>

<sup>[1]</sup> The amount of technical assistance for annual programme 2007 of the EBF was increased to maximum amount of 7% of total annual amount (plus 30 000 EUR). This increase shall be adjusted with the annual programme by the revision under the article 23(5) of basic act and article 23 of implementing rules for EBF.

## **IV.2. Information and Publicity**

### *- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority*

Publicity is provided in compliance with the Publicity plan for the respective programming years for all funds of the general programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows. The responsible authority provides information to general as well as targeted public through various communication instruments.

The general information, news and upcoming events are presented on the website of the responsible authority [http://www.minv.sk/?solidarita\\_a\\_riadenie\\_migracnych\\_tokov](http://www.minv.sk/?solidarita_a_riadenie_migracnych_tokov), in Foreign Aid News magazine published on monthly basis and recently as well on facebook <http://www.facebook.com/#!/pages/Solidarita-a-riadenie-migracnych-tokov/116913351664362?ref=ts>.

The information addressing the final beneficiaries is disseminated through information meetings at the start of the implementation of projects (3 for AP 2007-2009) and ad hoc meetings such as meetings concerning the submission of request for payments or changes in a handbook on implementation for final beneficiaries.

The information addressing the potential final beneficiaries and wide public has been disseminated through 3 articles in daily newspaper concerning the actual call for proposals and

followed by 3 information meetings. To improve the quality of submitted applications, the responsible authority provided one-day training concerning project preparation in July 2009.

Responsible authority as well organizes **conferences on annual basis** targeted for migrants, representatives of state and public authorities, final beneficiaries and potential final beneficiaries. Up to date two conferences were held. i.e. “*Solidarity in management of migration flows and interim evaluation of results in the Slovak Republic*” in **May 2009** and *Integration of foreigners in the Slovak Republic and financing possibilities within general programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows*” in **May 2010**. The wide public as well as EIF target group is addressed as well through short information on status quo in EIF implementation provided by the responsible authority at various conferences, workshops and meetings as part of project activities of final beneficiaries.

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

Responsibilities of final beneficiaries are as well stipulated in **Publicity plans and respectively reflected in grant agreements**. Provision of information on co-financing from the fund on all purchased equipment, published materials and organised events is obligatory. Grant agreements as well specify for each final beneficiaries specific information and publicity activities within projects. Most common form of publicity is realisation of workshops and conferences held at the end of project implementation and provision of information through web pages and press releases. In this respect final beneficiaries organized 6 conferences within AP 2007 and 2008. Leaflets and brochures are supporting instruments to these activities. Many projects under Priority 1 entail information activities as core activities generally targeted at enhancing the multicultural dialogue, in this respect final beneficiaries organized 48 workshops, information meetings, multicultural events etc. The information and publicity activities are monitored by the responsible authority during implementation of projects.

**Part V: BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF  
FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

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	581 409,11 €	495 907,11€	85,29 %
Programme 2008	601 959,41 €	546 881,14 €	90,85 %
Programme 2009	606 326,16 €	605 781,50 €	99,91 %
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	<b>1 789 694,68 €</b>	<b>1 648 569,75 €</b>	<b>92,12%</b>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Part VI: ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009</b></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 original AP 2007 planned 12 actions to be implemented under all four priorities, in reality seven actions were implemented under all four priorities. This change has been caused by delay in possible start of the actual implementation of the programme (see also part 2 and 3 of this section) and consequent joint call for proposal for both 2007 and 2008 annual programmes. Since originally, AP 2007 and AP 2008 were designed as follow ups, the joint call for proposal required strategic change in programming of actions under both APs and resulted in their revisions (both revision were approved by the Commission). Overall, the target for numbers of projects implemented under particular priorities was met compared to both original and revised versions of both programming documents. The actions that were originally planned under AP 2007 excluded in the revision were in reality implemented under AP 2008, thus all the key themes remained covered by the implementation. The exclusion has been necessary to provide transparency and prevent duplicity of actions between AP 2007 and 2008. The overall commitment is lower than expected as a result of the higher allocation and shorter time for implementation of projects.

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

The significant issue was raised due to the delay in the approval of the programming documents for 2007. The **national budgetary rules of the Slovak Republic** strictly stipulate that costs have to be reimbursed (by EIF in this case) in the very same year they were spent. Due to delays in approval of the programming documents we could not take the risk that costs for publishing a call for proposal might not be reimbursed in the same year. Thus the call for proposal has been published in October 2008 short time after the official approval of the programming documents and was accumulated in allocation for both AP 2007 and 2008. Realisation of first individual projects started in March 2009 providing only 10 months for their implementation. The national project started in January 2009 (significantly later than planned) implementing only the final stage of discussions and analysis before official approval of the conceptual document. With aim to draw funds efficiently, we published second joint call for proposal for actions that in character could be implemented in short –time (mostly cultural and information projects). **The integrated allocation from AP 2007 and**

**2008 and short time for realisation of projects resulted in lower commitment than expected.** Overall, taking into account as well the issue of im/possible revision of APs 2007, several projects lasted only 4-6 months (while 6 months being the original limit for realisation of a project). The technical matters such as height of advance payments and periodicity of payments request has been modified according to actual needs of these short projects.

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

The necessity to revise 2007 annual programme EIF was strictly based on practical issues caused by the delays in approval procedure of the document, national rules and the need to avoid the possible duplicity in financed activities and projects. The similar and mostly identical content of actions planned under 2007 and 2008 programming documents were planned as follow-ups. Due to late approval of the programming documents and national budgetary restrictions described in VI.1.2 the actual time for implementation of actions under both programmes decreased fundamentally and more over, two separate calls for proposals for the two APs would pose a serious risk to duplicity of actions and transparency of their implementation. The responsible authority decided to publish joint call for proposals for both APs whereas it required the adequate revision of these programmes. As described in VI.1.1. the number of implemented actions under AP 2007 was decreased while maintaining **the subject-matter of the actions. This change further required the revision of the division of financial breakdown among the actions planned**, where the financial funds has been moved from action not to be implemented under revision to the rest of the actions. The revision as well reflected the actual commitment of the grant agreements approved based on the results of the two joint calls for proposals.

**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)**

As regards the revision of AP 2007 all planned action were implemented under all four priorities, since the revision has been made after the complete commitment of grant agreements has been available. However, even as regards the original programme, the targets for number of implemented project under each priority were met. Due to the joint call for proposal implementing two annual programmes at once and shorter time frame as expected, the overall commitment has not met 100% but proved to be 83,26%. All projects successfully finished its implementation as planned (no project has been stopped) and no project was marked for significant deviation from its original character and scope.

**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?**

As regards the indicator “number of projects” under particular priorities the targets were met and in case of priority 1 and 2 even exceeded. The overall assessment of individual project indicators will be available only in June 2010. The interim reports however indicate good overall fulfillment since, the target values for indicators such as number of different events, number of trained persons or number of delivered researched out have been already reached. The preliminary final values of indicators summed up for AP 2007 and 2008 are given in VII.2 (effectiveness of the programme).

**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?**

In the overall assessment of AP 2007 (and 2008 as well) implementation of the actions proved to be appropriate with adequate response from the possible applicants and final beneficiaries. The highest demand was marked in Priority 1 and 2 since Priority 1 is focused mostly on delivering the services directly to the target group and Priority 2 on researches that have experienced wide lack in the respective area in the Slovak Republic. AP 2007 (as well as 2008) required revision in allocation and scope of actions due to reasons already explained in the above parts of this section (short time for implementation, need to redesign AP 2007 and 2008 from follow-ups to mutual implementation).

## **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?**

In overall assessment the AP 2008 **has been implemented within the original schedule**. The programme has been revised due to reasons already stated in section VI.1. of this report (delay in approval of APs, joint calls for proposal, short time for implementation), however even the targets of original AP have been mostly met. **The most significant deviation from original expectations emerged under Priority 4, whereas no project has been implemented.** The key reason is short time of implementation, since the respective action was focused on comparative research resulting into pilot solution and 10 months has not been regarded by grant applicants as sufficient. There was no need to change the scope of actions (it was AP 2007 which was modified in this respect to provide transparency and prevent duplicity of actions). The distribution among particular actions needed to be changed and exceeded 10% of EC contribution thus revision had been prepared and approved. All projects finished realisation until December 31<sup>st</sup> 2009.

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

Problems and measures taken and described in section VI.1 apply to AP 2008 respectively. Since in the first joint call for proposal there was no demand for implementation under Priority 4 (reason described in the part 1 of this section), the second joint call for proposals has been opened for actions more suitable in character for short term realisation. For AP 2008 it meant mainly support to information campaigns under Priority 1.

**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?**

The revision has been necessary as explained in section VI.1. of this report. The joint call for proposal required the redistribution of allocation among priorities. All actions remained covered as originally planned; the revision did not concern thematic issues. The projects were realised under Priority 1-3, there was no project under Priority 4 due to reasons described in VI.2. 1.

**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 Priorities 1-3 were fully implemented as planned in the revised AP 2008. The Action under Priority 4 has been opened in the call for proposal, but due to lack of demand it was not implemented. The reason for the lack of demand on the side of the grant applicants was insufficient time (of only 10 months) for realisation of sound comparative research and its application in form of a pilot solution. Since AP 2008 has been simultaneously implemented with AP 2007, the Priority 4 has been covered with one project under action of AP 2007 focused on networking and gathering international experience (dealing with indicators and their use in particular).

**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?**

The overall assessment of individual project indicators will be available only in June 2010. The interim reports however indicate good overall fulfillment under Priority 1-3 since the target values for indicators such as number of courses, number of trained persons or number of delivered researched out have been already reached. The preliminary final values of indicators summed up for AP 2007 and 2008 are given in VII.2 (effectiveness of the

programme).As regards the indicator “number of projects” under particular priorities the targets was fully met for Priority 1-3, for Priority 4 this target has not been met due to reasons explained above. However the Priority 4 has been covered by AP 2007 simultaneously implemented with AP 2008.

**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?**

In the overall assessment of AP 2007 (and 2008 as well) implementation of the actions proved to be appropriate with adequate response from the possible applicants and final beneficiaries. Lack of projects implemented under Priority 4 is the result of causes not to be predicted at the creation of the programme. The implementation under this Priority has remained covered by the revision, since it was opened for the call for proposals. The prolonging of eligible period has not been helpful in this particular case, since the reason was in short implementation time and the decision to prolong the eligibility period was officially approved in July 2009. The overall percentage of commitment is higher compared to 2007 being 89, 6%. The distribution among actions required change due to reasons described mostly in section VI.1. of this report.

**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?**

Up to date of elaboration of this report, it is possible to comment only on status of committed projects, not on experience from implementation since the projects started only in the beginning of 2010 and first payment requests and monitoring visits take place mostly at the end of May 2010. As of comparison of planned actions and actual commitment of grant agreements, all actions shall be implemented as programmed in AP 2009 with total percentual commitment being 99, 9 %. The real eligible costs are expected to be somewhat lower due to ineligible expenditure that might occur. The demand has proved to be a little higher for certain Priorities on the side of grant applicants and since the minimum targets for all actions will be met as regards the “number of projects indicator” it is possible to support all projects successful in the evaluation process. Such support will require revision of the programming document, since the change in distribution exceeds the limit of 10% of EC contribution.

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

Up to date the problems have not been encountered.

**3. Has a revision of the 2009 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what are the main changes?**

The revision will be necessary. The only change shall be made in distribution of allocation among actions, since mostly Priority 2 and 3 encountered higher demands than expected. The allocation will be transferred from uncommitted resources of the Priority 1. The coverage and number of actions shall remain as originally projected.

**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)**

Yes, all actions are expected to be implemented as is proved by the actual status in committed allocation.

**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?**

Regarding the target values set in the particular grant agreements (reflecting the indicators of AP) it is expected that the expected results shall be reached at the end of this programme.

**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 set in AP 2009 were appropriate which is proved by the overall commitment of the allocation. All four priorities will be implemented. The quantitative and qualitative outputs planned in successful projects fulfill the planned values of indicators in AP 2009. The need for revision reflects higher demand in Priority 2 and 3 and is feasible while meeting expected targets as planned in AP 2009.

## **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 in Slovak Republic has been set up as common for all four funds** of the General Programme, where the Ministry of Interior of SR acts as the responsible authority and certifying authority and Ministry of Finance of SR as audit authority. Common MCS has proved to be efficient, since common competent authorities, supported with common system documents such as manuals and plans (e.g. Operation manual, Audit Manual, Manual of the Certifying authority, Technical assistance plan, etc) and possibility to exchange mutual experiences among four funds significantly improved the coordination and smooth functioning of MCS. Certain beaurocratic burden occurred with TA implementation due to the necessity to calculate proportional value of expenditure.

During the two years of its operation the system was influenced by delay in approval of annual programmes 2007 and 2008 and subsequent time stress for implementation of all necessary steps and procedures for these programmes. The calls for proposals in some cases were published for shorter period of time; the projects' implementation could last for 10 months at maximum. Problems were encountered in some aspects of the system, e.g. quality of documentation provided to responsible authority by final beneficiaries, problems in public procurement procedures, especially their length and administrative difficulties. The higher number of smaller projects in cases where more calls for proposals were published created larger administrative burden for the responsible authority and subsequently for other authorities. In order to streamline and simplify the processes and implementation of the programmes responsible authority took several measures, e.g. in assessment and selection of projects, intensive communication with final beneficiaries during the implementation of their projects, pre-financing of the projects, as well as in number and skills of personal capacities of the responsible authority.

### **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**

Changes made to the management and control system stemmed mostly from the particularities of other funds of the General Programme but since the system is set up as common for all four funds they have concerned also the External Borders Fund. Among the changes were:

- incorporation of specialised units of the Ministry of Interior into the system of control and verification of eligibility of expenditure incurred to final beneficiaries of individual projects of European Refugee Fund and European Return Fund, namely the Migration Office of MoI SR and Borders and Aliens Police Office of MoI. This

change was based on experience from the implementation of the European Refugee Fund II with the aim to improve the execution of the operational/technical control of the eligibility of expenditure. The responsibility for the execution of controls and for the approval of the eligibility of expenditure (approval of declarations on verification of expenditure) stays further in the responsibility of the Responsible Authority.

- Changes on composition and rules of procedure of selection committee established by the responsible authority (chairperson of the selection commission will be the Head of Department of Foreign Aid and in case of a deadlock of votes, the vote of the chairperson will be decisive). This change should provide for smother procedure of of selection of the projects. The endorsement of grant agreements stays further in the responsibility of the Permanent State Secretary of the MoI SR.
- Changes in scope of authorities responsible for execution of audit operations where under the responsibility of Audit Authority the Financial Control Administrations will carry out tasks connected with audit on the final beneficiaries' level, according to their regional affiliation. This change should ensure that the AA has enough human resources to perform audits of system and projects at its disposal.

**All these changes have been notified to the Commission in accordance with Implementing Rules of the funds.**

**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 the annual programmes in general has proceeded successfully taking into account the experience from the ERF II programme, as well as Schengen Facility and system of Structural Funds. The contact with assigned desk officer has been well established and proved to be very helpful providing qualified response and commentary during implementation.

The implementation of AP 2007-2008 has proved to be most challenging due to relatively short time for implementation projects. All projects reached their set objectives and fulfilled required target values of indicators.

The responsible authority encountered few problems during the implementation of the annual programmes. Among them were:

- high number of operational objectives set in MAP – objectives were unnecessarily partialized and needed revision
- EC obligation to report and monitor the expenditure according to actions created administrative overload for both responsible authority as well for final beneficiaries with no tangible added value
- problems in low awareness of rights and duties of final beneficiaries
- lack of financial resources of final beneficiaries to co-finance the projects with own funds,
- difficulties with project evaluation since most of the in-field experts participate in implementation and thus are not eligible as evaluators
- insufficient administrative capacities of responsible authority and final beneficiaries.
- insufficient and confusing information from EC as a shared management partner concerning implementation rules.
- Insufficient quality of submitted requests for payment from final beneficiaries

The responsible managed to find solutions to identify problems, namely by means of:

- providing the pre-financing of the projects from the funds of the state budget,
- preparation of manuals and handbooks for final beneficiaries with detailed descriptions of procedures to be followed,
- providing the final beneficiaries with the pre-financing payments and 100 % of eligible expenditure of their projects. The Ministry of Interior of SR has been co-financing each project implemented under the EBF programme, the proportion of the grant being 75% EBF contribution and 25% state budget).
- enforcing the administrative capacities by means of hiring new employees, trainings, preparation of manuals of procedures.

- Meetings and trainings for final beneficiaries, in particular initial monitoring meeting with aim to present implementing rules and practical steps (February 2009), monitoring meetings to the updates of the manual for final beneficiaries (interim meetings) and training for final beneficiaries regarding rules for submission of requests for payments (September 2009)

**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**

Multiannual programme stated that the integration of migrants from third countries has been relatively new topic in public policy agenda in the Slovak Republic with absenting strategic guideline on national level and scarce sources of analytical data. In this respect, **EIF proved to be very significant instrument for establishing institutional framework and measures to be taken.** Implementation of all four priorities under EIF has proved to be very relevant to address the actual needs of migrants in their integration efforts and as well of different national and regional authorities intervening in the process. Thanks to the expertise and access of NGO sector to migrant communities the synergic effect has become evident. More particularly, experience gathered from delivering the services to the target group under Priority 1 and knowledge earned from analysis and researches under Priority 2 has been transferred to relevant actors such as regional employment offices, regional self-governments etc. under activities of Priority 3. Actions under Priority 4 are supporting for other actions and are very relevant for continuous improvement of solutions. During implementation of AP 2007 -2008 there hasn't been an evolution that would require change of focus only to one or two priorities; the strategic implementation of all priorities remains valid and is planned for future implementation.

\* Effectiveness of the programme

The key results of 2007 and 2008 implementation vary according to priorities. Output with remarkable significance for further actions has been the **National concept on Integration of migrants in the Slovak Republic** (national project) approved by the government in May 2009. Further Priority 1 projects provided face-to-face consultancy for 578 migrants and 48 cultural-and information events enhancing the multicultural dialogue what exceeded the planned values. The requirement for flexibility while delivering the services as defined in MAP has been fulfilled thanks to establishing several online consultancy points (increasing the value of provided consultancy since online consulting that is not added in the given amounts). Improvement of language and labour skills defined as one of key objectives in MAP has been reached through 33 individual courses (language and requalification) meeting specific needs of the target group such as studying materials and time-space availability.

Priority 2 and 4 fulfilled the objectives as planned elaborating several sound analysis and researches with recommendations disseminated to relevant actors for further use. Priority 3 improved the overall capacity of various state, public and regional authorities by providing trainings for 96 people, which is fulfilling the target values set in projects and APs. Overall, EIF provided common platform for creation of integration policy in the Slovak Republic with high participation of NGOs which were given the opportunity to enhance real - life integration and notify competent authorities on existing issues.

#### \* Efficiency of the programme

Efficiency of projects is one of mostly monitored and evaluated aspect of implementation. EIF legal conditions coming from implementing rules are rather strict, however the Slovak national law is even stricter concerning the purchase of goods and services. Both EC and Slovak legal rules are fully implemented into grant agreements with final beneficiaries, thus the efficiency of the programme is ensured. Cost – benefit value is one of the selection criteria and is evaluated through two stages of the evaluation and selection process and monitored and thoroughly checked during project implementation.

The costs-effectiveness of management and control of the fund was greatly enhanced by creating the common management and control system for all four funds whereby many processes could have been unified and reduced. The amounts planned for technical assistance in first two annual programmes as been sufficient only after all allocations for all four funds for respective annual programmes have been merged and the expenditures have been allocated proportionately to all annual programmes. The cost of the management of EIF represents particular part of the cost of Technical assistance as described in part IV.1. The total allocation for an annual programme can not be the only criteria for evaluation of height of management costs. Fund management requires also activities (e.g. administrative work, publicity) which have to be done independently of the number or amount of implemented projects.

#### \* Complementarity

The Complementarity with ERF has been ensured through common management and control system established for all four funds of the general programme Solidarity and Management of Migrant Flows. Due to relatively small NGO sector in the migration area, several final beneficiaries implement projects both under EIF and ERF, thus it was necessary to establish instruments that enhanced the control of complementarity, of staff costs in particular. Complementarity with other instruments available for funding projects with possible similar character, such as ESF or OSF, is regularly checked with every call for proposals, in particular the direct requirement for compliance control is sent to each relevant institution as part of administrative check of grant applications. Since the EIF target group is highly specific, up to date no institution has reported duplicity in actions. One project faced technical difficulties in distinguishing target group of two different projects (EIF/OSF) while providing legal counselling to unaccompanied under aged children, however the issue has been identified in time and cleared out with no duplicity.

#### \* Added value

**EIF proved to be very significant instrument for establishing institutional framework and measures to be taken in the Slovak republic** as there has not been established any

complex system of instruments and processes focused on integration of third country citizens with legal stay (excluding persons granted asylum or supplementary protection) besides those instruments implemented through EIF. The existing processes and instruments deal mostly with integration into labour market in terms of conditions to be fulfilled in order to obtain residence and work permit. Moreover, creating a strategic framework with acknowledging the integration as mutual two-way process has been as well great added value to status quo.

Implementation of projects has brought further aspect of added value in terms of active participation of migrants themselves. The persons with best access to migrant communities are “former” migrants who managed to gain Slovak citizenship and usually these are the people most willing to support communities by direct actions. NGO implementing EIF projects managed to create rather good network with these migrants and through EIF project enhance the active participations of migrant communities. As a result, the increase in tendency of “migrant “ NGOs to attempt to apply for EIF grant has become evident when comparing the background of applicants of AP 2007-2009. The tendency is important with regard to the fact, that self-identification with the integration process is crucial to its success.

### **VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement**

The programming exercise based on annual programmes is administratively more challenging and not providing enough space for adaptation of possible actions to actual needs or for more flexible approach to existing or emerging impediments from the policy (objectives) as well as financial point of view. We therefore suggest replacing the current system of multi annual programmes and annual programmes with one multi-annual program for the whole period, based e.g. on system of the structural funds. The advantage would be increased efficiency and effectiveness as well as reduction of the administrative workload.

The possibility to reallocate resources among annual programmes would solve most of the issues of late approvals of annual programmes.

Further more the obligation to revise a programming document when change in distribution exceeds 10% of EC allocation constitutes rather constraining formal act when there is no other change (i.e. no change in number, scope, character and planned outcome of actions). It is not possible to complete the revision before the actual change is needed since it occurs only at the close of calls for proposals. It would be very helpful, if the case of redistribution among priorities with no other impact could be excluded from 10% limit.

**\* 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 administrative requirements for the progress report are too complex and time consuming. The administrative workload could be reduced by increasing of the first pre-financing payment. This would allow Member States allocate greater resources at the initiation of projects thus increasing overall efficiency and the capacity of projects to achieve their programmed objectives and programmed spending.

The administrative operating expense for the management and control of the fund is extensive and the administrative burden on the member states is still increasing without any prospect of its decrease in the following years. However the amounts allocated for Technical Assistance is planned to decrease. Therefore we assume that should be maintained at 7% level.

A simplification and concise interpretation of the eligibility rules in line with the European Social Fund, or, for example previous ERF programmes would be also of a great help.

The revision of EIF target group would be very helpful due to several reasons. The implementation experience proved it rather impractical to divide persons granted asylum from the rest of persons provided with legal stay permit. People granted asylum have the same integration needs and face basically the same issues as the target group of EIF. As formulated by final beneficiaries, it would be more efficient and effective mainly when providing counselling and training to have these people in one target group instead of applying for two projects for the same services under EIF and ERF.

Furthermore, since integration is two way process as acknowledged in the EIF basic act, it incorporates the Slovak citizens. As mentioned earlier, former migrants are great help to the process, however there are not “eligible” as direct group. It would be of great help if implementation rules or according manual could clarify more openly evaluation and tracking of the target group in projects that have to inevitably include persons outside from the target group defined in the basic act. The clarification would prevent unnecessary issues during audits.

**\* 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?**

Reduction of time devoted to approval of the annual programme and possibility to have the programme approval decision already in March as stated in basic decision would help Member States to use the whole period of eligibility of expenditure for implementation of projects.

The interpretation of eligibility rules through manual of the Commission in some aspects brought more uncertainty and doubts than before is difficult to follow and implement in practice, e.g. strict interpretation of “operating grants”. In this context it should be possible for public organizations or NGOs to claim indirect costs even if they benefit from operating grants partly covering indirect costs. Instead, a mechanism preventing double financing could be established at member states level. Moreover the situation is more complicated in case of public authorities that are only beneficiaries for projects to be implemented under the “executing body” method. They are not allowed to claim indirect costs even though the eligibility rules for the fund provides for indirect costs in the executing body method

*End of the report*