

**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)

...SPAIN.....

Date:

...June 30th, 2010.....

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

Amapola Blasco Marhuenda, Deputy General Director for Social Intervention

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

Pilar Ortiz de la Vega, Jefa de Área

Subdirección General de Intervención Social
Dirección General de Integración de los Inmigrantes
C/ José Abascal, 39, 2ª planta, despacho 202 - 28071 MADRID
Teléfono 91 363 17 10
portizdelav@mtin.es

GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON EVALUATION EXPERTISE AND ON METHODOLOGY

1. Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?

Yes/ No: No

- If *Yes*, for what part(s) of this report?

- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:

* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.): (please describe)

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

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

Important remark

Any evaluation expertise must be obliged by the Responsible Authority to:

- use this template, exclusively;
- fully comply with any instruction, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out in this template.

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

Did you implement any of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “awarding body” method (as defined in Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC of 5.3.2008 - the European Integration Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programme(s)?

Yes/No: Yes

- If *Yes*, fill in Part I, pages 8 to 13.

- If *No*, do not fill in Part I, but go directly to Part II (Implementation of the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method) on page 14.

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

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

- Programme 2007: 89,59 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “awarding body” method
- Programme 2008: 90,68 % (estimation, since Programme 2008 is still undergoing operations of verification)
- Programme 2009: 87,97 % (estimated, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented)

I.2 - Calls for proposals

For each annual programme from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual EIF programmes in the “awarding body” method.

- Programme 2007: 2 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: 2 (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2009: 2 (number of calls for proposals)

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	437 ⁽¹⁾	331 ^(*)	258 ⁽³⁾	1026 ⁽³⁾
Projects selected	126	233 ⁽²⁾	115 ⁽³⁾	474 ⁽³⁾
Projects funded	126	233 ⁽²⁾	115 ⁽³⁾	474 ⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ Since it was not possible to launch an specific call for proposals for the EIF in 2007, this is the total amount of proposals received for our national calls for proposals.

^(*) see note ⁽²⁾

⁽²⁾ Part of this total (113) refers to the projects selected after a call for proposals specific for the EIF, which was launched for local entities in 2009. The rest (120) is the number of projects selected under the general call for proposals in 2008, when it had also been impossible to launch an specific call for proposals for the EIF. Presumably not all these 120 projects will be finally co-financed by the EIF.

⁽³⁾ In these figures, data on the call for proposals which is about to be launched at the time of writing this report is not yet available; Programme 2009's figures are, therefore, partial (they only refer to one call for proposals which has already be launched).

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

Yes/No: ...Yes....

- If *No*, explain why:

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

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

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

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

Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	19	4	0	23

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)	126	233	115 ⁽¹⁾	474 ⁽¹⁾
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table I.4)	19	4	0	23
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾	497 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ In these figures, data on the call for proposals which is about to be launched at the time of writing this report is not yet available; Programme 2009’s figures are, therefore, partial (they only refer to one call for proposals which has already be launched).

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

By Priority

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾
Priority 2	0	0	<i>now implementing</i>
Priority 3	0	0	<i>now implementing</i>
Priority 4	0	0	<i>now implementing</i>

⁽¹⁾ In these figures, data on the call for proposals which is about to be launched at the time of writing this report is not yet available; Programme 2009's figures are, therefore, partial (they only refer to one call for proposals which has already be launched).

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

By Category of Actions

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method →	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions			
Category a)	-	-	-
Category b)	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾
Category c)	-	-	-
Category d)	-	-	-

⁽¹⁾ In these figures, data on the call for proposals which is about to be launched at the time of writing this report is not yet available; Programme 2009’s figures are, therefore, partial (they only refer to one call for proposals which has already be launched).

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

Specific Priorities

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method→	145	237	115 ⁽¹⁾
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only	1	-	<i>now implementing</i>
Specific Priority 2 only	38	77	115 ⁽²⁾
Specific Priority 3 only	36	13	<i>now implementing</i>
Specific Priority 4 only	2	-	<i>now implementing</i>
Specific Priority 5 only	1	-	<i>now implementing</i>
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	67	147	<i>now implementing</i>
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	-	-	<i>now implementing</i>

- (1) *In these figures, data on the call for proposals which is about to be launched at the time of writing this report is not yet available; Programme 2009’s figures are, therefore, partial (they only refer to one call for proposals which has already be launched).*
- (2) *These 115 projects are meant to belong to Specific Priority 2. At this stage it is not possible to confirm whether any of these may also belong to any other Specific Priority and should, therefore, be listed under the row “Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities”.*

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

Yes/No:YES.

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

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

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

- Programme 2007: 10,41 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 9,32 % (estimation, since Programme 2008 is still undergoing operations of verification)
- Programme 2009: 12,03 % (estimated, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented)

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

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

- Programme 2007: 3 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 3 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 3 (maybe 2 more, up to a total of 5. These are provisional data, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented)
(number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009
Proposals received	7	14	Now implementing	21 ⁽¹⁾
Projects selected	3	3	3 + probably more (now implementing)	9 ⁽¹⁾
Projects funded	3	3	3 + probably more (now implementing)	9 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These total figures are partial, since it is not possible to include data on Programme 2009, which is now being implemented.

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

Yes/No: ... YES....

- If No, explain why:

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

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

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

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	21	1	2 + probably more (now implementing)	24 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These total figures are incomplete, since it is not possible to consider data on Programme 2009, which is now being implemented.

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)	3	3	3 + probably more (now implementing)	9 ⁽¹⁾
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	21	1	2 + probably more (now implementing)	24 ⁽¹⁾
TOTAL number of projects funded in the “executing body” method	24	4	5 + probably more (now implementing)	33 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These total figures are partial, since it is not possible to include data on Programme 2009, which is now being implemented.

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

By Priority

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →	24	4	5 ⁽¹⁾ + probably more (now implementing)
<u>Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...</u>			
Priority 1	0	0	1 ⁽¹⁾
Priority 2	3	4	2 ⁽¹⁾
Priority 3	21	0	1 ⁽¹⁾
Priority 4	0	0	1 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These figures are not final, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented.

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

By Category of Actions

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →	24	4	5 ⁽¹⁾ + probably more (now implementing)
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions			
...			
Category a)	0	0	1 ⁽¹⁾
Category b)	0	0	0 ⁽¹⁾
Category c)	11	4	3 ⁽¹⁾
Category d)	13	0	1 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These figures are not final, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented.

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

Specific Priorities

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method→	24	4	5 ⁽¹⁾ + probably more (now implementing)
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	-	-	1 ⁽¹⁾
Specific Priority 5 only	-	-	-
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities	-	-	-
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	24	4	4 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These figures are not final, since Programme 2009 is now being implemented.

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

Explanations for this part:

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

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

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

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

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

(Explanations continue on the next page)

It is not required to make a full description of all projects. What is needed is a concise, but very concrete description of the types of operations implemented under each Priority. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. A list of projects is not an adequate description.

Technical assistance measures and publicity measures are covered by another part of the template and should not be described here.

Finally, you will be asked to describe two “success stories” and one “failure”, among all projects funded from 2007 to 2009.

For each item the maximum length is mentioned below the item’s description.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

Many of the (approximately) 500 projects are focused on introductory activities, aimed to the following: a basic knowledge of the language and socio-economic and cultural characteristics of the host society, elimination of illiteracy, qualification for access to work, new technologies, etc.

They also pay comprehensive attention to immigrants: legal and social guidance, health, access to resources, access to labour market, education, housing, encouraging participation, maintaining their own languages and cultures while learning about the host society’s...

Some of the projects are addressed to collectives with specific needs, such as women, children and young people and newly arrived. These include temporary lodging for women with children, intervention and prevention of gender-based violence and sexual exploitation, preventive health programmes (sexual and reproductive rights, vaccination), educational support, encouraging women’s participation in all public spheres, etc.

They also promote intercultural dialogue, gender equality, and inter-relation between immigrants and host society.

These activities are developed at different levels (individual, group and community), and encouraging networking with other social agents. In some of them, intercultural

mediation, translators and information in different languages have been available. Innovative aspects have been considered.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

All the actions under Priority 1 have been implemented in the “awarding body” method.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

All the actions under Priority 2 have been implemented in the “executing body” method.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

1. The following action is included under this epigraph: *Development and implementation of a common application procedure related to the admission of foreigners*. This action, which is yet being implemented, has been included in the annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as it is considered that the development and implementation of an IT application (INDRA) would help making faster and easier the orientation of the management of admission procedures carried out by any competent administrative body.

Through this procedure, and in any given place or time, the interested third-country national can direct his/her request to a competent administrative body in the admission of foreigners, including diplomatic missions or consular offices in the exterior, and have access to the information regarding his/her application and the state of the procedures. (The information request can be done personally, or through the information technologies that allow the correct identification of the person).

2. Starting from a pre-existing situation of mutual ignorance over the existing resources and in order to promote coordination, complementarity and synergy of actions, the RA launched public calls of tenders to develop a computer application (SIRIA), which allows measuring and analyzing the results obtained in the reception services and integration on a national level, in order to improve the immigrant reception system in Spain, making it faster and more efficient.

Through this Quality Plan, the existing resources are being mapped and the records and intervention protocols are being homogenised, using this system of information collection on the existing tools and services on the entire national territory. It permits measuring and checking that the standards of quality on reception services have been complied with.

Also through public calls of tenders, another action under this paragraph has consisted in the creation and development of a computerised management and monitoring system for the programmes co-financed by the EIF, through which the final beneficiaries introduce information on the programmes and activities they implement, in a common data base. The progress reports are also available for the beneficiaries and can be used to evaluate the integration policies and instruments, and also facilitate the exchange of information.

Another action under Priority 2, “monitoring and continuous assessment of integration policies”, began to be developed from the annual programme 2008 on, although it had also been stipulated for the annual programme 2007. Finally the RA signed a collaboration agreement with the AEVAL (State Agency for the Evaluation of the Public Policies and Quality of Services) for this purpose.

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

There has not been any action in the “awarding body” method under Priority 3.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

1. In 2007 and 2008 (annual plan 2007), courses were held inside the action “Training of the agents that take part in the process of integration”. These courses, about Spanish legislation on immigration and its management and procedures, were conducted by civil servants and reached 80 professionals working in the public administration (71,25% women and 28,75% men), with a total of 124 hours of training in:
 - Regulation of the Organic Law 4/2000 on rights and freedoms of the foreigners in Spain and their social integration
 - Spanish regulatory framework on immigration. Procedures
 - Regulatory update. Procedures of the Unit of Large Businesses: system of quotas of non-EU workers
 - Spanish regulatory framework on immigration and its management. Worker relocation within the European Union.

Since the annual programme 2009, which is now being implemented, foresees the extension of the training of agents to other social agents and to other subjects such as evaluation, gender perspective, programming, etc., the RA is considering the possibility of launching calls for expression of interest to conduct these courses.

2. In these years, thirteen 3-days seminars have been held for coordination and exchange of experiences and best practices between local organisations from all over the State. These seminars were organised by the Sub-Department of Institutional Relations (Department of Integration of Immigrants).

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

In the “awarding body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

There has not been any action in the “awarding body” method under Priority 4.

In the “executing body” method

Maximum length: 15 lines

There is only one action under Priority 4, in the annual programme 2009, which has not yet been carried out. This action consists in organising forums and international meetings with city councils, non lucrative organisations and other public and private local organisations, in order to exchange experiences and information on best practices.

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

These 23 projects were carried out through agreements and nominative and direct subventions with different organisations for the implementation of introductory programmes. Agreements were signed with the Junta de Andalucía (Regional Executive of Andalusia), the Spanish Youth Council, Organisation of Ibero-American States, the Society of Lawyers and the nominative and direct subventions with the following NGO: Red Cross, ACCEM, CEAR, CEPAIM and LA CALLE.

These organisations developed, through these agreements, innovating introductory programmes, programmes for an integral reception, and introductory programmes about the host society for groups with specific needs.

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

Maximum length: 15 lines

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

1. In 2007 and 2008 (annual plan 2007), courses were held inside the action “Training of the agents that take part in the process of integration”. These courses, about Spanish legislation on immigration and its management and procedures, were conducted by civil servants and reached 80 professionals working in the public

administration (71,25% women and 28,75% men), with a total of 124 hours of training in:

- Regulation of the Organic Law 4/2000 on rights and freedoms of the foreigners in Spain and their social integration
- Spanish regulatory framework on immigration. Procedures
- Regulatory update. Procedures of the Unit of Large Businesses: system of quotas of non-EU workers
- Spanish regulatory framework on immigration and its management. Workers relocation within the European Union.

Since the annual programme 2009, which is now being implemented, foresees the extension of the training of agents to other social agents and to other subjects such as evaluation, gender perspective, programming, etc., the RA is considering the possibility of launching calls for expression of interest to conduct these courses.

2. In these years, thirteen 3-days seminars have been held for coordination and exchange of experiences and best practices between local organisations from all over the State. These seminars were organised by the Sub-Department of Institutional Relations (Department of Integration of Immigrants).
3. Corresponding to annual programme 2008 and 2009, the RA signed an agreement with the AEVAL (State Agency for the Evaluation of the Public Policies and Quality of Services) in order to implement the action “monitoring and continuous assessment of integration policies”, since it is the scope of this Agency to evaluate public policies in Spain.

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

Maximum length: half a page

There have not been relevant changes to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method.

All of them belong to Priority 1 and to category of actions “b”, and mainly to Specific Priorities 2 or 3, as it was stipulated in the annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009.

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

Maximum length: half a page

There is a change in relation to the annual programme 2007, under Priority 2, in actions conducted in the "executing body" method.

Due to the delay in approving the Annual Programme 2007 and, therefore, the reduction of time for implementing the actions, it was not possible to perform action 5, belonging to Priority 2 and Category C, called *Design of a Model for Evaluation of Introductory Programmes and Policy Integration*.

This action is included and implemented in the Annual Programme 2008 for the above-mentioned reasons.

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

Maximum length: half a page

In the “awarding body” method

There have not been significant changes to the projects funded in the “awarding body”.

In the “executing body” method

There have not been significant changes to the projects 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

1. Programme of Social Intervention with Young People (*Programa de Intervención Social con Menores y Jóvenes*).

Entity: Council of Alcorcón (Madrid) / Ayuntamiento de Alcorcón (Madrid).

Priority: P1

Specific priority: SP1, SP2 and SP3

Project aimed to work with groups with specific necessities through the following activities:

- Creation of networks and meeting spaces, especially for children and teenagers, immigrants and non-immigrants, with the aim of consolidate the coexistence.
- Activities related to gender and sexual and reproductive rights for teenager women.
- Improvement and good use of public spaces aimed to the general population.

This project had good qualitative and quantitative results, regarding that the knowledge of the project by the group of children and teenagers from the target population was quite ample: 600 children and teenagers were beneficiaries of the project. On the other hand, the positive impact of the project had also a positive influence in the collaboration of the working team with different agents and municipal institutions.

2. Promotion of Language and Culture Learning, as much as the Acceptance as the Origin, in Wafae Centers. (*Fomento del Aprendizaje de la Lengua y Cultura tanto de Acogida como de Origen en los Centros Wafae*).

Entity: Wafae Elche / Hospitalet de Llobregat.

Priority: P1

Specific priority: SP1 and SP 4

This project aimed to work the integration and the intercultural dialogue through the following activities:

- Spanish language classes; literacy training; arabic culture and language classes; intercultural activities; commemorative activities.

670 people have been direct beneficiaries of the project and 80% of the participants have successfully participated in the activities, acquiring new knowledge about different cultures.

The number of beneficiaries of the project exceeded the expectations. On the other hand, 90% of the users appreciated the methodology, human resources and infrastructure as very positive and considered that the project had promoted coexistence and tolerance.

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

Programme for Social and Cultural Inclusion in the Local Environment of the Immigrant Population, Empowering the Citizen Coexistence (*Programa para la*

Inclusión Social y Cultural en el Entorno Local de la Población Inmigrante, Potenciando la Convivencia Ciudadana).

Entity: Council of Santomera (Murcia) / Ayuntamiento de Santomera (Murcia).

Priority: P1

Specific priority: SP3 and SP4

This project aimed to work integration through the following activities:

- Creation and development of an education center.
- Intercultural activities and meetings: intercultural mediation services; family and health mediation; creation of common spaces; market, sport days, cooperative games.

This local entity did not develop some of the activities proposed in the project, returning the grant budget because of its difficulties in implementing the project.

Part IV: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

IV.1. Technical assistance

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

The actions implemented under the Technical Assistance measure over the 2007-2009 programming period were oriented basically to assure a technical assistance and to complement the human resources for the management of the European Fund for the Integration programme.

Specifically, the main duties for the technical assistance were focused on giving support to the project coordinators and the programme managers and day to day tasks, both made by the beneficiary organizations and the Responsible Authority elaboration of reports: collaboration in the elaboration of the Multi-Annual Plan and Annual Plans of EIF 2007, 2008 and 2009; revision of economic justification of the implemented projects, EIF 2007 and 2008; revision of EIF co-financed programs, analysis of the made activities; monitoring of co-financed activities, EIF 2007 and 2008; intermediate reports, EIF 2007; report on the programmes implemented by local entities, EIF 2007 and 2008; organization of a community Funds meeting aimed to NGO's, local entities and general public; technical assistance recently recruited to support the SOLID Funds work plan.

IV.2. Information and Publicity

Please provide a concrete description of the information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EIF Implementing Rules) implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Describe separately the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority and those by the final beneficiaries.

As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the annual information activity which you have organised to present, as of 2008, the launch of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2) a) of the EIF Implementing Rules.

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

Information has been published on the web site of the Ministry of Labour and Immigration, concerning the Multi-Annual Plan 2007-2013 and the Annual Plans 2007, 2008 and 2009:

[http://www.mtin.es/es/sec_emi/IntegraInmigrantes/Fondo_Solidaridad/FONDO INTEGRACION/index.htm](http://www.mtin.es/es/sec_emi/IntegraInmigrantes/Fondo_Solidaridad/FONDO_INTEGRACION/index.htm)

Regarding calls for proposals related to this Fund, three out of six have been made without publicity of the EIF, due to their later imputation to an EIF programme. On the web page of the Ministry there is a section to make public the most recent calls for proposals, as well as the list of beneficiaries organizations.

The public contracts done have included publicity of the EC co-financing according to the rules, with exception of the year 2007, also due to their later imputation to programme EIF.

The following activities haven been done with the aim to offer more transparency, to spread the type of eligible activities and to guarantee equal opportunities to the access to programmes cofinanced by EIF:

- informative sessions aimed to potential beneficiaries of the EIF.
- an informative act with the main target to give information to the potential beneficiaries, people interested and public in general, as well as to share experiences with the cofinancing of the Funds, specially EIF.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Beneficiary organizations were informed, after charging the projects to the different annual plans from EIF, of the obligation of giving publicity to the Fund, informing the public as well as its employees, and also the participants in the projects, on the EIF co-financing of the project and the obligation to include in all documents information on the co-financing of the aforementioned projects (in agreement with the application rules: 435/2007/EC Decision).

Beneficiary organizations have given publicity to the Fund by including the logo of EIF, according to article 34 of the application rules, previously mentioned:

- in all their activities,
- in all the elaborated materials: leaflets, guides, booklets, reports, documents, web pages, etc.

**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:

	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the annual programme	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as of 30 June 2010	EIF budget implementation rate (EIF Committed/ EIF Available)
Annual Programme	Amount (1)	Amount (2)	Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	8.555.657	8.555.567	100%
Programme 2008	11.392.323,57	11.392.323,57	100%
Programme 2009	14.764.541,68	7.047.810,33	48%
TOTAL 2007-2009	34.712.522,25	26.995.791	78%

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

Based on:

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

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

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

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

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

Annual programme 2007 should have been started being implemented in 2007 but, since it was approved in late 2008, this delay made it impossible to implement it in line with the programme schedule (please, note that in the 2007 programme there was no schedule for the activities; we mean the schedule of the whole annual programme). Once the programme with its modifications was approved, the deadlines were complied in the implementation of this annual programme.

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

Yes, actually we have encountered many problems:

- The main problem was the delay of the approval of the 2007 annual programme by the European Commission (in late 2008) and the delay in receiving the first pre-financing payments from the EIF funding (in november 2008).
- As a consequence, in annual programme 2007 it was not possible to launch any call for proposals for EIF, with its specific requirements. The measure accorded with the EC was to attribute to the EIF the activities being implemented or already implemented in our country, falling within the aims of the EIF.

- As a result of this, the beneficiary entities encountered considerable difficulties in the implementation of the eligibility rules provided by the EU, which they had to apply afterwards.
- In addition to this, trying to conjugate both Community and national rules on eligibility has proved to be considerably difficult for both the RA and the beneficiaries.
- In order to solve this problem, the RA wrote a manual to facilitate management, combining both regulations. The RA also organised seminars and provided technical assistance to the beneficiaries bodies. However, this effort succeeded only partially, since in many cases the RA could not find any satisfactory solution to the problems presented by these entities. In view of this, the RA has recently proposed to the SOLID Committee that it is the Responsible Authority of each Member State the one to define the eligibility rules, as it is in the Structural Funds.
- This also made it impossible to implement the annual programmes according to the rule N+1'5 (although for annual programme 2007 the EC extended it up to N+2).
- The Responsible Authority (RA) has found difficulties in meeting the deadlines for submitting the final reports, specially considering that the Audit Authority includes its audit works concerning the Funds in its Annual Audit Plan, and its schedule do not fit with the deadlines that the Responsible Authority has to submit its Final Reports to the European Commission.
- The RA and the entities also find in their daily work that the restrictive definition of the target groups excludes, for the sake of its documentary situation, destinataries of the actions such as children, women victims of gender violence or in situation of exploitation or trafficking, or other people who are in conditions of obtaining their residence permits, or those third-countries originals who have attained a Community residence card, for example by means of family reagrupation. The RA has proposed the revision of this aspect by the SOLID Committee in several occasions.

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

Yes.

The main modifications were:

- To suppress action 1: "Actions to promote participation among immigrants". Since the Responsible Authority did not have time to open a call for proposals for those actions, it was decided not to include any activity related to this action in this annual programme.
- In action 2 (then action 1): "Introductory programmes", the following activities were included: information, legal orientation, integration in the labour market, etc.
- Under "Technical Assistance" expenses of the Certification Authority were included.
- The Financial Plan was modified accordingly.

- 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)**

Once revised the 2007 annual programme and approved by the European Commission, we have implemented most of the actions contained in it.

Due to the delay in approving the Annual Programme 2007 and the subsequent reduction of time for implementing the actions, it was not possible to perform action 5 (*Design of a Model for Evaluation of Introductory Programmes and Policy Integration*) -Priority 2, Category c-.

This action is included and implemented in the Annual Programme 2008 for the reasons above mentioned.

Still remains the realization of an evaluation.

- 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?**

Although the evaluation indicators were first developed in the 2009 annual programme, the AR considers that the results for 2007 have been achieved since, in total, there were 145 projects funded.

- 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, we consider that the final distribution of the EIF funding between the actions was appropriate after the revision, in which part of the budget for actions under Priorities 2 and 3 was transferred to actions under Priority 1, and the budget for former action 1, "Actions to promote participation among immigrants", was also distributed among other actions under Priority 1, since the A.R. did not have time to open a call for proposals for this action.

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?

Since annual programme 2008, which should have been started being implemented in early 2008, was approved in late 2008, this delay made it impossible to implement it in line with the programme schedule (please, note that in the 2008 programme there was no schedule for the activities; we mean the schedule of the whole annual programme). Once the revised programme was approved, the deadlines were complied in the implementation of this annual programme.

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

Yes, actually we have encountered many problems:

- The main problem was the delay of the approval of the 2008 annual programme by the European Commission (in late 2008) and the delay in receiving the first pre-financings from the EIF funding. As a consequence, in 2008 it was not possible to launch any call for proposals for EIF, with its specific requirements. In 2009 only one call for proposals specific for the EIF was launched for local entities, and it was included in the 2008 annual programme. The measure accorded with the EC was to attribute to the EIF the activities being implemented or already implemented in our country, falling within the aims of the EIF; that included the projects selected under our national general call for proposals in 2008.
- As a result of this, the beneficiary entities encountered considerable difficulties in the implementation of the eligibility rules provided by the EU, which they had to apply afterwards.
- In addition to this, trying to conjugate both Community and national rules on eligibility has proved to be considerably difficult for both the RA and the beneficiaries.
- In order to solve this problem, the RA wrote a manual to facilitate management, combining both regulations. The RA also organised seminars and provided technical assistance to the beneficiaries bodies. However, this effort succeeded only partially, since in many cases the RA could not find any satisfactory solution to the problems presented by these entities. In view of this, the RA has recently proposed to the SOLID Committee that it is the Responsible Authority of each Member State the one to define the eligibility rules, as it is in the Structural Funds.
- The delay of the approval of the 2008 annual programme, as in 2007, made it impossible to implement the annual programmes according to the rule N+1'5.
- The Responsible Authority (RA) has found difficulties in meeting the deadlines for submitting the final reports, specially considering that the Audit Authority includes its audit works concerning the Funds in its Annual Audit Plan, and its schedule do not fit with the deadlines that the Responsible Authority has to submit its Final Reports to the European Commission.

- The RA and the entities also find in their daily work that the restrictive definition of the target groups excludes, for the sake of its documentary situation, destinataires of the actions such as children, women victims of gender violence or in situation of exploitation or trafficking, or other people who are in conditions of obtaining their residence permits, or those third-countries originals who have attained a Community residence card, for example by means of family reagrupation. The RA has proposed the revision of this aspect by the SOLID Committee in several occasions.

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.

In the context of economic crisis and a high amount of immigrants still in process of integration, for whom the unemployment rate is becoming higher, the following modifications were proposed by the Responsible Authority and approved by the Commission:

To reinforce the activities under Priority 1 ("Measures to put into practice the common basic principles for immigrant integration"), specifically Action 2: "Innovating introductory programmes", with 886.390,22 € and Action 3: "Introductory programmes for groups with specific necessities", with 275.795,24 €

The amounts added to these two actions were reduced from the budget addressed to Priorities 2 and 3, in which the Responsible Authority acted as Executing Body, in order to reinforce the participation and execution capacity of stakeholders, mainly those working on the field, aiming to increase direct intervention actions, which could have a higher impact on immigrant population as final beneficiary of EIF co-financed activities.

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)

Once revised the 2008 annual programme and approved by the European Commission, we implemented all the actions included in it.

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?

Although the evaluation indicators were first developed in the 2009 annual programme, the AR considers that the results for 2008 will be achieved since, in total, there will be around 230 projects funded by the EIF.

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?

Yes, we consider that the final distribution of the EIF funding between the actions was appropriate after the revision, in which actions 2 and 3 under Priority 1 were reinforced, transferring part of the budget originally assigned to Priorities 2 and 3, in order to reinforce the participation and execution capacity of stakeholders, mainly those working on the field, aiming to increase direct intervention actions, which could have a higher impact on immigrant population as final beneficiary of EIF co-financed activities.

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 annual programme for 2009 is now being implemented and, therefore, we have to wait at the end of its closure to assess the overall implementation of the programme. However, we expect to implement it as originally planned.

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

As explained in the preceding section, the 2009 annual programme is being implemented today. However, we found similar problems to previous years:

- The delay that has affected the previous annual programmes 2007 and 2008 has been accumulated to the start-up of the activities corresponding to the 2009 annual programme. The delayed launching of calls for proposals to implement the actions of these annual programmes has got into 2009: one of the calls for proposals launched in 2009 (the one for local authorities), actually corresponds to the 2008 annual programme; therefore, the call for proposals for local authorities to implement actions

under the 2009 annual programme will be launched in 2010, with the subsequent reduction of the period to implement these projects. In order to solve this problem, the RA made a proposal: that the period of eligibility could be N+2 for the 2008 and following annual programmes, which was rejected by the Commission.

- It was not possible to comply with the implementation of the N+1'5 rule proposed by the European Commission. As in 2007 and 2008, the above mentioned influenced in the impossibility of the fulfillment for that period.
- The beneficiary entities encountered considerable difficulties in the implementation of the eligibility rules provided by the EU.
- In addition to this, trying to conjugate both Community and national rules on eligibility has proved to be considerably difficult for both the RA and the beneficiaries.
- In order to solve this problem, the RA wrote a manual to facilitate management, combining both regulations. The RA also organised seminars and provided technical assistance to the beneficiaries bodies. However, this effort succeeded only partially, since in many cases the RA could not find any satisfactory solution to the problems presented by these entities. In view of this, the RA has recently proposed to the SOLID Committee that it is the Responsible Authority of each Member State the one to define the eligibility rules, as it is in the Structural Funds.
- The Responsible Authority (RA) has found difficulties in meeting the deadlines for submitting the final reports, specially considering that the Audit Authority includes its audit works concerning the Funds in its Annual Audit Plan, and its schedule do not fit with the deadlines that the Responsible Authority has to submit its Final Reports to the European Commission. We are changing the management and control systems to change the Certifying Authority, but the problem persists.
- The RA and the entities also find in their daily work that the restrictive definition of the target groups excludes, for the sake of its documentary situation, destinaries of the actions such as children, women victims of gender violence or in situation of exploitation or trafficking, or other people who are in conditions of obtaining their residence permits, or those third-countries originals who have attained a Community residence card, for example by means of family reagrupation. The RA has proposed the revision of this aspect by the SOLID Committee in several occasions.
- We are changing the management and control systems to revoke the Delegated Authority and change the Certifying Authority.

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 Responsible Authority has not yet considered necessary to revise the 2009 Annual Programme.

4. **Do you expect to fully implement the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme)? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

The RA expect to fully implement the 2009 programme, by the end of the stipulated period despite the difficulties encountered because of the reduction of the period for the implementation of the projects, above mentioned.

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?**

Yes, the programme remains to global implementation. We expect to have around 200 projects funded during this annual 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?**

Yes, we consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the actions is appropriate.

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

Based on:

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

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

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

Yes, we consider that it has been efficient.

Nevertheless, since we need to make some amendments in the Management and Control System (which we explain underneath), we are now revising the whole document in order to make it more adjusted and precise.

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

There was a change in the first version of the document, to designate the Directorate General for Immigrants as a Delegate Authority for the EIF. This revision was approved on april 2, 2009.

Currently, the Management and Control System of the EIF is being amended in order to revoke this Delegate Authority, which will be considered as a collaborating organisation, following the advice given by our desk officer. The Certification Authority is also going to change.

As indicated above, on the occasion of the revision of the document, we are now revising the whole document in order to make it more adjusted and precise.

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

In case you had recourse to an external expertise for other parts of this report:

This part must always be filled in by the Responsible Authority itself

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

In this period we assess as positive the following:

- The wide interest of the NGOs in the execution of programmes for the proposed objectives and within the framework of the European Integration Fund.
- The distribution of the fundings provided by the EIF has reached many entities, which have been subsidized, not only implementing big projects but also projects funded with small amounts. This fact allowed a greater number of entities develop their work, and therefore, strengthen the stakeholders and associative network and promote the integration of third country nationals.
- The actions undertaken have encouraged the training of beneficiaries.
- The calls for proposals for local entities launched with EIF fundings enhanced the work and improved the integration process at the local scope.

However, the overall assessment of the implementation of EIF in the period 2007-2009, is based on the global problems and the corresponding corrective measures taken:

The delay in the approval of the annual plans 2007 and 2008 resulted in a number of problems that diffculted, significantly, the management of the EIF and the implementation by the beneficiary entities of the approved programmes:

- Delay in receiving the first pre-financing payments from the EIF funding.
- Impossibility to launch call for proposals for EIF (2007 and 2008).
- The annual call launched in 2009 corresponds to the 2008 annual plan.
- Difficulties for the beneficiary entities with the implementation of the eligibility rules provided by the EU. In order to solve this problem, the RA wrote a manual to facilitate management, combining both regulations, EU and national. However, this effort succeeded only partially.

- Calls for proposals cofinanced by EIF were done later, due to the reasons explained above and, therefore, the implementation period of the co-financed projects was reduced.

Another important aspect of overall assessment is the restrictive definition of the target groups of FEI for their documentary situation. (See Part VII - Paragraph VII.3). We would like to remind that the RA has proposed the revision of this aspect by the SOLID Committee in several occasions.

VII.2. On the basis of the information available to you by 30 June 2010, please provide your preliminary assessment in relation to the following aspects of the European Integration Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009

*** Relevance of the EIF programme's priorities and actions to your national situation**

Please describe how relevant the programme's priorities and actions are overall to the problems and needs identified in your Member State. Has there been an evolution in your Member State which required a reshaping of the intervention?

Immigration to Spain has increased to the point of becoming one of the European countries with greatest numbers of foreigners residing permanently within its territory, 3.236.743 in 2007.

Actions of EIF are integrated into the Strategic Plan for Citizenship and Integration (PECI) 2007-2010, which reflects the needs and reality of the Spanish State in the mentioned period, as well as the methodological tools developed for the assessment of the Plan. Therefore, the actions undertaken within the EIF annual programmes in Spain fall within the framework of Peci and respond to the strategies included in it, according to the situation of immigration and integration in Spain.

In the context of economic crisis and a high amount of immigrants, still in process of integration, for whom the unemployment rate is becoming higher, some modifications were proposed by the Responsible Authority and approved by the Commission (see Part VI - Paragraph VI.2-Item 3), in order to adjust actions under Annual Programme 2008 to our changing national situation.

Improving the intervention protocols and unifying them in the Spanish State was found necessary, therefore under EIF actions it was considered the design and development of SIRIA application, an informatic programme which allows the monitoring and evaluation of the existing tools in the programmes and ensures the quality of service standards, also enabling more effective intervention techniques between social agents.

* Effectiveness of the programme

Please highlight the key results of your programme so far and the extent to which the strategy set out in your multiannual programme strategy has been implemented. Are the results of the intervention (as far as they are known by 30 June 2010) consistent with your objectives?

We have applied the strategy developed and reflected in the 2007-2013 Multiannual Programme for EIF, following the operational objectives also indicated in this programme.

Based on the priorities established for the Fund, we identify the the following:

- Introduction programmes for reception of newly arrived immigrants and, especially, for people with special needs (women, youth...).
- Information campaigns and promotion of meeting spaces.
- Design and application of methodology and indicators for the evaluation of programmes.
- Training and coordination to professionalize the administrative tasks in relation to the process of integration.
- Coordination actions and exchange of good practices between the different actors in the administration.

* Efficiency of the programme

Please estimate the cost of the management of the European Integration Fund so far and whether in your opinion the programme's objectives are being developed in accordance with the original planning at a reasonable cost.

The financial management for the European Integration Fund fully adjusts to the Annual Plans 2007, 2008 and 2009. The proposed budget for priorities and actions in each Annual Programme agrees with the figures reflected in the reports of expenditure presented to the EU. The objectives of each Plan are developed according to the budget originally proposed at each Annual Plan and the Multiannual Programme.

* Complementarity

Please explain how you ensured complementarity with your nationally funded programmes in the area of intervention of the EIF, on the one hand, and with other EC financial instruments, on the other hand, in particular the European Refugee Fund and the European Social Fund. Did you encounter any difficulty in this respect and, if so, what measures did you take?

The annual calls for proposals funded by the EIF inform about the programmes co-financed by this Fund.

The RA requires to the beneficiary entities of the Fund a memory of activities including an execution report which explains the coherence and complementarity with other instruments.

These measures prevent that the area of intervention of the EIF overlaps and duplicates the area of intervention of other national instruments or EC financial instruments.

Moreover, the Spanish government has control mechanisms that eliminate the risk of overlap or double funding through documentary verification of expenditure and its allocation reliable -even in the case that proportion or percentage of expenditure are total or partial to the different programs-.

On the other hand, the General Department of Immigrants Integration has created an administrative structure to coordinate the activities carried out by the Funds and ensures complementarity of all actions.

* Added value

Please explain how you perceive the EIF added value in your Member State in comparison with existing national programmes/policies/budget, and in relation to other EC financial instruments, in the area of intervention of the EIF.

The EIF is a tool that in relation to the process of integration of third-country nationals:

- supports the complementarity with other Funds, both national and EU instruments, as explained in the previous section.
- expands and reinforces the work done by NGOs and local authorities.
- facilitates the inclusion of new elements in the implementation of programmes and, therefore, the process towards an intercultural society.
- promotes dialogue and exchange of ideas with the stakeholders involved in the integration process, allowing the communication between all agents that are part of the integration process.

VII.3. Your suggestions and recommendations for improvement

In total 2-3 pages maximum

Under this item please specify in particular:

* Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (EIF basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the annual programming exercise in general?

EIF BASIC ACT

Final Report

The Basic Act lays down a period of 9 months for submitting the Final Report of each Annual Plan. In that period of time it is not possible that: 1) the RA checks the 100% of the expenditure, 2) the AA does all its audit works, 3) the CA does its certification works.

In Spain, the AA includes its audit works concerning the Funds in its Annual Audit Plan, and its schedule do not fit with the deadlines that RA has to submit its Final Reports to the EC.

For that reason, we propose that the Audit Report is not mandatory when submitting the Final Report and can be submitted later.

If there are discrepancies between the expenditures verified by the AA and the certified expenditures included in the Final Report, the suitable financial corrections could be made afterwards.

Target Groups

Although the general rule is that the final beneficiaries have to reside legally in the EU territory, the reconsideration of certain cases is requested:

- Minors
- Women victims of violence and persons in situation of exploitation or trafficking in human beings.
- Persons who are ready to obtain the legal residence for reasons of “rooting and integration” in the Spanish society.
- Other people who are in conditions of obtaining their residence permits, or those third-countries originals who have attained a Community residence card, for example by means of family reagrupation.

The RA has proposed the revision of this aspects by the SOLID Committee in several occasions.

Commission guidance documents:

The RA considers that the following documents will be very helpful to improve its annual programming exercise:

- The Manual on Programming, for the elaboration of which the Commission carried out a consultation and requested the information submitted by individual Member States.
- A Manual or Guidelines on Evaluation, whose process of elaboration has already begun. The AR considers that it would be very useful to have these documents shortly, since it would enable improving the evaluation processes and it would supply common directives to all the Member States.
- A document with directives on the incorporation in programming of the gender perspective and equality of opportunities. This is a directive stated in the numerous rules of the UE in this regard, as well as in our national rules. Furthermore, the AR considers of a great importance to have tools and advice to ensure that our programming exercise takes into account the different situations of women and men.

* 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?

EIF IMPLEMENTING RULES

- The differences of criteria between the Community rules and the national ones cause numerous problems of interpretation on eligibility, even by those bodies in charge of audit and certification. These differences complicate the management enormously (dilation of the processes by the need of requests of rectification, consideration of expenses as “ineligible” by some agents while others had indeed them as “eligible”, etc.).

On the basis of the above-mentioned, it is requested that it is the Responsible Authority of each Member State who defines the eligible expenditure for its country, as it has been done in the Structural Funds:

Article 56.4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, 11 June 2006, lays down: *The regulations on eligibility of the expenditure will be established on a national scale, subject to exceptions indicated in the specific Regulations corresponding to each Fund. Aforementioned regulations will cover the entirety of the expenditure declared within the framework of the operative programme.*

We consider that this is the way to follow if we really want to make flexible the implementation rules and to carry out a **shared management of the Funds**.

The responsible authority of the EIF in Spain has raised this proposal to the SOLID Committee, being supported by other 9 Member States (Germany, France, Belgium, Ireland, Cyprus, The Netherlands, Estonia, Poland and Hungary).

- The RA considers necessary the extension of the eligibility period in 6 months for all Annual Plans. In Spain, the pre-financings of 2007 and 2008 Annual Plans were received in November 2008. The two-year delay in the implementation of these plans has led to a delay in the implementation of the subsequent plans, which affects the development of the programs, especially those executed by the stakeholders, for which a prorogation would be a great improvement, in order to completely fulfil their goals.

The RA considers that extending the eligibility period in 6 months would mean a great improvement as far as the development of the programs and the achievement of the objectives are concerned.

- * 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?

On this issue, we would like to thank the Commission provided guidance and support, since it has helped us to implement the corresponding Annual Programmes as appropriate.

We would like, however, to make some suggestions that we think might be useful in the future to expand and improve communication with the Commission and among Member States:

- The final beneficiaries of the Funds pose doubts of different types in the daily management of the projects, some of which have to be consulted to the Commission by the RA. In order to expedite the answer to these questions and facilitate compliance with the deadlines in the delivery of reports, it is desirable the resolution of the doubts within a reasonable period of time.
- In relation to the questions or proposals made by each Member State, it would be helpful if the Commission could respond to them, in writing, within a reasonable period of time.
- We suggest the creation of a space for exchange, through a web platform coordinated by the Commission, in order to enhance the exchange of experiences, points of view and materials between the Member States, and the creation of forums focusing on different topics, eg. gender perspective, evaluation, programming, public awareness campaigns... At this point, we would like to emphasize that the implementation of this initiative would encourage the use of new technologies and facilitate contact between countries at low cost.

Although the inclusion in CIRCA of a similar platform might be foreseen, the RA puts forward the possibility that this space may be opened shortly, with an easier access by the staff of the different authorities of the Member States

End of the report