

**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)

.....United Kingdom.....

Date:

.....30<sup>th</sup> June 2010.....

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

..........

JOHANNE LAMIRANDE

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

...Julie-Anne de Thomasis; [Julie-Anne.DeThomasis@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Julie-Anne.DeThomasis@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk);  
0044 203 014 0332...

## **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

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

General advice and guidance. Particular assistance offered on sections III.10, III.11, V.12, VI.1.5 and VI.2.5.

- 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)

Yes. A Senior Research Officer from UK Border Agency's Analysis, Research and Knowledge Management (ARK) Directorate assisted with the report.

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

Not applicable

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

ARK's contribution to this report relates to the evaluation of actions and projects covered herein. The methodology employed by ARK for the overall evaluation is described below.

The EIF projects are being evaluated in a three year programme of research and assessment which covers the three EC Funds that the UK participates in. This will report fully in 2012. The completed report for the Evaluation of projects funded under the 2007 European Integration Fund annual programme is attached at **Annex A**.

### Important remark

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

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

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

**CONTENTS**

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2007, 2008 AND 2009 PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
3. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD, 2007 THROUGH 2009
4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
5. BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
7. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EIF PROGRAMMES, 2007 THROUGH 2009
8. Annex A - Report on the evaluation of projects funded under the 2007 European Integration Fund Annual Programme
9. ANNEX B - Examples of publicity materials produced by final beneficiaries

**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

- 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: 35%
- Programme 2008: 45%\*
- Programme 2009: 100%\*

*\* Note: these percentages include multi-annual projects.*

## **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
- Programme 2008: 2
- Programme 2009: 2

*(Note: there was one supplementary call for proposals in February 2009 that covered both the 2007 and 2008 programmes. All successful projects from this supplementary call are funded from the 2008 allocation. The second call for proposals for 2009 closed on 4 June 2010. At the time of writing, successful projects have been selected and offers of funding made, but pre-start checks are not yet complete and no projects have yet been funded.)*

### **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 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> 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	34	29	84	147
Projects selected	12	11	36	59
Projects funded	7	11	10 (at 28 June 2010)	28

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

No

- If No, explain why:

The offer of funding in respect of one of the projects selected from the 2007 call for proposals was withdrawn following concerns about targets, outcomes and eligibility of beneficiaries identified during initial monitoring. In all other instances, those projects that were not funded following selection withdrew following post-contract discussions and before initial payments were made. It

is not yet known how many of the 25 projects selected through the second call for proposals 2009 will accept the offers of funding and/or complete the pre-start check procedures.

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

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

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”. Please indicate the number of projects funded (*see definition on page 8*) in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals.

Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</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>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i> <i>(as at 28 June 2010)*</i>	<i>28</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	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i> <i>(as at 28 June 2010)*</i>	<i>28</i>

“awarding body” method				
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

*\* It is not yet known how many of the 25 projects selected through the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals 2009 will accept the offers of funding*

**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→	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i> <i>(as at 28 June 2010)</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Priority ...			
Priority 1	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>9</i>
Priority 2			<i>1</i>
Priority 3			
Priority 4			

**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 →	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10 (as at 28 June 2010)</i>
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Category of Actions ...			
Category a)			
Category b)	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>9</i>
Category c)			
Category d)			<i>1</i>

**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→	7	11	10 (as at 28 June 2010)
Of which: Number of Projects belonging to Specific Priority....			
Specific Priority 1 only			
Specific Priority 2 only		2	2
Specific Priority 3 only			
Specific Priority 4 only			
Specific Priority 5 only			
Projects belonging to several Specific Priorities		2	4
Projects not belonging to any Specific Priority	7	7	4

**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

- 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: 65% of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) granted in the “executing body” method
- Programme 2008: 55%\*
- Programme 2009: 0%\*

*\* These percentages include multi-annual projects*

## **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: 1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 1 (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)

*(Note: A memorandum was circulated internally in the Home Office and to other Government Departments with an interest in integration, education and social cohesion drawing attention to the external call for proposals and inviting expressions of interest for potential projects in “executing body” mode. Three expressions of interest were received, considered by the independent Apportionment Board, and invited to submit formal applications. Two applications were received, one of which was approved by the Apportionment Board. The second proposal focused on an ineligible target group so was rejected by the Responsible Authority. The third expression of interest was not pursued.)*

**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 31<sup>st</sup> December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> 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	1	2	0	3
Projects selected	1	0	0	1
Projects funded	1	0	0	1

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

Yes

- If No, explain why:

Not applicable

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

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

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

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest/ for proposals/ similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL Programmes 2007-2009</i>
Number	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</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>1</i> <i>(two-year project)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
Projects funded without such calls (see table II.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</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*

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

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

*By Category of Actions*

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

	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>
Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method →	<i>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*

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

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

- *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).*

*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*

The UK funded 7 such projects in 2007; 11 in 2008; and 9 in 2009 (as at 28 June 2010). Many of the projects focus on providing practical English language training giving participants relevant knowledge and skills to tackle barriers to education and employment, increase their access to local services and improve their quality of life. Certain projects focus specifically on vulnerable groups such as the projects run by The Arbour Youth Centre and Blackburne House accessible only to women, and the Third-Country Deaf Integration Project exploring barriers to integration for deaf people. Other key activities carried out by these projects include the facilitation of cultural orientation via educational trips; for instance, QED-UK’s UNITE project organises visits to local service providers including health and housing services, banks and leisure/cultural facilities. The projects also equip participants with soft skills facilitating further education and employment opportunities- for example, Helping Hands runs sessions on electronic communication and Bradford Welcomes New Arrivals enables participants to gain both literacy and numeracy qualifications.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

The UK funded one project in this category – the UK Border Agency’s Points Based System (PBS). PBS is a new system for managing visa applications to the UK from third-country nationals to work, train and study. It will rationalise and simplify approximately 80 existing routes for workers, trainees and students into five Tiers and will also put greater responsibility for migrants on those who directly benefit from them, such as employers and educational establishments.

The part of the project funded by EIF, was:

- a web based application process with clear eligibility criteria to facilitate self assessment of potential visa eligibility;
- guidance and training delivered to UKBA staff on new processes and procedures ensuring a smooth transition from the previous visa system to PBS;
- some elements of IT systems, tools and infrastructure developed that will enable the front end and internal process improvements to allow the web-based tool to work in a more user-friendly way;

- face to face interaction with employers and educational establishments to improve understanding of the Points Based System; and
- account management capabilities in place working with sponsors in the UK to improve their knowledge of PBS.

### **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*

The UK funded the COMPAS project under Priority 2. The overall aim of the project is to produce a new body of data and analysis in order to examine the experience of third-country nationals in the UK. The project comprises three main objectives: to examine routes to studying English with a citizenship context; to review academic and political literature on integration processes and initiatives to promote integration; and to inform government debates on future integration measures. The project also aims to disseminate information to the Home Office via an internal event and will also publicise the findings via a report and event targeting external stakeholders.

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Not applicable

In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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**

*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”.*

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**

*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”.*

Not applicable

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

In order to meet the requirements of Article 10 of Council Decision 2007/435/EC and Article 9 of Commission Decision 2008/457/EC, the UK has set up an independent Apportionment Board. The remit of the Board is to review and agree the proportions of funds that should be allocated to awarding body and executing body mode projects, and to approve projects funded in executing body mode. For 2007, the UK decided to concentrate on EC Priorities 1 and 3, and for 2008 and 2009 on Priorities 1, 2 and 3. No specific priorities were identified at national level but individual organisations seeking to address specific priorities were actively encouraged to do so in each of the funding years. In 2007 there were no proposals to address specific priorities but in 2008 and 2009 a number of beneficiaries did so and, where appropriate, were granted 75% support.

For 2007, the categories of actions chosen to support the UK domestic agenda for integration were:

- To continue to develop simplified admissions procedures that enhance the prospects of migrant integration;
- To address capacity issues in respect of language learning;
- To develop processes and programmes that help new migrants in general and specific targeted groups of disadvantaged migrants to become full and active members of UK society; and
- To develop a clearly defined path to citizenship that ensures migrants are fully and properly integrated into UK society and are empowered to achieve their full potential.

The categories of actions chosen in 2008 were slightly changed in order to encourage the submission of innovative project proposals. Because the only project proposal addressing Priority 3 in 2007 had been terminated, it was decided to incorporate a further effort to address this priority into the 2009 Annual Programme. This was the single major change from the distribution of projects outlined in the Multi-Annual Programme.

**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*

As mentioned previously, the Apportionment Board received three tentative proposals for projects in executing body mode, only one of which came to fruition. The first proposal, in respect of a points-based system for immigration, was anticipated in the 2007 Annual Programme and continued into the 2008 Programme. The other two tentative proposals were not foreseen in the Annual Programmes so there have been no significant changes to the distribution.

**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

Not applicable

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**

*Please describe two projects (preferably under two different Priorities) which, in your opinion, deserve particular attention since you consider them as e.g. of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirement, or innovative, or a good practice, of interest for other Member States, etc. It is up to you to judge what projects deserve particular attention.*

*It is necessary to provide a very concrete description of the projects concerned and of the reasons you consider them “success stories”. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.*

*Maximum length: half a page*

1. The Citizenship Project was run by Accrington and Rossendale College in Lancashire and is designed to facilitate the integration of third-country nationals by providing pre-entry English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and Citizenship courses, combined with information and guidance on further training and employment. The project overachieved on its principal output targets, providing services to 524 people against an original target of 480. The management team reported that the courses had a 96 per cent completion rate and an exam pass rate of 96 per cent.

Interviews with participants in the project showed that the project helped participants to:

- Gain the qualifications or skills required to be able to progress towards achieving British citizenship;
- Improve not only their English skills but also their confidence and understanding of UK culture, enabling people to communicate with a wide range of people and opening doors to services, employment and social interaction;
- Mix with people of different nationalities in an environment where they worked together, learning about each other’s countries and cultures; and
- Progress to other courses, either language- or skill-based.

Evidence from the interviews with staff and students showed that key elements that contributed to its success were;

- A strong teaching ethos, providing direction to the course content and implementation. The ethos is directed at helping integration in a wider sense than simply language tuition;
- Targeted advertising and word of mouth, combined with an easy to use enrollment system and encouraging staff often able to talk to potential new students in their own language;
- Flexibility in the classes to suit the learner with lessons offered at differing times of the day and for varying lengths of time. This enabled people with children and those in employment to take part.

2. The Community Service Volunteers (CSV) Media Clubhouse, Ipswich, developed an EIF funded project to promote community cohesion and integration through the delivery of: language courses; introductory programmes that promote understanding of the UK and integration; IT and media skills training for those who want to work; and exchange of good practice, experience and information.

It successfully met or exceeded every output target set out in its bid for year one. Elements that contributed to its success are:

- Conducting research into population need before starting the programme thereby identifying two distinctly different groups with particular needs, then tailoring the programme appropriately;
- The project worked with a large local employer to use their email network of employees to advertise the project and recruit participants. They found this to be a successful way of engaging with the target audience, many of whom are the wives of new employees in the area;
- The programme is volunteer-driven, with participants leading the development and implementation of the project. The daily administration, recruitment and the marketing and publicity work is reportedly delivered by the participants themselves; and
- The project has a partnership with a nursery to provide the Crèche facility at a concession rate for the duration of the ESOL classes. This enabled mothers with young children to attend.

Feedback from clients suggested that the project activities helped participants to understand the employment market and work environment in the UK, increased their social interactions with people outside their family and own community, improved work related skills and provided opportunities to learn more about the culture of the UK.

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

*Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there may be one project which you would regard as an important “failure”, because it proved impracticable, it did not meet expectations, or any other reason for you to judge, and you think there are lessons to be drawn from its failure.*

*The project should not be identified (i.e. the name of the project or beneficiaries should not be mentioned).*

*It is essential that the description of the project, your justification for a “failure”, and the lessons to be drawn can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EIF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.*

*Maximum length: half a page*

One project which received funding for two years did not meet its output targets due to a number of problems. The project targeted third-country nationals with a specific disability, living within one city. It identified a lack of specific services to this group despite the compounded barriers they experienced for accessing services, employment and interacting with the host community. The organisation is experienced at providing specialist services to this particular group and had staff able to provide the type of support required.

The project found that it was unable to meet its output objectives mainly because it had misjudged the potential target group within its bid, including refugees and EU citizens. It found that many referrals were therefore inappropriate and could not be funded under the EIF. In the second year, it was found misunderstandings remained around some elements of the eligibility criteria and the project had provided services to some individuals who were ineligible. This required a review of their output performance and renegotiation of their reclaimable costs. In addition to these problems, and perhaps the cause of some of the confusion, the project manager left the organisation in the second year leaving the leadership of the project in flux.

Although the project did not manage to support as many people as had been planned, the evaluation showed that the support that had been provided was highly valued by the clients. Feedback showed that the specialist skills of staff, the understanding they had for the clients and the difficulties they experienced, and the high level of input provided was effective at helping to improve communication skills, resolving problems that had impeded integration, facilitating access to services and providing wider social links.

In conclusion, although the quantitative targets for outputs were not met, the project approach was shown to be effective at promoting integration. The experience highlighted that the EIF is not suited for providing such specialist services as it created an artificial divide based on immigration status which is irrelevant for this group. The project would have been more viable and provided better value for money if it had been able to include refugees, European migrants and longer term migrants within its remit, especially as these all have very similar needs.

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

### Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

The UK utilised its Technical Assistance allocation to achieve four aims. These are:

- i) Support for final beneficiaries, including:
  - Pre-application, pre-start and in-year technical workshops
  - Monitoring visits – pre-start and at the 3 month and 9 month stages
  - Post-monitoring action plans, if required
- ii) Publicity and promotional events highlighting the contribution of Solidarity funding (see section IV.2 below)
- iii) Fulfilment of functions for operation of the Management and Control systems to administer the Solidarity Funds in the UK, including:
  - Financing staffing costs of the RA, plus staff involved with quality assurance of the monitoring, audit and certification processes.
  - Securing the expert services required, such as for auditing and evaluation.
- iv) Training and development of staff in the RA team.

## IV.2. Information and Publicity

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

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

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

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

*Maximum 15 lines*

The Responsible Authority held a Celebration and Communication event on 7 October 2009 to publicise the achievements of the 2008 Annual Programme. This was attended by senior members of staff from UKBA, project owners, policy officials and the Commission. Projects were presented with plaques in recognition of the EU funding.



Derby College receiving its 2008 funding plaque from Dee Bourke, Director of Central Operations & Performance, at the European Solidarity Funds Celebration & Communication Event, 7 October 2009

In addition, the Responsible Authority has created a webpage on the UKBA website with information about EIF and details of application opportunities. In accordance with the EIF Implementing Rules, the RA publishes its MAP and APs, as well as lists of awarded grants, annually on the UKBA website for publicity to the general public. We have also produced promotional items including logobugs, cotton shopping bags and pens. Other promotional work is undertaken through roadshows and pre-

application workshops which are advertised alongside calls for proposals and open to all who register.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

*Maximum 15 lines*

EIF final beneficiaries have actively publicised their projects and the fact that they are co-funded by the EU. Examples include presentations at events, leaflets, fliers and press articles. Please see **Annex B** for examples – further examples are available on request.

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

*Based on the Commission Decision approving each annual programme and on the information available to the Responsible Authority on the budget implementation of the programmes, please fill in the table below:*

Annual Programme	Total EIF contribution to the programme as set in the Commission Decision approving the Annual Programme  Amount (1)	Total EIF contribution <u>committed</u> by the Responsible Authority for the programme as a whole, as at 28 June 2010  Amount (2)	EIF budget implementation rate  (EIF Committed/ EIF Available)  Percentage (3) = (2) / (1)
Programme 2007	9,323,454.89	5,115,599.14	54.87%
Programme 2008	11,570,478.54	6,225,424.14	53.80%
Programme 2009	13,374,840.92	4,902,265.67	36.65%
<b>TOTAL 2007-2009</b>	<b>34,268,774.35</b>	<b>16,243,288.95</b>	<b>47.40%</b>

*Note: all figures in Euros, based on an exchange rate of £1 = €1.3*

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

*Based on:*

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

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

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

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

The fact that financial allocations for 2007 were agreed very late in the year meant that the process of developing the multi-annual programme and the 2007 Annual Programme was rather rushed and had to be undertaken at the same time as potential projects were being identified. Despite this, however, the programme was implemented broadly in line with the schedule.

Also, a number of selected projects dropped out before commencement. The main reasons given by project co-ordinators were capacity issues and difficulties in identifying match funding. Also, at around the same time as the programme was implemented, the patterns of migration outlined in the multi-annual programme changed rather dramatically. There was a surge of migration from new EU Member States and a reduction in low-skilled migration from third-countries. These changed patterns, together with the restricted target group for EIF, meant that it has not been possible to spend the full UK allocation. The revised focus on highly skilled migration to the UK has also meant that many new arrivals have existing language skills.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The most significant difficulties for the UK were the very tight deadline for implementing the programme and the issue of match funding. The tight deadlines meant we were unable to do as much promotional activity as we would have wished in order to raise awareness of the opportunity amongst potential project partners. The fact that budgetary constraints meant the UK Border Agency has not been in a position to provide match funding has also inhibited some potential bidders from putting projects forward. There was little that could be done about the deadlines but in respect of match funding we took steps to advise other Government Departments and the Learning and Skills Council (LSC – the body responsible for allocating funding for adult and further education) of the issue and the LSC in particular has been able to provide match funding for many projects providing English classes. Feedback from potential bidders is that the numbers of eligible third-country nationals needing support in some areas are not sufficient to justify dedicated EIF-funded classes. We therefore enquired whether there could be any relaxation in order to allow non-EIF funded participants and EIF beneficiaries in the same class and passed the Commission response to enquirers. The complexity of the funding arrangements that this would require have still, however, deterred potential beneficiaries from coming forward.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Not applicable

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

*15 lines maximum*

All the actions set out in the 2007 Annual Programme have been implemented although, as previously mentioned, the extent has been more limited than we would have wished.

**5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

The majority of the projects from the 2007 funding programme achieved their quantitative targets on involving participants in classes and in providing advice and guidance. However, only one project managed to achieve or exceed all of its targets for year one (CSV).

<b>Project</b>	<b>Output targets</b>
Accrington College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded original targets on the number of participants on courses (although adjusted to higher target in mid-year and did not achieve this).</li> <li>Underachieved on engaging organisations to raise awareness of project and on ESOL teachers doing additional citizenship-related training.</li> </ul>
Arbour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded targets on the number of participants.</li> <li>Underachieved on mentoring, volunteer training and employment placements.</li> </ul>
CSV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded all targets on providing classes on ESOL, interview skills, CV writing, ICT, information and advice sessions and volunteering.</li> </ul>
Derby College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded targets on learners provided with education and career advice.</li> <li>Underachieved on the number of learners provided with taster sessions, numeracy skills and ICT skills.</li> </ul>
Newham College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieved targets on number of employers engaged and exceeded targets on providing job search training and support.</li> <li>Underachieved on targets on information and advice sessions, ESOL training, awards of vocational qualifications and steering group meetings.</li> </ul>
RAD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded targets on providing advice on individual cases.</li> <li>Underachieved on advocacy for independent living, employment advice, involvement in multicultural social events and number of participants involved in BSL tuition.</li> </ul>
Slough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeded targets on the number of participants screened for basic skills and development plans developed. Also exceeded targets on the number of courses provided.</li> <li>Underachieved on the number of advice sessions provided and referrals for NARIC qualification verification.</li> </ul>

The analysis of the projects' more qualitative results, or effectiveness, was structured around the EU's 'Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy'.<sup>1</sup> There was evidence of the projects impacting on a number of the principles of integration although these have proved difficult to measure and quantify. The principles that were most effected by the work of the projects after one year were:

- Improving basic knowledge of the host society's language, history and institutions;
- Providing skills and knoweldge to enable employment;
- Promoting access to institutions, as well as to private goods and services; and

<sup>1</sup> COM(2005) 389 final: 'Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU'  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0389:FIN:EN:PDF>

- Encouraging interaction between immigrants and Member State citizens.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The distribution between the actions as outlined in the Programme was indeed appropriate and the actions set out in the programme addressed the UK and Commission's priorities. It was however unfortunate that the first call for proposals did not yield as many applications as anticipated, thus limiting the number of projects qualifying for funding.

## **VI.2. Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme**

### **1. Has the 2008 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

*15 lines maximum*

In the light of the experience of implementing the 2007 programme a great deal of work was done to raise awareness of the opportunities presented by the EIF, particularly with other Government Departments. The timescale for project proposals in the “awarding body” mode was also extended and pre-application workshops introduced. This resulted in a greater level of interest than in the previous year although less than half the expressions of interest resulted in formal proposals. The programme was therefore once again implemented broadly in line with the schedule.

As before, some selected projects dropped out before commencement but less so than in 2007. Once again, the main reason given was difficulty in identifying match funding although many cited the complexity of the funding process and the onerous reporting restrictions as reasons for not following up initial enquiries.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The most significant issue for the UK in 2008 was the under spend in its allocation. After an initial call for external project proposals it was apparent that even if all those projects that had applied were successful it would not be possible to spend the full allocation. There were a number of related issues for this.

Firstly, feedback from pre-application workshops was generally positive although as before a number of attendees remarked that the complexity of the funding arrangements might deter them from submitting applications. We had invited existing beneficiaries to attend workshops and to give presentations about their experiences so far. These presentations were well received and we noted that successful projects had developed informal networks to share information – again, a positive development. However, we noted that once again the number of tentative enquiries was significantly higher than the number of actual proposals received. We also noted that there was a greater tendency for organisations attending pre-application workshops to follow this up with a formal proposal.

As mentioned in the 2008 Annual Programme, it was decided to utilise the Home Office “Bravo Solutions” system – a paperless, online procurement system that was suitable for the submission of external project proposals.

Some potential beneficiaries experienced difficulties with this system, as a result of which a short extension to the period for submitting proposals was agreed and further support provided.

The shortfall was addressed by a supplementary call for external project proposals which resulted in a number of additional proposals being accepted.

**3. Has a revision of the 2008 programme by the Commission been necessary, or will it be necessary? If so, what were/are the main changes?**

*15 lines maximum*

Not applicable

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

*15 lines maximum*

All the actions set out in the 2008 Annual Programme have been implemented although, as in 2007, the extent has been more limited than we would have wished and the full allocation of funds has not been utilised.

**5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

The table below sets out the performance of the projects against the output targets set out in their funding agreements for the 2008 year. It should be noted that the number of targets varied across projects, from just two to 14, and that the figures do not reflect how much the targets were missed, or overachieved by.

	Overachieved	Achieved	Underachieved
Accrington and Rossendale College			100%
Slough Borough Council	40%	60%	
The Arbour Youth Centre	33%	17%	50%
The Royal Association for Deaf People	13%	13%	75%

Newham College of Further Education	10%	10%	80%
Ipswich CSV Media Clubhouse	93%	7%	
Derby College	50%		50%
Bolton WISE Ltd	unknown as yet		
Burnely Telematics & Teleworking Centre Ltd	33%		67%
QED-UK	60%	20%	20%
Bradford College	unknown as yet		
Royal Association for Deaf People (RAD) - 2nd project	unknown as yet		
NIACE (National Institute of Adult Continuing Education)		67%	33%
Toxteth Community College		50%	50%
Nottingham Training & Enterprises	80%		20%
Blackburne House (Womens Technology & Ed Centre)	unknown as yet		

Many of the projects have over-achieved the majority of their output targets and the evidence they supplied in their end of year reports suggests that most are on-track for achieving their qualitative aims as well. Some of the projects have under-achieved on their outputs, but many have identified the problems in their end of year reports, and provided suggestions on how they intend to improve in the coming year.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The distribution between the actions as outlined in the Programme was appropriate. As in 2007, because of the limited number of awarding body mode project proposals received and accepted, the proportions between awarding and executing body mode actions were not as we had intended; the aim had been for the majority of funding to go to awarding body mode projects. The situation in 2008 was better than in 2007 but it was still the case that the single project in executing body mode comprised a higher proportion of the funding than we would have wished.

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

Broadly, yes. As anticipated, the majority of funding was allocated to Priority 1 projects, but it was not eventually possible to allocate any funding to Priorities 2 or 3. The proposed projects described in the Annual Programme relating to Earned Citizenship and researching the effectiveness of UK integration strategies did not take place during the 2009 programming year. However, a large number of additional Priority 1 projects were eventually selected through two separate calls for proposals. The programme was once again implemented broadly in line with the schedule.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The main problem encountered by the Responsible Authority with respect to implementation of the 2009 Annual Programme (AP) relates to the full allocation of our national appropriation to projects. The restrictive nature of the eligibility rules – particularly the narrow target group – has inhibited organisations' scope to bid to the Fund.

Measures taken to address the problem are threefold:

- (1) Appointment of an allocation strategy manager to promote the EIF, encourage bidders and increase engagement of policy colleagues;
- (2) A second call for proposals relating to the 2009 funding year, which stated the minimum grant amount that could be applied for was £40,000 (c. €52,000); and
- (3) Promotion of the Fund through the information activity described at IV.2.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Not applicable

#### **4. Do you expect to fully implement the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme)? (= all or nearly all actions**

**set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme to be approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

*15 lines maximum*

The UK's ability to fully implement the 2009 programme is partially dependent on the outcome of our 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals relating to the 2009 funding year. A call was made relating to Priority 1 and if sufficient high quality bids are received, then the UK will be able to meet the commitments made in the AP approved by the Commission.

The closing date was 4<sup>th</sup> June 2010 and 59 bids were received. These were assessed by independent panels and the results were issued w/c 21<sup>st</sup> June 2010. We are currently (as at 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010) awaiting confirmation from the 25 selected projects whether they accept the offers of funding; we are simultaneously commencing pre-start checks for those who accept the offers of funding.

It is therefore premature to make a judgement on this question given the length of time existing projects have left to run and the outstanding results of our current call for proposals.

**5. Do you expect the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2009 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission – to be achieved at the end of this programme?**

*15 lines maximum*

As all of the projects commencing under the 2009 Annual Programme commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010 or later, it is too early to predict expected results.

**6. In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme to date, do you consider that the distribution of EIF funding between the Actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

*15 lines maximum*

Yes. The 2009 programme was drafted drawing on the experience gained to that point through implementation of the 2007 and 2008 programmes, and also in close collaboration with policy colleagues from across the UK Government. The programme therefore realistically reflected the UK's requirements and the Actions selected for implementation were those where we expected to attract the highest level of interest and achieve the greatest

impact. We rightly focussed the majority of our allocation on Priority 1 and our second call for proposals invited proposals relating to the wide action areas falling under Priority 1:

- 1) Setting up programmes and activities aimed at introducing newly arrived third-country nationals to the United Kingdom and enabling them to acquire basic knowledge about the UK's language, history, institutions, socio-economic features, cultural life and the fundamental norms and values, complementing existing programmes and activities
- 2) Preparing third-country nationals for their integration into the United Kingdom in a better way by supporting pre-travel measures which enable them to acquire knowledge and skills necessary for their integration, such as vocational training, information packages, comprehensive civic orientation courses and language tuition in the country of origin.

This helped to encourage a high number of bids – 47 – and it was also noted that the quality of application forms was higher, as reflected in the high pass-rate: 25 out of 47 bids (53%). This compares to 37 bids submitted to the first call for proposals under the 2009 programme, of which 11 were selected (30%) and 10 eventually funded.

## **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?**

*Half a page maximum*

Largely, yes. The UK Management and Control System (MCS) is shared between the three Funds in which the UK participates. It therefore benefits from the experience gained in relation to all three Funds. The MCS was drafted drawing on the experience of earlier phases of the ERF and is a 'living document' insofar as we are constantly monitoring and improving our systems – not only in light of our own experience, but also following audits by the Audit Authority (AA) and/or the Commission.

One example is the Commission auditors' findings (November 2009) regarding our selection and award procedures. They recommended: (i) the procedure for appointing members of assessment teams needed to be formalised; (ii) more information about the selection procedure should be provided to bidders as part of the call for proposals paperwork; (iii) the decisions of the assessment panels should be fully documented and signed; (iv) assessors should sign a 'declaration of no conflict of interest' and an agreement listing their roles, tasks and responsibilities. All of these recommendations have since been implemented in full. New declaration forms are now signed by all assessors and all decision paperwork is signed by the assessors and the chairpersons. Furthermore, a fair and open expression of interest campaign was held in March 2010, which resulted in the recruitment of a pool of more than 50 assessors. The assessors are being trained through a rolling training programme and, once trained, are called upon to participate in panels, as required. The pool has already been utilised for two separate procurement exercises, with great success.

Elements of our MCS that have worked particularly well are our Apportionment Board and our suite of workshops (pre-application pre-start

and in year technical). In general the MCS has provided a robust overall structure within which the Fund operates.

**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**

*Half a page maximum*

The key change to the MCS is that a single Responsible Authority has been created by combining the Responsible Authorities of the Return Fund, Refugee Fund and European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in UK Border Agency.

We have also reviewed our MCS to incorporate more flexibility in the pre-payment controls, i.e. based on a thorough risk assessment, we decide if a formal financial audit is needed before making a payment, rather than applying a blanket process requiring all projects to be formally audited.

**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?**

*1 page maximum*

As with any new funding process the implementation of the EIF programmes 2007 – 2009 met with some teething troubles. Whilst the UK Border Agency had existing experience with the European Refugee Fund the team managing the EIF programme was newly recruited and the pressure to deliver a programme to a very short deadline meant that training and induction of the new team was not as effective as it might have been. There were also internal difficulties in integrating EIF financial systems with Home Office systems.

Having a joint RA team from the beginning of implementation of the Solidarity Funds in the UK would have helped to alleviate many of these problems, hence our goal to merge the Funds within one RA team. Since February 2010, all three Funds have been managed together and we expect this to ease future implementation.

Despite the difficulties described above, implementation was overall very successful. The EIF has made it possible for many migrants who might otherwise not have had appropriate language or orientation training to receive it. In particular, many newly arrived spouses have benefited from support in their first year rather than having to wait until they had been in the UK for over one year because of restrictions in state funding.

We have received very positive feedback from beneficiaries, who have generally met or exceeded their targets. We have tried to make the monitoring process as “user friendly” as possible and whilst maintaining appropriate controls we have tried to be supportive to projects in achieving their aims. This dual approach seems to have worked well, but we continue to constantly seek to improve our processes and communication with projects.

The main issue for the UK is the inability to spend the full allocation, for reasons which have been outlined elsewhere in this report. The fact that many new migrants arriving under the points-based system of immigration, the integration elements of which have been supported by EIF, have pre-entry English has in one sense worked against us. This requirement has in fact reduced demand for English courses from those using the new system. In 2010 and subsequently, we will therefore focus more strongly on pre-departure integration initiatives. We will also invite projects involving the receiving society as a means of better supporting effective integration. Lastly, we have also appointed an integration strategy expert whose role is to market and promote EIF and to encourage potential external beneficiaries to submit applications.

**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?*

*15 lines maximum*

The EIF priorities and actions have certainly been relevant to the national situation in the UK. We have had a problem with capacity to deliver English lessons and EIF has addressed this directly. Inter-cultural competence building is also an issue identified by several researchers and whilst we have been disappointed at the small number of project proposals seeking to address this issue, it remains a priority domestically and the 2009 programme has shown us to be making progress in this particular respect.

The changed migration flows and the introduction of the points based immigration system have indeed led us to consider re-shaping the intervention and we will indeed do so from 2010 onwards. We wish to utilise the research into the effectiveness of our integration strategies funded by EIF to inform this reshaping. The opportunity presented by EIF is crucial in this regard as the present financial situation in the UK would not have allowed meaningful research of this nature.

The budgetary constraints affecting the UK and of course many other EU member states will of course put additional pressure on the ability to deliver language and orientation programmes. The EIF has enhanced, and will continue to enhance, our ability to help new migrants through such programmes and therefore remains entirely relevant to the national situation.

\* 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?*

*15 lines maximum*

In general, we are satisfied that the strategy set out in the multi-annual programme has been effective. The key objectives were to support the development of the integration-related elements of the points based system for immigration, to address the capacity issues in respect of English language provision identified in some reports into integration and cohesion issues and to introduce innovative introductory programmes. The successful projects now being supported by EIF have all contributed to the achievement of these over-arching objectives.

Key results are a significant number of projects delivering English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses including citizenship materials, strongly supporting the objectives of having a clearly-defined path to citizenship and supporting integration. Many projects are also providing generic training that supports economic integration.

Whilst some projects have made positive steps to involve the receiving society in the integration process, this has been to a lesser extent than we would have wished. Therefore, we will change the emphasis in future calls for proposals to ensure this aspect is addressed.

Shortly after the EIF was introduced the independent national co-ordinating body for integration was disbanded and plans for a successor body have not yet been agreed. This will provide some challenges for future development of integration strategies.

\* 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.*

*15 lines maximum*

As the programme develops, UK Border Agency is investing more resources in management and for the last year, recruitment has been a rolling activity for the RA team. We are fully using our TA allocation on the management of the fund, largely on activities that directly support the programme's projects and objectives. Certain management functions have offered excellent value for money, for example the evaluation element, which is undertaken in-house by the UK Border Agency's Analysis, Research and Knowledge Management Directorate. A full-time Senior Research Officer provides an exceptional

service, with larger research projects carried out by subcontractors selected through fair and open competition. Use of our in-house web team for design of the Return Fund webpage and organising/presenting events ourselves within the RA team have also provided good value for money.

\* 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?*

*15 lines maximum*

There have been no difficulties in ensuring complementarity with the European Refugee Fund (ERF). Policy development in respect of refugee integration is the responsibility of the UK Border Agency and information is shared between the responsible units on a regular basis – indeed the respective units collaborate on major policy changes. Since management of ERF and EIF merged within one overall RA team (together with the Return Fund), we have been able to achieve even greater synergies between the two Funds, including a shared MCS and pooling of resources and good practice.

It is slightly less straightforward to ensure complementarity with the European Social Fund as this is managed by other Government Departments. However, the strategic objectives for the ESF are publicly available and are therefore taken into account in developing integration strategies. Also, there have been regular meetings with the Education and Employment Departments (each of which is responsible for some elements of ESF strategy) to ensure there is no overlap.

\* 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.*

*15 lines maximum*

The EIF has done a great deal to promote and deliver integration strategies across the UK. The integration strategy is strongly linked to the acquisition of citizenship and the added value of the opportunities presented by EIF is to raise the profile of the already existing integration strategies.

Another area of added value relates to capacity building: EIF funding has enabled beneficiaries to deliver ESOL to a broader client group, making it possible for many newly arrived migrants to obtain support for their integration at an earlier stage than would otherwise have been possible. This is particularly the case with regard to people who have been in the UK for less

than one year because they are not eligible for any other government funding. In some cases, pilot projects could be taken forward directly because of EIF co-financing. The celebration events held by many projects have highlighted the positive attitude to life in the UK that attendance on an EIF-funded programme has helped develop. Teachers, as well as students, are highly motivated by these opportunities.

Sometimes national strategies directly financed by Government are viewed with some suspicion. A further added value of EIF is that its independent nature reduces some of that suspicion. And more concretely, the availability of this funding has given participants and others a much more positive view of Europe in general and the EC in particular as they are seeing genuine, practical support for their initiatives.

### **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?**

*Half a page maximum*

Whilst we acknowledge the practical difficulties of ensuring that the Basic Act has a firm legal basis in EU Treaties, it would be helpful if the target audience for the programme could be relaxed. Possibly as a result of the fact that many eligible third-country nationals already speak English before arrival, we have had difficulties in spending our full allocation. We have found that many people who have been in the UK for more than 5 years have expressed an interest in participating in programmes but do not meet the definition of “newly arrived”. There are significant numbers of migrants in the UK who have not sought to learn the language because there was no requirement for them to do so. Now this is a pre-requisite for citizenship, and as citizenship will in the future convey greater benefits, there is more of an incentive for such people to learn English. Some relaxation in the provisions of the Basic Act would therefore improve our ability to improve the annual programming exercise and to enable us to spend our full allocation.

**\* 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?**

*Half a page maximum*

Consistent feedback from projects is that they find the monitoring requirements onerous. Also, many would wish to have “mixed programmes” including migrants from elsewhere in the EU as well as acknowledged refugees. Experts in integration say that ‘taking down walls’ between different types of migrants and mixing course participants encourages integration whereas including only eligible third-country nationals can emphasise the sense of “being different”. Finding a practical means of enabling mixed programmes without prejudicing the integrity of EIF funding would therefore be extremely beneficial.

In relation to Specific Priority 2, which relates to specific target groups, we would suggest that the list of target groups be more comprehensive to include more vulnerable groups, for example those on low incomes or welfare recipients.

We have also found that the audit process has caused some difficulties, with some expenditure we had previously thought to be eligible being deemed ineligible following an audit. Often this is because of different interpretations of roles. For example, a “Project Manager” is often someone with day-to-day responsibility for running a project and ensuring it achieves its objectives. In other instances, the “Project Manager” may be a senior officer in an organisation who is responsible for strategic development of the project and is not directly involved in running it. Therefore, more precise definitions or, better still, the ability for Responsible Authorities to exercise some discretion, might resolve this difficulty.

**\* 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?**

*Half a page maximum*

The UK enjoys excellent relationships with desk officers at the European Commission and appreciates the technical support offered on a regular basis. However, it would appear that the case-load of desk officers is quite high and it can sometimes be difficult to contact them and to get quick responses to detailed queries. The UK experience of combining all funds under one RA has shown that co-management allows us to work more consistently and efficiently across the funds on questions of eligibility. We would therefore commend closer collaboration between the funds within the Commission so that the advice given to Member States is consistent, accurate and unambiguous. As such, the UK would support a higher proportion of the overall budget being spent on increasing the capacity of desk officers to deal with questions from Member States. This would also increase the possibilities for collaborative working and also for informal exchanges on points of difficulty.

Publication of the evaluation guidelines that were drafted in 2009 would be helpful.

<i>End of the report</i>
--------------------------