

Independent evaluation of 1998 and 1999 projects benefitting asylum-seekers, displaced persons and refugees.

Projects co-funded by the EC under
budgetlines B3-4113, B5-803 and B7-6008

Annex I - IV

Ede, the Netherlands, November 2002

Annex I

Terms of Reference

Annex I: Terms of Reference

Contract n°: DG.JHA/A2/2000/001

TECHNICAL ANNEX

Description of Tasks

1. Introduction

The purpose of this contract is to carry out an independent evaluation of 261 projects relating to reception, voluntary repatriation and integration of refugees from 1998 to 1999.

1.1. Background information

The European Parliament introduced into the 1997 General Budget of the European Union new budget lines in relating to refugees, displaced persons and asylum applicants. The objectives of these budget lines were:

- to improve reception conditions for asylum seekers and displaced persons and to facilitate access to asylum procedures in the Member States;
- to facilitate the voluntary return of refugees, displaced persons and asylum applicants from the European Union to their countries of origin and their reintegration there;
- to support the integration of refugees in the Member States.

A. Reception and voluntary repatriation projects

Reception and voluntary return projects were provided for by two separate budget lines in 1998:

- Budget Line B7-6008 to support pilot projects to facilitate the voluntary return of displaced persons who have found temporary protection in the Member States of the European Union.
- Budget Line B5-803 to cover pilot projects to improve reception conditions for asylum applicants and displaced persons and to facilitate access to asylum procedures.

Two joint action under article K3 (2) of the Treaty on European Union to cover the two lines in question were agreed by the Council for the calendar year 1997 in July 1997 as the legal bases for the schemes.¹ Two further joint actions were agreed by the Council in April 1998.² Under the 1999 budget, a new joint action was adopted by the Council on 26 April 1999.³ In 1999 there was a single budget line for both reception and voluntary repatriation under the terms of the joint action (Budget line B5-803). Article 14 of Joint Action 1999/290/JHA of 26 April 1999 provides for evaluation of projects and measures financed under this Joint Action.

The 1997 projects are not covered by this contract.

Reception and voluntary return projects were directly managed by the Commission up to 15 October 1999. A Technical Assistance Office (TAO) was contracted to assist the Commission in the management of the B5-803 projects from 15 October 1999.

B. Integration of refugees

Budget line B3-4113 provided financial support to promote the integration of refugees given permission to stay in a Member State targeting the achievement of independence and the prevention of social exclusion. In the first two years the funds were used to support pilot actions at national or local level and three European projects in each year involving actions in all 15 Member States. The Commission supported 62 measures in 1997 and 70 in 1998 under Budget Line B3-4113. In 1999 the budget line supported 37 preparatory measures for a future legal instrument in the filed (COM (1998) 731) which was subsequently withdrawn when integration actions were included in the Commission proposal for a European Refugee Fund (COM (1999) 686). All 1999 measures were required to involve partners in at least two Member States.

The aims and objectives of the pilot actions and of the preparatory measures and the selection criteria for actions supported were set out in detail in the annual guidelines for applicants (Annex A of these specifications). The evaluation of the individual integration actions and the global evaluation of budget line Bd-4113 should specifically refer to these as impact and output indicators. The calls for proposals for the three years were published in the Official Journal of the European Communities.⁴

The 1997 projects are not covered by this Contract The 1997 integration projects were the subject of a separate external evaluation completed in 1999. The Contractor will be required to take account of the results of the previous evaluation with regard to the multi –annual measures that continued in 1998 and 1999. The report will be handed over to the Contractor at the first meeting with the Commission after contract signature.

¹ 97/477/478/JHA Official Journal L 205 July 31 1997

² JHA/98/304/305 Official Journal 138 of May 9 1998

³ Official Journal L114/2 of 1 May 1999

⁴ OJ C211 of 12.7.1997 – OJ C84 of 19.3.1998 – OJ C130 of 11.5.1999

1998 Projects – (amounts in ECU)

Member State	Line B3-4113 No of projects and total co- financing per Member State (desk analysis only)	Line B5-803 No of projects and total co- financing per Member State (desk analysis only)	Line B7-6008 No of projects and total co- financing per Member State (desk analysis only)	Total number of projects
A	3 (534.353)	2 (164.401)	5 (1.124.231)	10
B	4 (487.959)	2 (221.521)	3 (812.158)	9
D	13 (1.247.567)	11 (714.114)	17 (3.986.723)	41
DK	4 (252.011)	1 (43.831)	4 (2.154.260)	9
E	3 (134.552)	1 (458.685)	1(111.146)	5
F	4 (453.022)	1 (228.871)	1 (980.000)	6
FIN	3 (415.908)	0	2 (229.580)	5
GR	7 (1.219.809)	2 (598.499)	4 (1.273.182)	13
IRL	1 (150.532)	0	0	1
I	6 (783.639)	2 (868.695)	3 (621.801)	11
LUX	1 (80.000)	0	0	1
NL	2 (203.700)	0	1 (89.516)	3
P	1 (32.304)	0	0	1
S	3 (333.412)	0	8 (1.013.276)	11
UK	12 (980.200)	2 (514.144)	3 (604.127)	17
European	3 (2.377.314)	0	0	3
Total	70 (9.686.282)	24 (3.812.760)	52 (12.594.132)	Total 146 projects

1999 Projects – Amounts in Euro

Member State	Line B3-4113 No of projects and total co-financing per Member State (analysing and visit)	No of B3-4113 projects to be visited	Line B5-803 No of projects and total co-financing per Member State (analysis and visit)	No of B5-803 projects to be visited	Kosovo measures No of projects and total co-financing per Member State (desk analysis only)	Total No of projects
A	2 (441.207)	1	5 (875.244)	3	1 (1.352.333,54)	8
B	1 (79.341)	1	4 (1.337.024)	2	1 (530.502)	6
D	6 (506.980)	2	18 (3.491.811)	10	1(3.925.177)	25
DK	1 (99.242)	1	4 (854.166)	2	1 (721.593)	6
E	1 (53.493)	1	3 (596.186)	1	1 (480.890)	5
F	2 (233.628)	1	3 (677.378)	1	1 (1.469.403)	6
FIN	1 (253.665)	1	2 (329.780)	1	1 (433.077)	4
GR	2 (596.931)	1	5 (52.103.117)	3	0	7
IRL	2 (184.793)	1	1 (176.106)	1	1 (326.848)	4
I	5 (549.675)	2	4 (1.741.440)	2	1 (1.739.817)	10
LUX	1 (64.760)	1	0	0	1 (193.933)	2
NL	3 (262.318)	1	2 (230.772)	1	1 (1.093.501)	6
P	0	0	1 (190.340)	1	1 (425.392)	2
S	1 (183.415)	1	5 (970.614)	2	1 (866.117)	7
UK	7 (595.606)	1	7 (1.447.492)	3	1 (795.417)	15
European	2 (851.616)	1	0	0	0	2
Total	37 (4.956.668)	17	64 (15.213.182)	33	14 (14.300.000)	115 projects (of which 50 must be visited)

Important note: The Contractor will visit 17 of the 37 1999 integration projects and 33 of the 64 1999 Phase II reception and voluntary return projects. The Contractor will submit a list of projects to be visited, for the Commission's approval, in line with the division set out above. The Contractor should try to visit every project after submission of the project's interim report and before the end date of the grant agreement. However, it should be borne in mind that results would be more clearly discernible if projects are visited in their final stages, i.e. in the final two months of the project.

Summary table – distribution of projects throughout EU Member States

Member State	1998 projects All three lines, desk analysis only	1999 Projects, of which 50 are to be visited	Total No of 1999 projects to be visited per Member State	Total number of projects per Member State 1998-99 to be evaluated
A	10	8	4	18
B	9	6	3	15
D	41	25	13	66
DK	9	6	2	15
E	5	5	2	10
F	6	6	2	12
FIN	5	4	2	9
GR	13	7	4	20
IRL	1	4	2	5
I	11	10	4	21
LUX	1	2	1	3
NL	3	6	2	9
P	1	2	1	3
S	11	7	3	18
UK	17	15	4	32
European	3	2	1	5
Total	Total 146 projects	115 projects	Total: 50 Projects to be visited	261

Note that “1998 projects” refer to projects financed under the 1998 budget year, but that those projects generally began in December 1998, and ended in December 1999, with final reports submitted three months later. The Kosovo measures were co-financed for a maximum of six months. Most of the Kosovo measures began on 26 April 1999, although some of them began as late as July 1999, ending in January 2000. 1999 projects began in December 1999 (integration projects) or January/February 2000 (reception and voluntary repatriation). Note that performance of the contract must be planned bearing in mind that ongoing 1999 projects must be visited after submission of the project’s interim report. Project visits must take place before the end dates of the individual grant agreements (Dec 2000-Jan/Feb 2001).

Short descriptions of all 261 projects attached in Annex A.

2. Purpose of the contract

2.1. General requirements of the Contract

The Contractor will undertake a global evaluation of the 1998 and 1999 projects described above, to report findings and to make recommendations.

The Contractor will report to the Justice and Home Affairs DG. Evaluators will be expected to be available to discuss progress with their work, once reasonable notice is given, and to present its findings orally on completion of the contract.

2.2 Scope of the contract

The Evaluation must cover, in particular, three issues:

- **Implementation and management of the projects**
- **An evaluation of the projects' impact**
- **An analysis of whether Community funds allocated to the projects were used efficiently and whether they provided value for money in relation to the amounts granted.**

The evaluation should begin with a thorough desk analysis of each individual project to include:

- An evaluation of whether the project was properly selected in accordance with the criteria set out in the joint actions for reception and voluntary repatriation projects, and the guidelines for integration projects. The contractor should take into consideration a small number of non-selected projects in order to form an overall opinion of the validity of the selection process (five non-selected projects per year per budget);
- Assessment of the content of the individual projects compared with the legal base or the guidelines;
- Assessment of management and implementation of projects by the beneficiary organizations compared with project descriptions and original applications;
- Assessment of whether projects achieved their aims. These results could be quantitative (for example the number of returnees) or qualitative (general contribution to the overall aims of the Joint Action or the guidelines).
- A cost benefit analysis for each project and an assessment of whether value for money was obtained.

The results of the above analysis must be presented as individual assessments for each of the 26 projects.

Questionnaire to grant beneficiaries

Once the desk analysis has been completed, a questionnaire should be sent to all 261 grant beneficiaries. The contractor will be required to draft a questionnaire for approval by the Commission. The questionnaire should as a minimum:

- The clarity of the guidelines

- The management by the Commission and/or the TAO, etc
- Their assessment of whether the projects achieved their stated aims
- Their assessment of how the programme responds to the needs in the Member State and/or in the EU in general, give their experience in the field
- Their assessment on the impact of the project on their project's final beneficiaries
- Their suggestions for future content of programmes.

The content of the questionnaire may be further completed in view of proposals contained in the bid of the selected tender.

Results obtained from the questionnaires should be incorporated into the individual project assessments.

Visits to 1999 projects

The Contractor will be required to visit 17 of the integration projects that began in December 1999, and 33 of the 64 Phase II reception and voluntary repatriation projects under the 1999 programme, which began in January or February 2000. **These visits must be carried out during the lifetime of the individual projects, before the end date of the project, preferably within the last two months of the project's life.**

The aim of these monitoring visits is to supplement the desk analysis previously carried out with more comprehensive information and input available from on-the-spot visits. The Contractor will be required to carry out these evaluation visits using a standardized monitoring grid approved by the Commission, and a comparison must be made between the objectives/information available from the desk analysis, and the real results discernible during on-the-spot visits.

In general, monitoring visits should group together all projects in the same geographical region.

Overall evaluation

The overall evaluation for the three budget lines over the two years must include:

- A global assessment of whether the programmes achieved their aims
- Taking the programme as a whole, analysis of whether there was a proper allocation and use of resources given the political and economic circumstances in the EU and in the countries of origin. A cost benefit analysis per budget line per year must be provided.
- Global analysis of results with synoptic tables to include a comparison between the two years, etc.
- An assessment of the overall management of the projects and budget lines by the Commission and TAO
- An assessment of the impact of the programmes on the final beneficiaries
- An assessment of the impact of the programmes on the situation in the Member States
- An analysis of complementarity with other programmes at national and/or EU level

Compulsory sources of information

- The Contractor will have access to the evaluation tables drawn up on individual projects in the course of the project selection procedures, and all minutes of selection committee meetings.
- The contractor will have access to the individual project files at the Commission's premises and at the premises of the Technical Assistance Office. 1998 project files include: the application form, the forward budget, the signed grant agreement, any correspondence relating to the project, any interim and final reports and the Commission's internal evaluation of these reports, details of payments made, the final financial statement, and where relevant, project-related publications and material. Some final reports may also include an evaluation by the grant beneficiary or an external evaluation requested by the grant beneficiary. 1999 project files will also include an implementation timetable (B5-803 projects only), the interim report, and the Commission's internal evaluation of the interim report by the time this contract is underway.
- Contact with relevant international organizations e.g. UNHCR, Red Cross, IOM, ECRE, Caritas, etc.
- The external evaluation report for B3-4113 1997 measures will be provided to the Contractor after contract signature.

The work shall begin on the date of signature of the contract. Shortly after signature a first meeting will be held at the Commission's premises in Brussels in order to settle all details of the tasks to be undertaken.

2. Meetings with the Commission

The Contractor will be requested, and should be prepared, to attend an initial meeting at the Commission's premises in Brussels and four more meetings in Brussels to discuss the progress of the work.

The tasks specified above shall be executed on the Contractor's premises.

Annex II

Methodology

Annex II: Methodology

II-1 Introduction

In this Annex an overview is given of the methodology as used in this evaluation. Although sometimes extensive information is provided, e.g. on the measurement of *performance differences*, it is impossible to explain each and every step in great detail.

II-2 Some main data

Although the evaluation should have started in the summer of 2000, some delays occurred within the commission so that the contract for the evaluation was only signed in the beginning of 2001. Further delays occurred i.a. because completed questionnaires were returned much later than anticipated. The evaluation concerned the 254 projects that were co-funded in all Member States under the respective budget lines of 1998 and 1999.

In order to assess issues related to selection, all files of these projects were screened on a number of topics. The files of 5 projects could not be found. In addition 25 files of *rejected* applications were evaluated to assess whether or not this rejection was justified.

Field visits were made to 50 projects, for the names of the GBOs visited reference is made to Annex III.

Virtually all GBOs that implemented projects received a questionnaire. In total 115 completed questionnaires were processed as from the end of November 2001 onwards. Some completed questionnaires were received after that time and could not be included in the processing except on selected items (mainly remarks made).

II-3 Main lines of approach

The emphasis of the evaluation was on the effectiveness and relevance of the projects and underlying programmes. As the final beneficiaries were not included (this would have been practically impossible), our main source of respondents were the staff of the GBOs who had been

involved in the implementation of the projects. By definition, this causes the evaluation to reflect a high-level of self-evaluation as the answers obtained come from those who are being evaluated. After finalising this report in draft, we have screened the findings again on distortion that may have been caused by this self-evaluative aspect. It caused few adaptations, the major adaptation concerned the text of 5.3.1.

The approach was characterised by:

1. A pilot phase
2. Various types of the questionnaire all derived from a same 'mother-questionnaire'
3. Training of all staff concerned
4. A systematic effort to obtain reliable data on goal achievement and impact.
5. Much space given for qualitative remarks to respondents and the subsequent efforts systematising these remarks in relevant findings.

The **pilot phase** took place from February to April 2001. A number of drafts for the questionnaire were developed and tested out. Simultaneously, those involved in these efforts got a direct impression of the subject matter.

On basis of these pilot interviews, including interviews with the relevant staff of the EC and TAO, a '**mother-questionnaire**' was elaborated, indicating for each question to what type of project this question was relevant. In total 10 types of projects were defined on basis of the criteria of the budget lines. That means that sometimes we divided the budget lines in subclasses.

The questionnaires were then sent, in the correct composition of questions to the GBOs. It proved extremely time-consuming to get the names, addresses and e-mail addresses of these GBOs.

In the mean time, all **staff** involved (10) participated in a **workshop**. The details of the study and especially the various questions were discussed at length to make sure that each would understand questions and possible answers in a similar way. This was important because of the multitude of languages involved. All languages of the EC were represented in the team except Greek (ad hoc assistance was recruited for this language).

The way in which we approached the challenge to come to reliable and valid estimates of goal-achievement and impact at various levels is described below.

The decision to provide respondents to the questionnaires with much space to give remarks or suggestions was very successful. Thousands of remarks were received, analysed, classified and processed. This was a very time-consuming part of the processing period. At the same time these remarks provided valuable insights and suggestions.

II-4 Measuring plan-realisation

Many projects did not define their objectives, beneficiaries, activities in an operational manner. As a result, it is difficult to measure goal-achievement. In order to obtain a reliable estimate, GBOs were asked to quantify their plans, as they were originally made and according to a last approved revision (if any). Then they were asked to indicate what was achieved in reality.

Two types of approaches were made for this. One aimed at maximum clarity, asking GBOs to define the units in which interventions were organised (e.g. lectures, a seminar, one night accommodation), the number of units planned and realised, the number of beneficiaries reached per unit, etc.

The second one was more global, in principle aiming at describing the activity and the number of beneficiaries (to be) reached by it.

Further we asked the GBOs to limit their answers to the 4 main activities in their project. This was done not only to concentrate on the main issues but also to increase comparability as otherwise some GBOs would have felt tempted to go into great detail while others would give main activities only.

In general, the responses indicate that GBOs have spent much effort in providing correct answers. This shows especially in the remarks they made to these tables. Not completely to our surprise the great majority of the GBOs opted for the second, more global approach. A problem here was how to assess the degree in which *different* activities served *same* beneficiaries. We have solved this problem by (a) a detailed analysis of the answers obtained and (b) by calculating for those projects for which we had detailed information the ratio between the total number of beneficiaries indicated for all 4 activities and the number of *different* beneficiaries thus served. By combining these two estimates, an estimate for the total number of *different* beneficiaries per project was reached.

II-5 Valuating impact

In order to obtain an impression of impact, projects were asked if they succeeded in assisting beneficiaries to pass certain thresholds. Those projects that were 'sure' that they succeeded in doing so are considered as having had 'impact', the rest as having had no impact. The reality is of course much more diverse but it is assumed that this gives an indication for the total.

When it comes to valuation (excellent, good, reasonable, poor) of this impact, we have no firm yardstick. This holds for all types of projects: reception, integration and voluntary return. We therefore tried to develop some kind of yardstick, either by comparing years or on basis of common sense.

There is one more particularity to mention when it comes to the valuation of impact as it was done in this study. The answers given concern projects rather than individual beneficiaries. Of course, not all beneficiaries reacted in a same way on the services and facilities offered by the projects. However, we think that often there was much similarity. Furthermore, there hardly was an alternative as it would have been impossible to refine impact further, given the kind of monitoring that occurred in the projects.

II-5.1 Reception projects

For reception projects we face the problem that many of these projects did not aim at objectives that concern **both** our thresholds (impact-indicators in fact) while many also were busy in providing day-to-day necessities and were intended just to do that.

In order to value the impact of these projects, we have given scores on basis of the answers obtained. If the project was sure that most of the beneficiaries passed one of the thresholds a score of 4 was given, a 3 if the project was almost sure, otherwise a 2. If a project has passed both thresholds with at least a 3 and a 4 score, the overall score given was 5. Applying these scores, some 66% of the projects scored 4 (good) or better in 1998 (33% excellent) and 78% did so in 1999 (43% excellent).

II-5.2 Voluntary return projects

For the voluntary return projects the problem of impact is even more complicated as the objectives to be achieved were ambiguously defined or at least sometimes interpreted in different ways. From a formal point of view, the actual return of potential returnees is only one possibility of a positive impact. Another (positive!) possibility is that after participation in a return programme, the beneficiary takes the decision not to go after all.

If we express impact in terms of the projects that succeeded in guiding the beneficiaries through all three thresholds, irrespective of the outcome of the last threshold, the picture is as follows:

	threshold 1	threshold 2	threshold 3
1998	94%	77%	69%
1999	93%	59%	66%
Total	94%	69%	67%

In 1999 we find a remarkable pattern, as the number that takes a decision to return or to stay (threshold 3) is *higher* than the number that passes threshold 2! The difference is caused by projects where most beneficiaries did not complete the programme offered for threshold 2. Either because they became convinced they wanted to stay and therefore didn't follow the rest of the programme or because they returned before finalising the programme. In fact, it should be added that I have formulated the first sentence of the section not completely right. The YES answers on the third threshold are people who state that: "they **exclude** voluntary return as a serious option" (Q E4-112-07; rt3imp13). I have taken the NO answers for the people who did decide to take voluntary return as a serious option. Similarly I have counted the people who answered that they 'probably' exclude the option, for 50% and added them to the NON-returnees while counting the 'perhaps' answers also for 50% and adding them to the potential returnees. These groups together are in the 69, 66 and 67%. However, it is clear that this is not highly exact as some of the non-returnees may have been more or less forced to go while also under the returnees some people may stay or go to other countries after all. Yet, globally speaking, I think that the data reasonably approach reality as described.

When further analysing the data of threshold 3, it appears that (expressed in terms of the total number of projects that started with activities related to threshold 1), division between stayers and returnees is as follows:

	stay	return	
1998	31%	38%	rounded
1999	24%	42%	rounded
Total	28%	39%	

In fact, 'return' is not the correct expression here as some of these may have travelled to other countries or stay after all.

II-5.3 Integration projects

For integration projects we have followed a same scoring technique as was done for reception projects taking into account that now there were three thresholds. If a project was sure to have assisted most beneficiaries in passing a threshold, the score of 4 was given, if they were almost sure a score of 3, otherwise a score of 2 or 1.

For the final score for a project, the highest score on any of the three thresholds was taken so with a maximum of 4. However, if two of the thresholds scored 4 and one 3 or 4, a final score of 5 (excellent) was given.

The result was as follows:

Year	Excellent	Good	Reasonable	Poor/No	N
1998	23%	46%	23%	8%	13
1999	40%	30%	25%	5%	20
Total	33%	36%	24%	6%	33

integscores (rt3imp10)

Although the good+excellent scores in total hardly changed from 1998 to 1999, the excellent scores increased considerably.

Average scores for culture and language were 3.5; for employment and income 3.4 and for confidence and action orientation also 3.4. So, very little difference.

II-5.4 Impact on the programme and policy level

The issues considered here are directly related to policy-related priorities:

- continuity (continuation of project after EC co-funding came to an end, did other organisations become active)
- complementarity and pressing needs
- partner development and networks
- innovation and replication
- increased consistency in relevant policies

Continuity

In order to measure continuity, several options had to be taken into account: continued project with other funds, one (or even more) new projects were started up with other funds, the project was continued in a modified form (often with some former activities discontinued and/or some new activities included).

For impact we decided to take all options, that means only 'no continuation' or 'don't know' are considered as 'no impact'. If we apply this approach, 84% of all projects were continued in one way or another in 1998 (N=43) and 82% of the projects in 1999 (N=72). This, of course are very high percentages indeed, especially when taking into account that over 5% (both years) "didn't know". These don't know answers also included those who still were waiting for a definite decision on new funding.

Complementarity and pressing needs

The complementarity answers were very positive, on average 70% was sure that the project was complementary to other projects while an additional 16% answered 'perhaps'. If we count these latter answers for 50%, 78% of the projects considered themselves complimentary to existing interventions (84% 1998, 77% 1999).

These findings are confirmed by the answers on the question whether or not the project was responding to a 'pressing need'. Almost 90% (!) of the projects (N=108) found this to be the case (taking the 'perhaps' answers for 50% again). However, there is a difference with the complementarity question because here the percentage increases from 88% to 91% (when only taking "yes" answers from 80 to 88%).

In order to have an indication of the impact, the complementarity percentages appear fully suitable. To be sure: this impact concerns the way *intended* policy (complementary projects) was realised. Probably the word 'result' or 'policy related performance' would be better. Whatever the case: the percentage of projects that reached complementarity was very high and this is confirmed by the answers on 'pressing needs'.

Did the project cause other organisations to become active ?

In our highly specialised societies, organisations have their own missions and clients. As the problems related to large scale presence of asylum-seekers and/or refugees are relatively new and often difficult to define in 'traditional' terms, many existing organisations do not feel an urge to step in although they may have facilities and/or expertise that can be of great value.

The question whether or not the project caused other organisations, not active before in relevant fields, to become active, therefore is relevant.

For 1998, there is an overwhelming "don't know" answer: 83% of the respondents. Only 5% is sure that this is the case, an additional 7% thinks that this is 'perhaps' the case. For 1999 the situation is completely different. The "don't knows" are now 33%, 29% answers 'yes' and an additional 17% 'perhaps'. Most outspoken are respondents from the B3/1999 transnational pilots (46% yes, 31% perhaps). rt3imp08

In order to estimate 'impact' we have taken the "yes" percentages again for 100% and added the 'perhaps' percentages for 50%. For 1998 just below 9% of the projects caused other organisations to become active, for 1999 this increased to 38%. Given the high rate of "don't know" answers, percentages are likely to be somewhat too low. Yet, even at this level, one tends to conclude that this is a real impact, as most organisations will need to really pass a threshold before entering the domain of asylum seekers, refugees or displaced persons.

Partnerships and networks

Although the satisfaction of partnerships is also a form of impact if such partnerships were promoted by the Commission, the *continuation* of the partnership after the project came to an end appears to be a better way of measuring impact here. To be sure, not all partnerships were a result of the policy of the Commission, yet there is little doubt that the Commission played an important role here.

The percentage of organisations that continued partnership after co-funding ended is very high: just over 90% for both 1998 and 1999. There is a difference between the budget lines here: the B3 projects are clearly lower (80-85%) than the B5 projects (95%). rt3imp09

Innovations

The question to be asked when it comes to innovations is whether or not we should take into account the *kind* of innovation. Although it is interesting and relevant, we decided not to do so when it comes to an indication of impact because we wouldn't know how to give for example a weight to distinct forms of innovation.

However, the issue is more complicated than this. Because at the one hand it should be established whether or not the innovation can be related to the co-funding of the EC. As in more than 70% of the cases, the EC funding was considered of 'crucial' importance and in an additional 20+% of importance, this does not cause problems.

Finally, there is of course the *use* made of the innovation. Projects may be rather optimistic about the use made of the innovations they applied. Therefore, they were also asked how much use they made of the innovations implemented in other projects. This percentage is indeed somewhat lower but only slightly so. However, should the value of innovations be based on its replication only? Because an innovation that proves after all less promising than anticipated, still can be of value if only because it prevents others from doing the same (there is a direct relation with partnerships and networking here).

We decided to deal with this impact through both the percentages of projects that reported substantial innovations *and* the replication rate.

As for the replication rate, in order to assess impact, we originally made a distinction between replication in one's own country, transnational replication, and replication in one's own project of an innovation developed by others. Furthermore, a further graduation was possible: replication in more than one project or in one project. In order to give an overall percentage, we have added all these answers, counting more than one project, one project and perhaps a project as same answers, then we calculated the percentages.

Unfortunately, this question was only asked during the field visits and the data concern therefore only 1999. On basis of the definition just given, 57% of the projects either had an innovation seen replicated elsewhere and/or had replicated an innovation from another project. There was a considerable difference between the budget lines. The B3 budget line scored clearly higher (79%) than the B5 budget line (46%). This was mainly caused by the fact that B3 scored much higher on 'replicated in other countries'. rt3imp04

Substantial innovations were reported by 93% of the projects. However, 37% of the projects didn't answer the question probably because the respondent couldn't recall anymore what was innovative 2 years ago and what not. This was especially so when the respondent was not active in the project at that time. If in all 37% cases, no innovation had taken place, the percentage would have been 58%. It is of course highly unlikely that the non-respondents would deviate so much from the respondents. We estimate here that in the 1999 projects, over 80% contained an element that was considered as 'substantially innovative' by the implementing organisation. There was no great difference between the B3 and B5 budget lines in this respect (B3 was slightly higher). As stated, we have no data for 1998. rt3imp01

Increased consistency in policies

The number of projects answering this question was so low that we estimate that very little impact was made in this field or at least that projects were not aware of such impact.

II-5.5 Overall policy-impact: performance trends

The *performance* reflected by the impact of the programmes (budget lines) as described in the previous paragraphs is a clear sign that indeed on the programme level a substantial impact occurred. In addition it is interesting to assess whether or not there is a difference in performance between the impact for a same part of a budget line in the two years under consideration. If this difference is positive, impact has increased. Otherwise it has decreased. Increased impact(s) in general will reflect (also) *learning processes*: improved project design, selection procedures, improved co-ordination of projects, strengthened implementation capacity, etc.

The advantage of such a comparison is the use of exactly the same definitions for the 1998 and 1999 situation. There are also disadvantages or dangers. For example, if performance is very poor indeed on a certain issue, a clear increase in performance may be interpreted in too positive terms: the performance still is far below acceptable standards. This is the case for financial procedures for example.

In calculating these performance trends, use is made of *performance indicators*. Usually the impact percentages as described in the previous paragraphs are used as such. However, also a few other performance indicators are used such as *plan-realisation* and *relative efficiency* as these were dealt with in chapter 5. Below, each performance indicator is described and the way *performance differences* will be interpreted.

It was tempting to include the **timely publication** of the opening of the budget lines also in this context. However, the Kosovo measures in 1999 would make comparison difficult.

The **selection** of projects in terms of eligibility is difficult because of the problems relating to the 'achievement of a common minimum standard in the Member States'. Apart from this problem differences between the years would be minimal while performance in general would be high. The same is true for the legitimacy of the *rejection* of applications.

The organisation of the selection process and especially the **perceived transparency** would show dissatisfaction at the side of the GBOs but a slight increase from 1998 to 1999. However, in fact first more clarity should be established in order to come to a practical standard of conduct. At the one side there should be transparency, at the other endless discussions about the outcome of the selection should be avoided.

The **number of beneficiaries** reached does not appear suitable to measure performance trends. The differences between their involvement in the projects are far too wide while furthermore maximisation of the number of beneficiaries was no aim.

Goal-achievement in terms of **plan-realisation** appears to be a valid performance indicator in the range between, say, 50-150% (as is the case for 1998 and 1999). The reason to put limits relates to the necessity that the formulation of the objectives is realistic. If goal-achievement differs very much from stated objectives, either there must have been important external factors at work and/or the project planning was weak. However, this was not the case here. Plan-realisation was 90% in 1998 and 123% in 1999.

What was stated on plan-realisation seemingly also holds more or less for **relative-efficiency**. However, this is not the case because, obviously, there is a relation between the two (see the definition in chapter 5). Therefore, the trend in relative efficiency should be toward 100. That means that a development from 80% in 1998 to 80% in 1999 should be considered exactly as positive as a trend from 120 to 110. Relative efficiency was 123% in 1998 and 113% in 1999, so a positive performance difference of 10%.

The percentage of GBOs who receive the information on the opening of the budget lines through the '**proper**' **official sources** of the EC would also be an interesting indicator although not exactly a source of great satisfaction: over 1998 only 2% of the respondents reported that this was their main source of information, in 1999 that had increased to 9% but still this is not an impressive score.

The same is true for the question if it was **easy** to get the (additional) **information on the criteria and conditions for submitting a proposal**. Here we meet the problem of how to count the 'somewhat' answers. If we count these for 50%, as we did in other cases, the answers are 66% found it easy in 1998 and 78% found it easy in 1999. (rt3man07)

The perceived usefulness of the **guidelines** cannot be used because guidelines were not available for all budget lines in 1998. For 1999 some 57% of the respondents found them useful.

The **accessibility** of Commission staff scored high. Applying the same formula as usually applied, 82% found this OK for both 1998 and 1999. There are some contradictions here with answers on other, similar questions. An important problem here is the poor rating of the financial management and procedures of the Commission. For that reason we have omitted other management performance indicators for the establishment of trends, except the payment procedures.

Performance of the **TAO** can not be included here as it only started functioning in 1999. Its performance for 1999 received very high scores.

We have taken payment procedures as performance indicator for **financial procedures** in general because here there is the least chance for mixing up all kinds of other factors that also may play a role. In 1998 24% of the respondents found them efficient and 27% somewhat efficient (total score: 37%). In 1999 32% found them efficient and 37% somewhat efficient (total score: 50%). It should be kept in mind that these scores are *positively* influenced by the inclusion of more (semi-) public organisations in 1999. These organisations have more own resources, are therefore less dependent on the co-funding and tend to avoid the clearly negative scores.

Although we have paid attention to the **management of the projects by the GBOs** we are not able to compare performance between 1998 and 1999 except in terms already mentioned: goal achievement and impact on the project level. Comments made by staff of the Commission and the TAO suggest a tension between 'sticking to original objectives' at the one hand and 'flexibility to adapt to changing situations' at the other. Clearly, one cannot score high on both. Apparently many projects did not know the permissible and not permissible margins, especially in 1997. Reporting and budget control are also mentioned (usually in a negative way) but such monitoring remarks tend to be made on an ad hoc rather than a systematic basis and cannot be used for performance (trend) analysis.

The impact on project level has already been discussed. These impact percentages will also be used as performance indicators, resulting in the following data:

Table II-5.i: Performance indicators and trend from 1998 to 1999 (21 indicators)

Performance indicator	1998(%)	1999(%)	differ.	level*	remarks
timely publication opening BLines				--	
eligibility, selection of applications				++	
eligibility, clarity criteria	66	78	10	+	
plan realisation	90	123	35	++	note 1 (rounding)
relative efficiency	123	113	10	+	note 2 and 3
proper publication BLines	2	9	5	--	
easy to get info on criteria	68	78	10	+/-	
usefulness guidelines				+/-	note 4
accessibility EC staff	82	82	0	+(+)	
performance TAO				++	
financial procedures EC	37	50	15	--	note 5
reception, impact	66	78	10	+	
voluntary return, impact	69	67	0	++	note 6
integration, impact	69	70	0	+	
influence projects on local commun.	52	80	30	(+)	note 7
continuity projects after end co-f.	84	82	0	++	
complementarity projects	84	77	-5	++	
other organisations become active	9	38	30	+	
partnerships and networks cont'd	90	90	0	++	
innovations made, used				++	note 8
increased consistency policy			0	--	note 9

* Level refers to the level of performance reached. ++ means that the level of performance is considered very high (and therefore difficult to maintain) while -- means that the level is very low (and therefore easy to improve). The valuation of this level is done on basis of objective data in as far as available (e.g. derived from performance indicators) **and** on basis of perceived relevance by the evaluators.

note 1 differences are rounded to the nearest 5 to avoid unjustified appearance of exactness.

note 2 the difference is *positive* for reasons explained earlier

note 3 the performance level as + (rather than ++) because of conflicting remarks on various files.

note 4 the answer is lower than we would have expected, perhaps much is known to those who are already familiar while the others use it insufficiently. Therefore not included in overall performance differences. (see 6.2.2.1)

note 5 on basis of remarks made by GBOs, level set at very low (--) rather than low (-), see also remarks made earlier (6.3.4)

note 6 the level is estimated to be higher than of the reception projects because of the complexity of these projects

note 7 believed to be very weak, see 7.3

note 8 no data for 1998

note 9 no or hardly impact, see 8.6

Annex III

List of visited projects and persons interviewed

Annex III: List of visited projects and persons interviewed

Visited projects

B3-4113 Integration projects visited

NL	R'dam	1009	Steunpunt multiculturele ontwikkeling in Noord Brabant
S	Göteborg	1019	Göteborgs initiativet
L	Luxemburg	1021	Fondation Caritas Luxembourg
Europe	Brussels	1023	Red Cross/ EU liaison bureau
DK	Holbaeck	1045	Municipality of Holbaek
A	Vienna	1066	Evangelisches Hilfswerk Österreich
D	Augsburg	1068	Tür an Tür e.V
E	Lerida/Madrid	1069	MITA, Centro de Desarrollo de Iniciativas Empresariales
IRL	Dublin	1071	Irish Refugee Council
F	Helsinki	1074	Helsinki City North East Social Centre
B	Brussels	1075	OCIV, Overlegcentrum voor Integratie van Vluchtelingen
F	Paris	1076	France Terre d'Asile
D	Frankfurt/Main	1099	Internationaler Bund
GR	Athens	1104	Hellenic Red Cross
I	Roma	1107	CIES, Centro d'informazione e Educazione allo Sviluppo
I	Udine	1125	IRES, Istituto di Ricerche Economiche e Sociali del Friuli Venezia
UK	London	1133	Royal National Institute for the Blind

B5-803 1999 Reception and Voluntary Return Projects visited

UK	London	203	Kent Committee for the Welfare of Migrants known as Migrant Helpline
UK	Dover	205	British Red Cross
S	Goteberg	210	Göteborg-Initiativet
S	Helsingborg	211	City of Helsingborg
E	Madrid	215	Instituto de Migraciones Servicios Sociales
P	Lisboa	216	INDE, Intercooperação e Desenvolvimento
NL	Rijswijk	218	COA, Centraal Orgaan Opvang Asielzoekers
I	Roma	219	Italian Council for Refugees Consiglio Italiano per I Rifugiati

I	Roma	221	International Organization for Migration
GR	Athens	224	Hellenic Red Cross
GR	Athens	227	KSPM, Reintegration Centre for Migrant Workers- Refugee Department
GR	Athens		
D	Munchen	232	Landeshauptstadt Munchen Sozialreferat fluchtlingsamt
D	Hamburg	233	WOGÉ e.V.
D	Berlin	234	Behandlungszentrum für Folteropfern e.V.
D	Duisburg	235	Verband der Initiativgruppen in der Auslanderarbeit
D	Berlin	236	Arbeitsgruppe Entwicklung u. Fachkräfte in Bereich des Migration und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit
D	Dortmund	238	Deutsch Bosnisch Herzegowinische Gesellschaft e.V.
D	Bremerhaven	239	Arbeiterwohlfahrt Kreisverband Bremerhaven e.V.
D	Hofmei	242	Kreisausschuss des Main-Taunuskreises-sozialamt
D	Lindau	244	Zentrum zur Behandlung von Folteropfern
D	Munchen	246	Euro-Training-Centre e.V.
F	Paris	247	France Terre d'Asile
FIN	Helsinki	251	International Organisation for Migration
DK	Kopenhagen	253	Danish Refugee Council
DK	Kopenhagen	254	Danish Refugee Council
B	Brussels	257	Rode Kruis (België)
B	Brussels	258	International Office for Migration
A	Graz	261	Verein ZEBRA, Zentrum zur sozialmedizinischen, rechtlichen und kulturellen Betreuung von Ausländern und Ausländerinnen in Österreich
A	Wien	262	International Centre for Migration Policy Development
A	Wien	263	Caritas Österreich

Persons interviewed

Fieldvisits B3-99

Project Number	Organisation	Name and Function of Persons interviewed	
1076	France Terre d'Asile	Pierre Henry	Director
1019	Göteborgs Initiativet	Agneta Starfelt	Project leader
		Erling Zetterman	Legal responsible
1021	Foundation Caritas Luxembourg	Samia Bounaira	Project coordinator
		Mr le Grand	Project evaluator
1066	Evangelisches Hilfswerk in Österreich	Judith Sattleberger	INTO coordinator
1068	Tür an Tür - Mit einander wohnen und leben e.V.	Matthias Schopf-Emrich	Chairman
		Margret Wuecher	Project leader, finance
		Stephan Schille	
1069	Centro de Desarrollo de Iniciativas Empresariales	Ana Cárcamo H.	Director of MITA
		Ana Maria Delgado	Executive

			secretary/sociologist
		Rodrigo Baco	Economist/book keeper
1071	Access Ireland refugee social integration project	Ann Moroney	Project Coordinator
1074	Helsinki City North East Social Centre	Pipsa Rusama	Project coordinator
1075	Overlegorgaan integratie vluchtelingen	Koen de Mesmaker	
1099	Internationaler Bund	Ursula Wenzel - Wohlfahrt	Tutorin
1104	Hellenic Red Cross	Dora Papadopoulou	Director of Social Welfare Dpt.
		Zephie Thanassoula	Social worker in charge
1107	Center for Development Information and Education	Maria Teresa di Muzio	Pr Coordinator
		Maria Fuse	Project coordinator selection and evaluation
		Anita Ceraso	M&E
1133	Royal National Institute for the Blind	Egon Walesch	European Policy and Development Manager
		Kishor Patel	Corporate Race Equality Adviser
1009	Steunpunt Multiculturele Ontwikkeling in Noord Brabant	Harrie van Onna	Soc. Affairs and Employment dept. Communication
		Abdi Abdullahi	VWR Teamleader
1023	Red Cross/ EU Liaison Bureau	Ute Mohring	Head of division
1045	Municipality of Holbaek	Jens Hedegaard	International project leader
1125	Instituto Recerche economiche e sociali del Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Ires FVG	Paolo Tomasin	Project coordinator
		Valli Burello	Project pr
		Elisabeth Graziano	Administrative secretary

Fieldvisits B5-99

Project Number	Organisation	Name and Function of Persons interviewed	
203	Kent Committee for the Welfare of Migrants known as Migrant Helpline	Annie Ledger	Chief Executive
		Bronwin Drake	One Step Service Manager
		Wendy Oliver	Financial Controller
205	British Red Cross	Briony Thomas	Regional services development manager
		Keefa Kiwanuka	Refugee Unit Manager
215	Instituto de Migraciones Servicios Sociales	Pablo Gomez T.	Coordinator special programmes service
219	Consiglio Italiano per i	Marilisa Fantaci	Project manager

	rifugiati- Organizzazione non-lucrativa di utilita sociale		
		Daniela di Capua	Supervisor implementation
224	Hellenic Red Cross	Papadopoulou Dora	Project Manager
		Michailidou Penelope	Social Worker
		Dragatis Panagiotis	Social Worker
227	Reintegration centre for migrant workers, refugees department	Artemis Kalavanou	Project Leader
		Marie Papantoniou-Fragouli	Project Leader
233	WOGÉ e.V.	Christine Tuschinsky	Fortbildungsreferentin
234	Behandlungszentrum für Folteropfer e.V	Dr.phil. Angelika Birck	Project management, psychologist
		Ralf Weber	Psychotherapist
		Richard Grünberg	Administrator
		Britta Jenkins	Public relations officer
236	Arbeitsgruppe Entwicklung u. Fachkräfte in Bereich des Migration und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit	Dr. Karin Lutze	Project Manager
		Klaus Dünnhaupt	Director
		Driton Emini	Project Officer
238	Deutsch-Bosnisch-Herzegowinische Gesellschaft e.V.	Cornelia Gilch	Project coordinator
244	Zentrum zur Behandlung von Folteropfern	AD Boda	Project manager
246	Euro-Training-Center e.V.	Frederic Valli	
		Willy Frauenknecht	
247	France Terre d'Asile	Pierre Henry	Director
253	Danish Refugee Council	Nina Lassen	Project Manager
		Louise Holck	Head of asylum department
261	Verein Zebra, Zentrum zur sozialmedizinischen rechtlichen und kulturellen Betreuung von Ausländern und Ausländerinnen in Österreich	Edith Glanzer	Director
		Eva Zipper	Assistant director
210	Göteborgs-Initiativet	Tomas Magnusson	Head of office
		Jasmina Rekić	Project manager
211	intergration -oh flyktningsservice inom utvecklingsnamnden	Lars Rexert	Head of steering committee
		Emma Pettersson	Member of st. Committee
		Johnny Duhr	Controller
		Brigitte Enfeldt	Project Manager
216	Intercooperação e	Arnaud de la Tour	Project manager

	Desenvolvimento		
		Sofia Centeno	Project assistant/supervisor training and monitoring
218	Centraal orgaan opvang asielzoekers	Gerard Slotema	Secretary European Affairs
221	International Organisation of Migration Mission in Italy	Luca dall'Oglio	Chief of mission
		Giulia Falzoi	Head Proj & Progr Implem. Unit
232	Landeshauptstadt München Sozialreferat flüchtlingsamt	Marion Lich	Project Manager
		Regina Ober	Consultant Asia
		Latif Avdyli	Consultant Kosovo
		Sylvia Glaser	Coordinator, Cons. E Europe
235	Verband der initiativgruppen in der Ausländerarbeit	Heinz Soremsky	Executive Secretary
239	Arbeiterwohlfahrt Kreisverband Bremerhaven e.V.	Volker Tegeler	Manager
		Gabi Doliwa	Project coordinator
242	Kreisausschuss des Main-Taunus Kreises - Sozialamt	Joachim Werle	Project leader
		Renate Ogrinz-Ohr	Member Beratungsteam
251	International Organisation for Migration	Jose-Angel Oropeza	Regional representative
		Mirkka Henttonen	Project Coordinator
		Simo Kohonen	Office Manager
254	Danish Refugee Council	Annette Colding	Information consultant
		Vagn Larsen	Head of information dpt
		Asim Perendija	International dpt. Project manager
257	Rode Kruis Vlaanderen	Barbara Janssens	Adjunct-diensthoofd
		Hilde	Opv Pol AZ
		Dhr Coumans	Directeur Vlaanderen
258	International Organisation for Migration	Cecile raillant	Project coordinator
262	International Center for Migration Policy Development	Gerda Theuermann	Deputy Director
		Eva Kitzler	Project coordinator
263	Caritas Österreich	Stephanie Krön	Coordinator

National Resource Persons

Country	Name
Netherlands	Kim van Dooren

Annex IV

Project Data Sheets

Annex IV: Project Data Sheets

Legenda:

Type of project:	In terms of its co-financing from the EC
Year:	The year of financing that was basis for the evaluation. The project may have started before or continued till after that year.
Pr. Ref. Number:	The reference number of the project was it came to us. Sometimes the project organisations may use other Ref. numbers (e.g. the number of the previous year).
Type of organisation:	Public, semi-public, NGO, other (official church organisation, private)
Eligibility:	+ = ok +/- = questionable - = formally not-eligible In case the score is different from + a comment is given
Type of beneficiary:	The <i>main</i> category is given. The following categories were available: -refugees -displaced person -potential returnees -self help organizations -staff, indirect contact -staff, indirect contact local population, local/national other (MS) -service providers, authorities, local organizations (MS) -professionals, enterprises in home country -people in home country, home country other -refugees incl. potential returnees -refugees, asylum seekers, displaced persons -refugees, (rejected) asylum seekers, displaced persons, illegals -n.a. is filled when no answer was given or obtained
Planrealisation:	++ = 125% or more of planned number of beneficiaries were reached + = 90 - 124% reached +/- = 75 - 89% reached - = 50 - 74% reached -- = less than 50% reached n.a= no data available or some data missing
Relative efficiency:	same codes as for planrealisation
Website:	http://www usually has been omitted. We have included this information to assist those who are interested in further information. However, as many projects do not exist anymore, such information may not be anymore available. There may also be other websites providing relevant information.

Please, note: In the following pages, first all 1998 projects are listed, then the 1999 projects.

Projects not included in this Annex:

B5-803	reception (g)	1999	205	file missing or incomplete
B5-803	reception (g)	1999	223	cancelled project
B5-803	voluntary repatriation (i)	1999	259	file missing or incomplete
B5-803	reception (g)	1999	1260	file missing or incomplete
B7-6008	voluntary repatriation (h)	1998	10002	file missing or incomplete
B7-6008	voluntary repatriation (h)	1998	10005	file missing or incomplete
B7-6008	voluntary repatriation (h)	1998	10013	cancelled project
B7-6008	voluntary repatriation (h)	1998	10015	file missing or incomple