

European integration fund

European Integration Fund - General

Background

1. The European Integration Fund (EIF) is a European Union (EU) funding programme, which has the formal title of 'European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals'. It supports the efforts made by Member States in enabling third-country nationals of different economic, social, cultural, religious, linguistic and ethnic backgrounds to fulfil the conditions of residence and to facilitate their integration into European societies. All EU Member States, with the exception of Denmark, participate in the EIF.
2. The EIF is one of the four funds which form part of the EU's General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows. The Fund was established by Decision 2007/435/ EC of the European Parliament and of the Council dated 25 June 2007.
3. Decision 2007/435/ EC, commonly known as 'the Basic Act' established the EIF for the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013. The Decision defined the objectives to which the Fund contributes, the implementation arrangements, the available financial resources, and the distribution criteria for the allocation of the financial resources. It also established the EIF's management rules and monitoring and control systems, which are based on the sharing of responsibilities between the European Commission (EC) and Member States.
4. 'The Basic Act' is supplemented by secondary legislation of the EC. The Commission Decision, 2007/3926 of 21 August 2007 set out the strategic priorities and specific priorities for the EIF. . The Commission Decision, 2008/457/EC of 5 March 2008, as amended by Commission Decision, 2011/177/EU of 2 March 2011, laid down detailed rules for implementation of the EIF, including Member States' management and control systems, rules for administrative and financial management, rules on eligibility of expenditure.

Duration

5. 'The Basic Act' set up the EIF to operate for the period 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013. The Fund was in place for seven EU programme years, 2007 to 2013 with each programme year representing 30 calendar months.
6. Although, the EIF formally ended on 31 December 2013, the rules on eligibility of expenditure permit project related expenditure to be charged to the Fund

until 30 June 2015 and technical assistance spending to be charged until 31 March 2016.

General Objective

7. The EIF's general objective is stated in Decision 2007/435/EC as being:

‘ to support and encourage the efforts made by the Member States in enabling third-country nationals of different economic, cultural , religious, linguistic and ethnic backgrounds to fulfil the conditions of residence and to facilitate their integration into European societies.....’

Specific Objectives

8. The ‘ Basic Act’ lists four specific objectives for the EIF, namely:

- a. facilitation of the development and implementation of admission procedures relevant to and supportive of the integration process of third-country nationals;
- b. development and implementation of the integration process of newly-arrived third-country nationals in Member States;
- c. increasing of the capacity of Member States to develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals;
- d. exchange of information, best practices and co-operation in and between Member States in developing, implementing and evaluating policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals.

Target Groups

9. The target groups for the EIF are defined in Article 1 of the Basic Act in the following terms:

‘ Third –country nationals who are on the territory of a third country and who are complying with specific pre-departure measures and/or conditions set out in national law, including those relating to the ability to integrate in the society of this Member State fall under the scope of this Decision.

Third-country nationals I who have applied for asylum in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken, or enjoy refugee or subsidiary protection status, or qualify as refugees or are eligible for subsidiary protection in accordance with Council Directive 2004/83/EC of 29 April 2004 on minimum standards for the qualification and status

of third –country nationals or stateless persons as refugees or as persons who otherwise need international protection and the content of the protection granted shall be excluded from the scope of this Decision.

Third-country national means any person who is not a citizen of the Union within the meaning of Article 17(1) of the Treaty.’

10. The effect of these clauses is to exclude from eligibility for support under the EIF any individual who would be eligible for support under the European Refugee Fund (ERFIII).

Level of Fund

11. The total sum made available under the EIF for the period 2007 to 2013 was €825 million. Most of the sums are allocated to Member States, but up to 7 per cent of the total is retained by the Commission and used to fund Community actions concerning immigration and integration policy.
12. Member States allocations are determined by a formula which is set out in the Basic Act. Each Member State receives a fixed amount of €500,000 per annum. The remaining available funds are then split with: (a) 40 per cent allocated in proportion to the average of the total number of legally residing third-country nationals in Member States over the previous three years; (b) 60 per cent in proportion to the number of third-country nationals who have received an authorisation issued by a Member State to reside on its territory over the previous three years. A number of categories of individuals are excluded from the calculations of the numbers of third-country nationals, namely:
 - a. seasonal workers as defined under national law;
 - b. third-country nationals admitted for the purpose of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service in accordance with Council Directive 2004/114/EC.
 - c. third –country nationals admitted for purposes of scientific research in accordance with Council Directive 2005/71/EC.
 - d. third-country nationals who have received a renewal of an authorisation issued by a Member State or a change of status, including third-country

nationals who acquire long-term resident status in accordance with Council Directive 2003/109/EC.

Community Actions funded directly by Commission

13. Community Actions funded directly by the Commission must relate to measures applicable to the target groups for EIF. In addition, to be eligible for funding Community Action projects should do one or more of the following:

- a. further Community cooperation in implementing Community law and good practices in the field of immigration and implementing good practices in field of integration;
- b. support the setting-up of transnational cooperation networks and pilot projects based on transnational partnerships between bodies from one or more Member States designed to stimulate innovation, facilitate exchanges of experience and good practice and improve the quality of integration policies;
- c. support transnational awareness – raising campaigns;
- d. support studies, dissemination and exchange of information on best practices and all other aspects of immigration and integration policies, including for the use of state of the art technology;
- e. support pilot projects and studies exploring the possibility of new forms of Community cooperation in the field of immigration and integration and Community law in the field of migration;
- f. support the development and application by Member States of common statistical tools, methods and indicators for measuring policy developments in the fields of immigration and integration;

14. Projects are generally awarded Community Actions funding on the basis of open calls for tenders launched by the Commission.

Eligible Actions in Member States

15. In addition to focusing on the EIF target groups, projects funded via Member States must address one or more of the eligible actions of the Fund that are relevant to the specific objective.

16. The eligible actions relating to the facilitation of the development and implementation of admission procedures relevant to and supportive of third-country nationals objective are:

- a. facilitate the development and implementation by Member States of admission procedures, inter alia, by supporting consultation processes with relevant stakeholders and expert advice or information exchanges on approaches which target specific nationalities or categories of third-country nationals;
- b. render the implementation of admission procedures more effective and accessible to third-country nationals inter alia by using user-friendly Communication and Information Technology, information campaigns and selection procedures;
- c. prepare third-country nationals for their integration into host society 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:

16. The eligible actions relating to the development and implementation of the integration process of newly arrived third-country nationals in Member States are:

- a. set up programmes and activities aiming at introducing newly arrived third-country nationals to the host society and enabling them to acquire basic knowledge about the host society's language, history, institutions, socioeconomic features, cultural life and the fundamental norms and values as well as complement such existing programmes and activities ;
- b. develop and improve the quality of such programmes and activities at local and regional level, with a particular emphasis on civic orientation;
- c. reinforce the capacity of such programmes and activities to reach out to particular groups, such as dependants of persons subject to admission procedures, children, women, elderly, illiterate or persons with disabilities;
- d. increase the flexibility of such programmes and activities, in particular through part time courses, fast track modules, distance or E-learning systems or similar models, enabling third-country nationals to complete the programmes and activities while at the same time working or studying;
- e. develop and implement such programmes or activities, targeted at young third-country nationals, with specific social and cultural challenges related to identity issues;

- f. develop such programmes or activities encouraging the admission and supporting the integration process of highly qualified and qualified third-country nationals;

17. The eligible actions relating to the ' increasing the capacity of Member States to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals ' and ' exchange of information, best practices and cooperation between Member States in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating policies and measures for the integration of third-country nationals ' objectives are:

- a. improve the access of third-country nationals to public and private goods and services , inter alia, by intermediary services, interpretation and translation services and by improving the staff intercultural capacities;
- b. build sustainable organisational structures for integration and diversity management, promote durable and sustainable participation in civil and cultural life, and develop modes of cooperation between different relevant stakeholders enabling officials at various levels to swiftly gain information about experiences and practices elsewhere and, where possible, to pool resources;
- c. develop and implement intercultural training, capacity building and diversity management, training of staff within public and private service providers, including educational institutions;
- d. reinforce the capacity to coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate national integration strategies for third-country nationals across the different levels and departments of government;
- e. contribute to the evaluation of admission procedures or the integration programmes or activities by supporting representative surveys among third-country nationals having benefited from them and/or among relevant stakeholders, such as enterprises, non-governmental organisations and regional or local authorities;
- f. introduce and implement schemes to gather and analyse information about the needs of different categories of third-country nationals at local or regional level by involving platforms for consultation of third-country nationals and for exchange of information between stakeholders and by conducting surveys among immigrant communities on how best to support those needs;
- g. contribute to the two-way process underlying integration policies by developing platforms for consultation of third-country nationals, exchange of information between stakeholders and intercultural, inter-

faith and religious dialogue platforms between communities and/or between communities and policy and decision –making authorities;

- h. develop indicators and benchmarking for measuring progress at national level;
- i. develop high quality monitoring tools and evaluation schemes for integration policies and measures;
- j. increase the acceptance of migration in host societies as well as the acceptance of integration measures through awareness – raising campaigns, particularly in the media.

Strategic Guidelines

18. The Commission Decision, 2007/3926 of 21 August 2008 sets out the strategic priorities and specific priorities for the EIF. The Decision listed four strategic priorities for the targeting of EIF resources, with Member States being required to address all of the priorities. The Decision also referred to five specific priorities which could be addressed under any of the strategic priorities. Where Member States fund projects addressing one or more specific priority, the EU contribution to the project's costs can be increased from the standard 50% to the level of 75%.

19. The strategic priorities agreed by the Commission are as follows:

Priority 1: Implementation of actions designed to put the 'Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union' into practice

Priority 2: Development of indicators and evaluation methodologies to assess

Progress, adjust policies and measures and to facilitate co-ordination of comparative learning

Priority 3: Policy capacity building, co-ordination and intercultural competence building in the Member States across the different levels and departments of government

Priority 4: Exchange of experience, good practice and information on integration between the Member States

20. The specific priorities agreed by the Commission are as follows:

Specific Priority 1: Participation as a means of promoting the integration

of third – country nationals in society.

Actions involving the participation of third-country nationals in the formulation and implementation of integration policies and measures.

Specific Priority 2: Specific target groups

Actions, including introduction programmes and activities, whose main objective is to address the specific needs of particular groups, such as women, youth and children, the elderly, illiterate persons and persons with disabilities.

Specific Priority 3: Innovative introduction programmes and activities

Actions developing innovative introduction programmes and activities, such as enabling third-country nationals to work and study at the same time, e.g. part-time courses, fast-track modules, distance or e-learning systems.

Specific Priority 4: Intercultural dialogue

Actions aimed at encouraging mutual interaction and exchange, such as developing intercultural dialogue, in an effort in particular, to resolve any potential conflict caused by differences in cultural or religious practices, and thus to ensure the better

integration of third-country nationals in the societies, values and ways of life of Member States.

Specific Priority 5: Involvement of the host society in the integration process

Actions addressing effective ways of raising awareness and activity involving the host society in the integration process.

Multiannual and Annual Programmes

21. Member States pursue the objectives of the EIF within the framework of Multiannual Programmes which are agreed between the Responsible Authority of the Member State and the Commission for the entire period of the Fund from 2007 to 2013. Where necessary, Multiannual Programmes can be subject to a mid-term review. The Multiannual Programmes : describe the baseline position in the Member State; analyse the requirements in the Member State in relation to the baseline position; outline the strategy to achieve the Member States objectives including priorities and funding levels; describe how the strategy is compatible with other regional, national, and community objectives; describe the framework for implementation of the Member State's strategy; include an indicative financing plan giving provisional overall and EU contributions by priority and programme year.
22. The Multiannual Programme is implemented by the means of Annual Programmes which are agreed between the Responsible Authority of the Member State and the Commission.
23. Responsible Authorities are required to submit Annual Programmes within an agreed timetable. Annual Programmes must cover: the general rules for selection of projects to be funded from the programme; a description of the actions to be supported; the proposed financial breakdown of the Fund between actions including an indication of the amount requested for technical assistance. Technical Assistance being the costs incurred by the Member State in managing the Fund.
24. Annual Programmes submitted to the Commission can be changed in the light of discussions between the Responsible Authority and the Commission or to reflect developments in the Member State. Responsible Authorities must submit a revised Annual Programme to the Commission if it is necessary to revise the financial breakdown between actions by more than 10 per cent for any action.

25. Once a Member State's annual programme is approved by the Commission, the Commission releases a pre financing payment of 50 per cent of the approved allocation for the programme year. The balance of the funding is payable when the Member State submits its final financial declarations for the programme year and these are accepted by the Commission.

Management and Control Systems

26. A Member State is required to implement its multiannual and annual programmes for the RF in line with a Management and Control Systems (MCS) document agreed with Commission. The MCS :

- a. defines the functions of the bodies concerned with management and control and the allocation of functions within each body;
- b. details how the principle of separation of functions will be achieved;
- c. outlines how adequate resources will be allocated to the management and control functions;
- d. sets out the procedures for ensuring correctness and regularity of Fund expenditure;
- e. describes how reliable accounting, monitoring, and financial reporting procedures will be achieved;
- f. describes the reporting and monitoring system if the Responsible Authority delegates tasks;
- g. outlines the manuals of procedures that are in place;
- h. describes the arrangements for auditing the functioning of the system;
- i. provides the systems and procedures for ensuring an adequate audit trail;
- j. describes the procedures for reporting and monitoring irregularities and for recovery of sums incorrectly paid.

Other Responsibilities of the Responsible Authority

27. In addition to its role in relation to the submission of multiannual and annual programmes, the Responsible Authority for the Member State undertakes the following tasks :

- a. organises and advertises calls for tenders and proposals;
- b. receives payments from the Commission and makes payments to final beneficiaries;

- c. monitors the delivery of project outputs and checks that expenditure declared by projects is eligible expenditure;
- d. ensures that there is a computerised system in place for the accounting records of each action and that data necessary for financial management, monitoring, control, and evaluation is collected;
- e. ensures that bodies involved in the implementation maintain adequate accounting systems;
- f. sets up procedures to ensure that documents relevant to expenditure and audits are retained for appropriate periods;
- g. ensures that the Audit Authority receives all necessary information on procedures and verifications of expenditure;
- h. ensures that the Certifying Authority receives all necessary information on procedures and verifications of expenditure required for the purposes of certification;
- i. draws up and submits to the Commission progress and final reports on the implementation of annual programmes, declarations of expenditure, and requests for payment ;
- j. carries out information and advisory activities.

Responsibilities of the Certifying Authority

28. The Certifying Authority is responsible for:

- a. certifying that the declaration of expenditure is accurate, results from reliable accounting systems, and is based on verifiable supporting documents;
- b. certifying that the expenditure declared complies with applicable Community and national rules and has been incurred in respect of actions selected in accordance with the criteria applicable to the programme;
- c. ensuring that it has received adequate information for certification purposes;
- d. taking account for certification purposes of the results of audits carried out by the Audit Authority;
- e. maintaining accounting records in computerised form of expenditure declared to the Commission;

- f. verifying the recovery of any Community financing found to have been unduly paid as a result of irregularities detected;
- g. keeping an account of amounts recoverable and amounts recovered under the general budget of the European Union.

29. The Audit Authority is responsible for:

- a. ensuring that audits are carried out to verify the effective functioning of the management and control system;
- b. ensuring that audits are carried out of actions on the basis of an appropriate sample to verify expenditure declare, the sample to represent at least 10% of the total eligible expenditure for each programme year;
- c. presenting to the Commission an audit strategy covering the bodies which will perform the audits of systems and actions, ensuring that the main beneficiaries of co financing by the RF are audited and that the audits are spread evenly throughout the programming period.

European Integration Fund in the United Kingdom

Introduction

30. The United Kingdom (UK) has participated in the European Integration Fund (EIF) from the outset and has funded projects in all programme years from 2007 to 2013.
31. The European Integration Fund in the United Kingdom is managed and implemented by the Home Office, with the Responsible Authority, Audit Authority, and Certifying Authority functions being performed by different parts of the central government department.
32. During most of the programming period for the European Integration Fund, the functions of the Responsible Authority were performed an executive agency of the Home Office - the UK Border Agency (UKBA). Following, the abolition of UKBA on 31 March 2013, the Responsible Authority function is now performed within the core Home Office.

Responsible Authority

33. The Responsible Authority for the European Integration Fund in the United Kingdom is the EU Funding Team, which is located in the Finance and Estates Directorate of the Corporate Services group of the Home Office. The EU Funding Team also acts as the Responsible Authority for the other two Funds of the EU's General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' in which the UK participates – the European Refugee Fund and the European Return Fund.
34. The Responsible Authority has not delegated any of its functions to delegated authorities, although some are discharged via service level agreements with other parts of the Home Office or provided under contract by external providers.
35. The costs of the Responsible Authority's work in managing and implementing the EIF is met from the technical assistance element of the UK's annual allocation of programme funds.

Audit Authority

36. The Audit Authority for the EIF in the United Kingdom is the Internal Audit unit of the Home Office, which is part of the Performance and Risk Directorate of the Corporate Services group of the department. The Internal Audit unit also acts as the Responsible Authority for the other two Funds of the EU's General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' in which the UK participates – the European Refugee Fund and the European Return Fund.
37. The Audit Authority outsources project and systems audit work to an external contractor –KPMG. The Internal Audit unit commissions project and systems

audits from KPMG on the basis of an agreed plan. The KPMG outputs are formally reviewed by Internal Audit staff who also oversee delivery of the plan.

Certifying Authority

38. The Certifying Authority for the RF in the United Kingdom is a named individual within the Home Office – Mostaque Ahmed. Mostaque Ahmed is a senior civil servant and is also the Certifying Authority for the other two Funds of the EU's General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' in which the UK participates - the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals and the European Return Fund.
39. Mostaque Ahmed can be supported in his certifying authority role by his own staff or contractors, as appropriate.

UK Apportionment Board

40. The UK Apportionment Board covers the EIF and the other two Funds of the EU's General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' in which the UK participates – the European Refugee Fund and the European Return Fund. It exists to reinforce transparency and impartiality in the strategic apportionment of the Funds and helps the UK to fulfil the partnership arrangements set out in Article 11 of the ERFIII Basic Act.,573/2007/EC
41. The Apportionment Board is part of the UK's Management and Control Systems (MCS) for the EIF and the other Funds. It is intended to be a fair, transparent and semi-independent mechanism which ensures that the Funds are allocated appropriately and in line with the UK's priorities agreed with the Commission.
42. The Apportionment Board carries out the following functions in relation to the EIF:
 - a. reviews and agrees the apportionment of the annual programme funds between 'executing body mode' projects and 'awarding body mode' projects.
 - b. reviews proposals for EIF projects received from the Home Office (and potentially other parts of Central Government) for funding in 'executing body mode' against the criteria set by the Commission and the Responsible Authority, assesses whether the proposals represent value for money, and decides whether or not to approve them.
 - c. reviews and agrees any amendments proposed to the apportionment of the annual programme funds arising from planned revisions of annual programmes.
43. The chair of the Apportionment Board is the Director of Finance for HM Passport Office and UK Visas and Immigration within the Finance and Estates Directorate

of the Home Office. The remainder of the membership comprises senior representatives from:

- a. Department for Communities and Local Government
- b. Department for Work and Pensions
- c. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- d. UK Permanent Representation to the European Union (UKRep)

44. The UK Apportionment Board meets annually and looks at papers prepared by the UK Responsible Authority. Special meetings can be called, as necessary, to move forward the annual programmes of the EIF or other Funds. It is also possible for decisions to be taken 'out of committee' on the basis of documents submitted to the Board. The aim of the Board is to reach consensus decisions, but majority decisions are accepted where necessary.

UK Management and Control Systems

45. As required by Article 30 of the EIF 'Basic Act', the EU Funding Team, as the UK Responsible Authority, has agreed a Management and Control Systems (MCS) document with the Commission. The MCS covers all of the three Funds in which the UK participates. The document is updated periodically to reflect changes to procedures and in personnel.

46. The latest version of the UK MCS, agreed in September 2014, includes the following information;

- a. general information on the three designated authorities (Responsible Authority, Audit Authority, Certifying Authority) and background detail on the Home Office and UK Government structures and policies.
- b. details of where the three designated authorities sit within the Home Office management structure and the names of the lead officials in each authority.
- c. details of the arrangements for payments to beneficiaries and evaluation of projects.
- d. information on the legal status of the designated authorities and the functions carried out directly by the authorities.
- e. organisation charts and resources for the designated authorities.
- f. description of role and functions of the UK Apportionment Board
- g. information on the how the designated authorities were designated.
- h. details of how the separation of functions is achieved.

- i. details of how tasks not carried out by the designated authorities directly are monitored.
- j. description of arrangements for drawing up MultiAnnual Programmes.
- k. description of arrangements for drawing up Annual Programmes.
- l. description of procedures where the Responsible Authority acts as an executing body.
- m. description of procedures for selection and implementation of projects where the Responsible Authority acts as an awarding body.
- n. description of arrangements for the monitoring of projects implemented by final beneficiaries.
- o. description of financial management of projects.
- p. information on handling of irregularities, corrections, and recoveries.
- q. information on first level and Audit Authority audit missions, and Audit Authority report.
- r. details of certification of expenditure.
- s. description of arrangements for evaluation.
- t. description of accounting and bookkeeping
- u. description of reporting to Commission
- v. arrangements for ensuring existence of an audit trail.

UK National Requirements

47. The UK's national requirements for the EIF are in line with the overall objectives of the UK Government in respect of integration. The strategic objectives for the UK in respect of integration at the time the UK's Multiannual Programme for the EIF was agreed were :

- a. to continue to develop simplified admissions procedures that enhance the prospects of migrant integration;
- b. to address capacity issues in respect of language learning;
- c. 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;

- d. 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.

48. These objectives are consistent with the specific objectives of the EIF as set out in the Basic Act, specifically Article 3 (s) and (b) of 573/2007/EC.

UK Operational Objectives

49. The UK adopted four operational objectives relating to integration:

- a. development of admissions procedures that enhance the prospects for the integration of third country nationals;
- b. addressing capacity issues in respect of language learning;
- c. developing 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;
- d. developing 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.

50. The UK's first operational objective related to the development of admissions procedures related to the Points Based System (PBS) for immigration. The aim was to implement a rationalised managed immigration system consisting of a five-tiered points based system relating to the core business functions : management of the entry clearance process for third country nationals wishing to come to the UK for work or study; management of leave to remain or further leave to remain decisions in respect of third country nationals. A transparent, easily understood and well communicated admissions procedure was seen as underpinning all actions in respect of integration and helping to avoid disadvantages to individuals which inhibited their effective integration. The English language component of PBS was seen as a way of ensuring that new migrants coming for work have both the language and vocational skills needed , thus facilitating their early economic, social and cultural integration.

51. The first operational objective was intended to be the focus for actions financed during the early part of the EIF funding cycle – the 2007 and 2008 programme years.

52. The UK's second operational objective related to addressing capacity issues in respect of language learning. A need was identified to respond to greater numbers of migrants requiring language support and to put in place measures that enhanced their ability to either enter or progress in the labour market.

53. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes were seen as contributing directly to assisting economic integration by facilitating entry into employment, but also as contributing directly or indirectly to social and cultural integration. The ability to speak English was seen as helping the migrant to feel less alienated from the host community, and assisting engagement with that community.
54. To address the shortfall in language programmes, the UK intended to use the majority of its EIF allocation to increase ESOL capacity by inviting external organisations to bid for project funding under the Fund. External bidders would also be invited to submit proposals for innovative approaches to language development needs. The second operational objective was planned to be addressed throughout the full funding period for EIF, annual programme years 2007 to 2013.
55. The UK's third operational objective related to the development of 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.
56. The UK aimed to address the third operational objective throughout the EIF funding cycle, by seeking applications for funding from organisations that specialised in providing targeted support to disadvantaged groups.
57. The fourth operational objective for the UK was to develop a clearly defined path to citizenship that ensured that migrants are fully and properly integrated into UK society and are empowered to achieve their full potential.
58. The UK intended to address its fourth operational objective by promoting the concept of earned citizenship, including elements of voluntary activity. This would be a focus for projects funded during the latter part of the EIF funding cycle, annual programme years 2009 to 2013. Supporting additional pre-entry language development for specified categories of migrants was also identified as a possibility for funding under the fourth operational objective in the 2009 and 2010 programme years.

UK Strategy and Key Actions

59. The UK adopted the four strategic priorities for the EIF set out in the Commission Decision, 2007/3926 of 21 August 2008 namely:
 - a. Priority 1: Implementation of actions designed to put the 'Common Basic Principles for immigrant integration policy in the European Union' into practice.
 - b. Priority 2: Development of indicators and evaluation methodologies to assess Progress, adjust policies and measures and to facilitate co-ordination of comparative learning.

- c. Priority 3: Policy capacity building, co-ordination and intercultural competence building in Member States across the different levels and departments of government.
- d. Priority 4: Exchange of experience, good practice and information between the Member States

60. In 2007 and 2008, the UK's key actions under Priority I were designed to be focused on an objective to develop the Points Based System. They included :

- a. development of front end interfaces with the migrant making the application process clearer and simpler, including developing a web based application process and clear eligibility criteria to facilitate self assessment.
- b. improving internal business processes to ensure better customer service.
- c. researching and agreeing appropriate levels of language competence for those seeking entry to work.
- d. delivering guidance and training to staff on new processes and procedures to ensure a smooth transition from one system to another

61. The second objective under Priority 1, enhancement and development of the UK's capacity to deliver language programmes to new migrants, was designed to be delivered throughout the EIF funding period. Key actions identified were:

- a. support for programmes and activities designed to introduce newly arrived third country nationals to the host society.
- b. support for programmes that assist newly arrived third-country nationals to acquire basic knowledge about UK language, history, institutions, socio-economic features, cultural life and fundamental norms and values.
- c. building capacity for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes. This is to cover areas such as work specific language courses as well as general conversational support.
- d. development of specifically targeted programmes aimed at particularly vulnerable groups such as women, youths and children with low literacy levels.

62. The UK's objective under Priority 2 was intended to focus on the assessment of the effectiveness of integration initiatives and, from that assessment, identifying

examples of good practice and developing further indicators. Key actions identified to achieve the objective were:

- a. research and evaluation of current integration policies of the UK.
 - i. impact studies on migrants who have already been through Life in the UK and ESOL routes to highlight strengths and weaknesses with a view to demonstrate ways of improving services to newly arrived third country nationals.
- b. comparative study to examine whether current UK integration policy delivers effective measures of integration of newly arrived third country nationals into the host community.

63. The UK's objective under Priority 3 was to address the issue of intercultural competence, with the aim of improving the knowledge and awareness of migration and migrant issues with key external stakeholders including local government and businesses. During the lifetime of EIF it was intended to finance external projects at a local level that aimed to develop the skills of people dealing directly with new migrants in identifying and meeting their needs in a culturally sensitive manner. It was also intended to utilise some funding internally to increase the knowledge and awareness of policy officials of intercultural issues. Key actions identified to achieve the objective included:

- a. supporting programmes that aimed to share best practice in ways to build bridges between communities, introducing the newly arrived third-country national to the host community.
- b. supporting programmes that aim to develop the knowledge of people, for example, officials in local authorities and government departments, who engage directly with migrants about different cultures.

64. The Priority 4 objective for the UK stated an intention to learn from domestic experience initially and to continue to share information and good practice informally through EU networks. This was expected to provide a good platform for the development of bilateral or multilateral projects with other Member States. The intention was to focus on Priority 4 from the 2010 annual programme onwards. Key actions within the objective included:

- a. supporting programmes on joint projects with other Member States to evaluate integration policies across the EU.
- b. sharing good and best practice.
- c. developing and sharing experience of e-learning and other innovative training approaches.

- d. encouraging a transnational approach to involve newly arrived migrants in voluntary work, peer mentoring and other programmes.

Target Groups

65. The target groups for the EIF in the UK were all of the groups named in the Basic Act, namely:

- a. any third-country national or stateless person having the status defined by the Geneva Convention and who is permitted to reside as a refugee in one of the Member States;
- b. any third-country national or stateless person enjoying a form of subsidiary protection within the meaning of Directive 2001/55/EC;
- c. any third-country national or stateless person who has applied for one of the forms of protection described in (a) and (b);
- d. any third-country national or stateless person enjoying temporary protection within the meaning of Directive 2001/55/EC;
- e. any third-country national or stateless person who is being or has been resettled in a Member State.

Target Groups

58. The target groups for the EIF in the UK were derived initially from the target groups defined in Article 1 of the Basic Act, that is:

- third country nationals on the territory of a third country who were complying with specific pre-departure measures and conditions set out in UK law, including those related to the ability to integrate into UK society.
- third country nationals who were not citizens of the European Union within the meaning of Article 17 (1) of the Treaty.

59. The UK followed the EU eligibility rules in excluding from support under EIF any individual who met the eligibility requirements for support under the European Refugee Fund.

60. The UK also limited the eligibility for EIF to comply with UK legislation and Government Policy. Additional eligibility requirements were introduced as follows:

- third country nationals had to have been admitted to the UK in a category that may lead to settlement.

- third country nationals had to be ‘newly arrived’, defined initially to be around 5 years or less and, from the 2011 annual programme onwards, as around 10 years or less.
- students, seasonal workers, visitors were excluded as these groups have no legitimate expectation of staying long term in the UK.

Level of European Integration Fund in the UK

61. The total sum allocated to the UK for the period 2007 to 2013 was €110.521 million. The level of the UK’s allocation grew from €9.323 million in the 2007 programme year to €29.835 million in the 2013 programme year. The growth was mainly attributable to increases in the Commission’s budget for the EIF.

62. The UK’s Multiannual Programme for the European Refugee Fund, covering the period 2007 to 2013, was submitted to the Commission in June 2008. Following discussions between the Responsible Authority and the Commission, the UK’s Multiannual Programme was approved on 5 November 2008.

63. The Multiannual Programme has not been revised since its adoption. A summary of the [Multiannual Programme](#) as agreed in 2008 is available on GOV.UK.

UK’s Annual Programmes for EIF

64. The UK’s annual programmes for the years 2007 to 2010 have been formally closed by the Commission. Consequently, the Responsible Authority has received all sums due from the Commission and has in turn made all payments to final beneficiaries of the Fund.

65. The table below shows the sums allocated to the UK for the four programme years, the sums made available for spending by beneficiaries in each year, and the actual expenditure incurred on the programme. The table shows the total planned and actual spending on integration activities, described as ‘programmed costs’ and the EU contribution.

European Integration Fund – Allocated Funds and Expenditure for Programme Years 2007 to 2010

Year	Programmed Costs(€)	EU Allocation (€)	Committed by UK (€)	Allocated EIF funds (€)	Expenditure(€)	EU Share(€)
2007	18,653,866.93	9,323,455.61	8,946,925.60	4,685,925.31	10,514,760.35	3,924,553.03

2008	22,067,724.08	11,570,478.54	10,584,508.06	5,687,627.15	4,085,703.97	2,443,269.65
2009	25,787,009.09	13,374,839.81	8,632,653.27	5,535,689.04	6,209,403.60	4,127,217.25
2010	28,312,953.75	15,138,593.75	15,033,251.72	10,174,530.04	11,986,892.15	8,266,246.76

66. The financial declarations and closure reports for the UK's annual programme for EIF in 2011 were submitted to the Commission on 31 March 2014. The closure reports remain under discussion between the Commission and the Responsible Authority and the programme remains open. The figures in the table are provisional.

European Integration Fund – Allocated Funds and Expenditure for Programme Years 2011 – Provisional

Year	Programme Costs(€)	EU Allocation (€)	Committed by UK (€)	Allocated EIF funds (€)	Expenditure(€)	EU Share(€)
2011	34,719,587.83	17,904,293.45	15,275,244.19	10,701,678.12	12,452,255.15	8,874,873.39

UK's 2012 Annual Programme for EIF –Results

67. The UK's 2012 Annual Programme for the EIF funded projects over the thirty months period from 1 January 2012 to 30 June 2014. The financial declarations and closure reports for the programme year were submitted to the Commission on 31 March 2015. The table below shows the allocated funds and expenditure figures included in the financial declaration. The figures are provisional until the annual programme is accepted by the Commission.

European Integration Fund – Allocated Funds and Expenditure for Programme Year 2012

Year	Programmed Costs(€)	EU Allocation (€)	Committed by UK (€)	Allocated RF funds (€)	Expenditure(€)	EU Share(€)
2012	36,935,554.33	24,283,908.00	11,519,771.50	8,776,616.40	10,312,802.46	7,881,962.53

Selection and Approval of Projects

68. The Responsible Authority's written closure report on implementation of the EIF in the UK during the 2012 programme year followed the format laid down in Commission guidance. The report included a full timetable on the implementation of the 2012 annual programme, starting from the Executing Body Mode Call for Proposals issued to the UK Border Agency, Home Office, and Department for Communities and Local Government on 1 September 2011, and the UK Apportionment Board meeting on 20 October 2011, which approved the allocation of the available EIF funds to strategic priorities and the division of funds between awarding body mode (ABM) and executing body mode (EBM) projects

69. The report mentions that the Responsible Authority launched an open EIF Calls for Proposals for new ABM projects in the 2012 annual programme on 11 February 2013, with approximately £10,000,000 being available to fund projects with eligible actions under strategic priorities 1, 3, or 4.

70. The Responsible Authority's targets for the open Call were projects that fell into four distinct categories:

- preparation of third country nationals for their integration into the UK whilst still on the territory of the third country and complying with specific pre-departure measures. Project activities could include the acquisition of English language skills, acquisition of knowledge of the UK's history, institutions, socio economic features, cultural institutions, and norms and values.
- developing programmes to assist with the integration of third country nationals who were legally in the UK with a potential route to settlement. Project activities could include provision of ESOL, pre-employment advice, generic employability skills and signposting to

vocational training, voluntary and community activities and mentoring opportunities.

- policy capacity building, coordination and intercultural competence building in the UK across different levels and departments of government. Activities could be targeted on gathering and analysing information about the needs of third country nationals at local level, or building structures for sustainable integration and developing cooperation between different stakeholders.
- facilitating the exchange of experience, good practice and information on integration with other Member States, focusing on fostering cooperation in the development and implementation of integration policies and measures.

71. A total of 21 applications were received in response to the open Call, of which 4 were rejected during an initial sift, because of missing or inaccessible information. The Responsible Authority's selection panels passed 11 applications at the initial assessment stage. The panels failed 6 applications which did not meet the minimum standard to proceed to stage 2 of the assessment process, including 3 applications which fell below the minimum grant amount for the Call. The acceptance rate for completed applications was 65 per cent.

72. The Responsible Authority held visits and meeting with the 11 applicants successful at the first assessment stage and undertook concurrent checks on the financial position of the applicants, as part of the second stage of the assessment process. This resulted in 1 application dropping out as the organisation was unable to provide information requested to complete the assessment of the project proposal. A further application was rejected at this stage on financial grounds.

73. The 9 successful projects and 2 unsuccessful projects following the completion of the second stage of the assessment process were notified of the outcome on 14 June 2013. The successful projects went on to receive funding from the EIF 2012 programme. In addition, there were 28 projects continuing from the previous year, 10 of which were in their second and final year, with the remaining 18 projects being in their third and final year. Three projects funded in earlier years, that had been expected to continue into the EIF2012 programme, did not continue because of the availability of alternative funding sources or lack of sufficient assurance that the expenditure to be incurred was within the EC and UK requirements for EIF funding.

74. The total number of ABM projects receiving funding from the EIF 2012 Annual Programme was therefore 37.

75. A workshop for the successful projects was held on 28 June 2013. The Commission and Responsible Authority eligibility rules and the monitoring, audit and evaluation requirements of EIF funding were presented in detail. Grant agreements for the new projects were signed between 28 August and 13 September 2013, with the first year of the projects running between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2014. In a new departure for EIF grant, multiyear grant agreements were signed with the 9 projects covering funding for both the 2012 and 2013 programme years.
76. The written closure report notes that there were no projects selected in Executing Body Mode in the 2012 annual programme. It mentions that in its original annual programme submitted to the Commission, the Responsible Authority indicated that a significant amount of funding would be made available to support one of the UK's actions. To take forward the intention to fund EBM projects, an EBM Call for Proposals was issued to the UK Border Agency, the wider Home Office, and the Department for Communities and Local Government on 1 September 2011. There were no applications received before the closing date for the Call on 20 September 2011.
77. The outcome of the EBM Call for Proposals was reported to the UK Apportionment Board at its meeting on 20 October 2011. The Apportionment Board asked the Responsible Authority to undertake further work to identify and develop EBM applications from UK government departments, and agreed to reserve £8,068.363.07 for potential EBM projects in the 2012 annual programme.
78. Subsequent discussions with a number of UK government departments and local government associations did not identify any projects that could be brought forward for EIF funding in the remaining period for expenditure to be eligible for funding from the 2012 annual programme. This led to the Responsible Authority to decide not to proceed with a second EBM Call for Proposals that had been planned for the early part of the 2012 calendar year.
79. At its meeting on 22 October 2012, the UK Apportionment Board agreed that the funds previously reserved for EBM projects in the 2012 annual programme should be reallocated to provide additional funding for ABM projects. The change was reflected in the UK's revised and final annual programme 2012, which was agreed by the Commission on 14 December 2012.

Implementation of the actions of the Programme

Priority 1

80. The written closure report indicates that the UK implemented four actions under Priority 1 during the 2012 programming period. The first two actions related to the preparation of third country nationals for their integration into the UK whilst

still on the territory of a third country. Action 1 provided for projects to receive 75 per cent funding from the European Integration Fund whilst Action 2 provided for projects to receive 50 per cent funding from the Fund.

81. The third and fourth actions consisted of introductory programmes specifically to:

- address capacity issues in respect of language learning;
- develop processes and programmes that help new migrants in general and specific target groups of disadvantaged migrants to become full and active members of UK society;
- develop programmes that provide opportunities for third country nationals and members of UK society to interact with each other through voluntary and community activity, mentoring, etc;
- address issues affecting young people and highly qualified migrants;
- support eligible migrants who want to access the labour market through providing pre-employment advice, generic employability skills, and signposting to vocational training, mentoring, job placement or internship opportunities.

82. Action 3 provided for projects to receive 75 per cent funding from the European Integration Fund, whilst Action 4 provided for projects to receive 50 per cent funding from the Fund.

83. The written closure report includes information on the activities funded under the four actions under Priority 1. A total of 35 projects were co-funded from the EIF to support Priority 1 actions, comprising 16 projects that commenced under annual programme 2010, 10 projects continuing from annual programme 2011, and the 9 new projects. There were 2 co-funded projects relating to actions concerned with the preparation of third country nationals for their integration into the UK whilst they were still on the territory of a third country. Both projects received 75 per cent funding and came within action 1. There were no pre-departure projects co-funded at 50 per cent, and thus no projects fell within action 2. The number of co-funded projects related to introductory programmes was 33, equivalent to 90 per cent of all projects co-funded during the annual programme year. The number of introductory programme projects receiving 75 per cent co-funding was 31. These projects came within action 3. In addition, 2 projects came within action 4 and received 50 per cent co-funding.

84. A total of 95 per cent of all funded projects (35 projects) delivered activities to address capacity issues in relation to language learning. The number of Priority

1 projects that included actions targeting vulnerable groups was 33, equivalent to 89 per cent of all funded projects. A clear majority of all funded projects (25 projects, 68 per cent) included civic orientation elements in their range of activities. The provision of general and practical information, social and legal guidance and counselling was also a majority activity across all funded projects, with 21 projects or 57 per cent of the total providing some activities within the group. A narrow minority of all funded projects, 17 projects or 46 per cent of the total, included Priority 1 actions to promote meaningful contact and dialogue with UK society.

85. Less common activities in Priority 1 projects were: adaptation of public and private services through training and capacity building, health care, intercultural faith and religious dialogue, which were found in between 15 per cent and 21 per cent of all funded projects. Rare activities, which were found in 5 per cent or less of all funded projects, were assistance in housing and means of subsistence and platforms for consultation with third country nationals.
86. The written closure report confirmed that the UK did not implement any actions in support of Priority 2 during the 2012 annual programming period.
87. The UK implemented one action under Priority 3 during the 2012 programming period. The action was described in the revised annual programme as:
- To enhance the knowledge and skills of regional and local government officials in developing policy concerned with integration and building intercultural competence in those areas of local and national government that have responsibility for dealing with migrants and migration issues.
88. A total of 2 ABM projects were funded to support the UK action. Both projects were continuing projects, having been selected originally during the 2010 Call for Proposals. There were no new projects supporting the Priority 3 action. The Responsible Authority did invite bids from projects with eligible actions relevant to strategic priority 3 in the open Call for Proposals launched on 11 February 2013. One application was received with a proposal relevant to Priority 3 actions, but it had to be rejected because of the absence of mandatory documents
89. The co-funded Priority 3 projects covered a limited range of activities ranging from health care to consultations with third country nationals. One activity, adaptation of public and private services, was common to both projects.
90. In line with the revised annual programme approved by the Commission, there were no actions in support of Priority 4 during the 2012 annual programming period.

Results of the Implementation

91. Projects funded under Priority 1, actions 1 to 4 covered a broad group of activities, but all the projects helped to improve language proficiency amongst third country nationals. This result was consistent with the emphasis the Responsible Authority placed on addressing capacity issues in respect of language learning in the 2012 annual programme and in earlier annual programmes for 2010 and 2011, which formed the basis of Calls for Proposals under Priority 1, in both those years.
92. The vast majority of the projects funded under Priority 1, 33 projects from a total of 35, addressed one or more of the specific priorities that activated 75 per cent funding. A total of 26 projects addressed specific priority 2 (specific target groups) in isolation with a further 3 addressing both specific priority 2 and 5 (involvement of the host society). There were 3 projects that addressed specific priority 3 (innovative programmes and activities), on of which also addressed specific priority 5. One project focused exclusively on specific priority 3.
93. More than half of the Priority 1 projects (23 projects; 66 per cent) were delivered by social partner organisations. Six projects (17 per cent) were delivered by education or research organisations and 4 projects (11 per cent) by local authorities. Two projects (6 per cent) were delivered by private and public law companies. Two thirds of the Priority 1 projects (23 projects; 66 per cent) were delivered by a single organisation, with no partners. Where partners were involved there were usually more than one: 23 per cent (8 projects) involved multiple partners, while six per cent (two projects) had only one partner.
94. The most common delivery locations for Priority 1 projects were London (34 per cent; 12 projects) and Yorkshire and Humberside (23 per cent; 8 projects). Slightly over eleven per cent of the projects (4 projects) provided UK wide delivery. Projects were delivered in most regions of the UK, with the exception of South West England and Scotland.
95. There were 10 projects that met or exceeded all of their output targets were:
- British Council
 - Eduwise Limited
 - East London Advanced Technology Training
 - Halifax Opportunities Trust
 - Ipswich CSV Media Clubhouse
 - Learning Unlimited
 - Learning Unlimited English(TaLE)
 - Newham College FE
 - QED-UK
 - Slough Borough Council
 - ESOL Nexus
 - Mutuality
 - Pathways to Professions
 - Integrated Calderdale
 - The Vision
 - Active Citizenship and English(ACE)
 - Teaching and Learning
 - New Directions
 - ESOL Unity through Diversity
 - Migration Excel

96. The 22 projects that met some but not all output targets were:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| • Action Acton | Integration, Citizenship, ESOL(ICE) |
| • Ashiana Community Project Ltd | Integrating in to Birmingham Life |
| • Bradford College | Living and Learning in Bradford |
| • City College, Nottingham | Greetings UK |
| • Doncaster Ethnic Minority
Regeneration Partnership | Learning for All – Removing Barriers
to Citizenship |
| • East London Advanced
Technology Training | The Welcome Club |
| • Groundwork London | Cultivating Communities |
| • ILC Manchester | Mum’s Club |
| • Iranian and Kurdish Women’s
Rights Organisation | Journey to Integration |
| • Jagonari WERC | Positively Integrated |
| • Jobs, Education and Training
(JET) | Tyneside Orientation
and Migrant Support Service
(TOMSS) |
| • London Borough of Haringey | Haringey Welcome |
| • Path Yorkshire | English for Integration
and Work |
| • Path Yorkshire | Integrate Leeds |
| • Portsmouth City Council | In-Those Gateway Portsmouth |
| • QED-UK | English for Work |
| • QED-UK | Living in Britain |
| • Shipley College | Mother’s Tongue |
| • The Arbour Youth Centre | Connecting Mums |
| • The Arbour Youth Centre | Migrant Women’s Empowerment
and Leadership |
| • The Arbour Youth Centre
Social | Migrant Women’s Mentoring and
Inclusion Project |
| • Workers Educational Association
(WEA) South Wales | English Skills for Integration and
Learning |

97. There were three projects that did not meet any of their targets:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| • Burnley Telematics and
Teleworking Ltd | At Home in East Lancashire |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------|

- Hillcroft College, London Blueberry Cake
- Hugh Baird College Migrant Women's Integration Programme

98. An independent evaluation of all 35 priority 1 projects found that the projects had a target of 4,713 participants and that 4,933 people participated across all projects (104 per cent of the target). Numbers varied in accordance with the scale or intensity of activity. For example, the Migrant Women Empowerment and Leadership project, run by the Arbour Youth Centre, was relatively small scale but high intensity (targeting 55 participants with a planned unit cost of £4,624) whilst the Integrate Leeds project, run by Path Yorkshire, was of similar scale but lesser intensity (targeting 72 participants with a planned unit cost of £2,317). Targets for individual projects ranged from 47 to 478 participants while actual numbers varied from 37 to 595 participants.

99. The average number of participants exceeded the planned figure by 17 per cent across all projects. The median number of participants exceeded the planned figure by 4 per cent across all projects. The overachievement on participant numbers was seen by project staff as linked with word of mouth recommendations from family and friends and the structure and content of courses i.e. package of support provided not just ESOL.

100. Although the overall target number of participants was exceeded, performance varied at the level of the individual project. 57 per cent of Priority 1 projects (20 projects) generally met or exceeded their targets. Nearly half of Priority 1 projects (46 per cent; 16 projects) overachieved against their target number of participants whilst a further 11 per cent (4 projects) met the target exactly. The remaining 43 per cent of projects (15 projects) did not meet their target number of participants, including three per cent (1 project) which had an achievement rate of less than 50 per cent.

101. Performance against participant targets varied with the type of delivery organisation. Projects run by social partner organisations had the highest target number of participants (2,829) and the total number achieved narrowly exceeded the target (2,831). However, these projects had the second lowest target and average participant numbers, with only projects delivered by private companies having lower average figures. This possibly reflected the smaller size and more limited capacity of social partner organisations compared to public authorities.

102. Projects run by public authorities were the most successful in meeting their participant targets, with projects run by local public authorities achieving 139 per cent of the target figure and projects run by state or federal public authorities meeting 195 per cent of the planned number. In contrast, projects run by private companies were least likely to meet participant targets (89 per cent).

103. Projects run by public authorities were the most successful in meeting their participant targets, with projects run by local public authorities achieving 139 per cent of the target figure and projects run by state or federal public authorities meeting 195 per cent of the planned number. In contrast, projects run by private companies were least likely to meet participant targets (89 per cent).
104. Almost all priority 1 projects (31 projects) targeted women or other vulnerable groups. These projects aimed to support 5,413 participants (94 per cent of the total number of participants across all EIF projects) and achieved 113 per cent of this target (or 92 per cent of the target for all EIF projects). The range of participants per project mirrors the range for the EIF programme overall (i.e. the lowest and highest target and actual participant numbers for the programme were projects which targeted women and vulnerable groups).
105. The two projects that did not target women or other vulnerable groups achieved 157 per cent of their target number of participants. This is some indication that projects focused on women and vulnerable groups found it more challenging to recruit eligible participants. Possible explanations are that vulnerable groups are harder to reach and engage, and that individuals from these groups face greater barriers to participation. For example, family commitments may prevent participation despite the efforts of delivery organisations to provide support to remove obstacles, through provision of childcare for participants.
106. Projects considered that there was a strong rationale for targeting women as they faced greater barriers to integration, citing lack of English language skills (for example Ashiana Community Project referenced work undertaken by the University of Oxford in their application form and East London Advanced Technology Training cited the findings of their own research) which can limit their access to education and employment leading to them spending a high proportion of their time at home. This in turn can lead to isolation and impact on their ability to engage with day-to-day life in the UK. Projects helped with this by providing English language training alongside activities designed to support integration such as visits to places of interest and mentoring/befrienders.
107. Across the 35 projects there were a total of 345 output targets, of which around two thirds (68 per cent; 235 targets) were achieved (38 per cent; 132 targets) or overachieved (30 per cent; 103 targets). The remaining 32 per cent were underachieved: 16 per cent or 55 targets were 75 to 99 per cent achieved; seven per cent or 24 targets were 50 to 74 per cent achieved; and nine per cent or 31 targets were less than 50 per cent achieved.

108. There was considerable diversity between projects in the outputs recorded. Outputs were tailored to reflect the precise nature of project activity, and the targets for these activities, which varied according to the planned nature and scale of the intervention. The independent evaluator noted that there was likely to be considerable double-counting of individuals across the different output measures for any given project
109. The projects targeting women and vulnerable groups accounted for 324 output targets. This represented 94 per cent of the targets for all EIF projects. These projects overachieved against 35 per cent (121) of their targets and achieved 30 per cent of their targets (104). There were 55 targets, 17 per cent, where the achievement rate was between 75 and 99 per cent of the target. A further 23 targets, seven per cent, had a 50 to 74 per cent achievement rate. A total of 27 targets, eight per cent, had achievement rates below 50 per cent,
110. The most common activities were language training and other skills/training. Interviews with participants suggested that improvement of language skills was generally the main motivation for individuals to engage with the projects. However, only a proportion of language and other skills related outputs were met by projects. The achievement rate varied from 41 per cent, or 15 targets, for other skills/training, to 54 per cent, or 21 targets, for ESOL participation, to 79 per cent, or 15 targets, for ESOL qualification). Challenges in meeting participation targets are likely to have been linked to under-recruitment of beneficiaries, which may be reflected in underachievement.
111. The first of the two Priority 3 projects significantly overachieved on all of its output targets and delivered training in integration issues to many more NHS staff than had been planned. The second project overachieved or met all of its output targets and delivered training to many more local authority staff than planned at the start of the project. The performance of both projects improved over previous years, which was an indication that courses were becoming better known within the participant organisations and were regarded as providing value to attendees.

Other Matters covered by Written Implementation Report

112. The written closure report for the 2012 annual programme for the EIF followed the standard format for reports to the Commission. Sections were included on: the results of technical assistance; problems encountered during implementation' procedures applied when the Responsible Authority acts as an Executing Body; coherence and complementarity with other EU programmes ; assessment of progress in implementing the Multiannual Programme' measures taken to publicise the EIF programmes

UK's 2013 Annual Programme

113. The annual programme was originally submitted to the Commission on 28 February 2013 and formally approved on 6 December 2013. Subsequently, the

Commission requested some technical revisions to improve the presentation of the programme. A revised version incorporating the technical amendments was submitted by the UK Responsible Authority on 12 January 2015 and approved by the Commission on 16 March 2015.

114. UK's 2013 Annual Programme for the EIF will fund projects over the thirty months period from 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015. The financial declarations and closure reports for the programme year are required to be submitted to the Commission by 31 March 2015.

Financing Plan

115. The breakdown of the UK's allocation between actions is shown in the table below.

European Integration Fund – UK Financing Plan for Programme Year 2013 € (Euros)

Action	EU Contribution(€)	Public Allocation (€)	Private Allocation (€)	Total (€)	EU Percentage (%)	Share of Total (%)
Strategic Priority 1 Action 1: Pre Departure Measures 75%(ABM)	991,741	330,581		1,322,322	75	3
Strategic Priority 2 Action 2: Introductory Programmes 75% (ABM)	13,770,081	4,590,027		18,360,108	75	46
Strategic Priority 1 Action 3: Introductory Programmes 50%	1,671,858	1,671,858		3,343,716	50	9

Strategic Priority 1 Action 4: Introductory Programmes 75% (EBM)	7,295,447	2,431.81 6		9,727,263	75	25
Strategic Priority 1 Unallocated	2,122,464			2,122,464		5
Strategic Priority 2	Nil					
Strategic Priority 3	2,759,714	919,905		3,679,619	75	9
Strategic Priority 4	Nil					
Technical Assistance	1,223,387			1,223,387	100	3
Total	29,834,692	9,944,18 7		39,778,87 9	1	100

116. The 2013 Annual Programme includes introductory information about the mechanisms for apportionment of EIF funds and selection of projects in executing body and awarding body mode. This is a more specific and focused presentation of information included in the Management and Control Systems (MCS) document.

Actions to be supported by the Annual Programme

117. The annual programme outlines the funding to be made available under Action 1 of Priority 1: Pre-departure measures to multiple awarding body mode projects selected through external calls for proposals. It describes the purpose and scope of the action, the expected grant recipients, the expected results and the indicators to be used. Expected results are:

- 500 third country nationals to be engaged;
- 2 information related materials packs to be developed;
- Development of sustainable models of good practice;
- Reports on the impact and value of projects;

- Establishment of 2 training centres in third countries;
- 100 third country nationals to achieve recognised qualifications.

118. The annual programme goes on to describe the funding to be made available under Action 2 of Priority 1: Introductory Programmes to multiple awarding body mode projects selected through internal and external calls for proposals. It describes the purpose and scope of the action, the expected grant recipients, the expected results and the indicators to be used. Expected results are:

- Active engagement with all parts of UK society to foster and encourage a two way integration strategy and delivery;
- Provide support and engagement for third country nationals to understand cultural difference and their rights and responsibilities;
- Over 20 projects to deliver Citizenship Training courses to over 200 beneficiaries;
- More than 5 projects to provide basic skills training tests , including ICT, for third country nationals;
- Over 5 projects to provide Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) and Personal Development Plans for up to 1,500 beneficiaries.

119. The third action under Priority 1 included in the annual programme was 'Increase the effectiveness of integration measures addressing the specific needs of vulnerable groups (women, youth and children, the elderly, etc). The action consisted of multiple awarding body mode projects selected through internal and external calls for proposals. The annual programme describes the purpose and scope of the action, the expected grant recipients, the expected results and the indicators to be used. Expected results are:

- At least 2 projects to run pilot schemes within schools to increase capacity in schools for delivery of language development programmes and linguistic support for third-country national children. To include at least 20 final beneficiaries;
- Up to 40 projects to provide English Language (ESOL) training courses. To include at least 500 beneficiaries;
- Up to 40 projects to provide English Language (EAL) training courses;
- Up to 20 projects to provide training in ICT and other technical skills. To include up to 200 final beneficiaries;
- Provide additional support to third country national children in basic skill qualifications (numeracy and literacy training);
- Organise mentoring schemes;

- Working specifically with London Boroughs and Local Education Authorities working with first generation children and their parents to include the parents in integration activities, breaking down language and cultural barriers. To include 25 final beneficiaries

120. The annual programme continues by outlining the funding to be made available under Priority 3: Policy Capacity building to multiple awarding body mode projects selected through external calls for proposals. It describes the purpose and scope of the action, the expected grant recipients, the expected results and the indicators to be used. Expected results are:

- At least 4 projects to organise interaction sessions conducted between the host society and third country nationals. 50 final beneficiaries to be involved;
- Up to 3 projects to develop drop in sessions and study groups held by national or local government to shape local, regional and national policy. Up to 500 final beneficiaries to be involved;
- An assessment of the local approach to integration initiatives in relation to the UK Localism Agenda and Localism Act 2012.

121. The annual programme confirms the intention not to fund Priority 2 or Priority 4 actions during AP2013.

122. Finally, the annual programme describes how technical assistance funding will be used.

Further information on the [list of funded projects](#) is available on the GOV.UK website.

Contact Details

Further information on the European Integration Fund in the United Kingdom is available from:

European Funding Team, Home Office, 8th Floor, Lunar House, Croydon CR9 2BY

Email: EuropeanSolidFundsEnquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk