| CCI | 2014FI65AMNP001 |
|---|---|
| Title | Finland National Programme AMIF |
| Version | 2017.0 |
| Time period covered | 01/01/2014 - 30/06/2017 |

The evaluations are carried out by experts who are functionally independent of the Responsible Authorities, the Audit Authorities and the Delegated Authorities. The Responsible Authority entrusted the evaluations to external experts. The evaluation contractor is a private company KPMG Oy Ab.

Finnish government's central purchasing body Hansel had a framework agreement for these kinds of services. Under this framework agreement it was possible to organize a simplified procurement. The call for tenders was open in March, but there were no offers submitted. We negotiated directly with one of the framework contractors and asked their offer to make direct award of the contract.

The evaluators have adequate expertise because they prepared also the SOLID final evaluations.

The AMIF National Programme is divided into four Specific Objectives: Asylum, Integration/legal migration, Return, Solidarity. Specific Objective (SO) 4, Solidarity is not included in the Finnish National Programme. Altogether 41 projects have been funded and 5 have been finalised at the time of this evaluation.

The primary focus of this evaluation is in the alignment of the funded project portfolio compared to the targets set by the European Commission. The purpose was to make sure that the AMIF fund is progressing in the right direction. At the time of the evaluation only a few of the projects had been completed and the results indicate that the value of this evaluation would be in the alignment of activities to the set targets rather than measuring outcomes against set targets. Nevertheless, the indicators used were also evaluated to provide understanding of the current progress towards targets.

The data used for this evaluation has been collected from several sources, by combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The reporting provided by all the projects funded within this funding period was collected and analysed in this evaluation. As the reporting of every individual project was reviewed, the evaluator evaluated the nature of the activities and results to meet with the definitions stated in the templates.

The data gathered from the project reports was supported by interviews conducted with the personnel of the Ministry of the Interior, but also with other relevant government officials such as the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Employment. Interviews were also conducted with the project developers, especially to evaluate the sustainability of the results and the reasons behind the successes and failures. The actual evaluation of the results and possible impacts were conducted by triangulating the information provided by the project implementers, government officials, and official government reports.

Within **SO 1 Asylum**, a total of 15 projects have been funded. The cumulative budget of the projects is 5,28 million euro with an EU funding share of 3,96 million (75%). S0 1 Asylum aims at speeding up the processing of asylum applications by strengthening cooperation between the authorities, the division of employee resources and professional competence. Efforts within SO 1 increased the effectiveness of the initial phases of the asylum process. Reception conditions have been improved in particular to take into account of the special needs of vulnerable people.

Within **SO 2 Integration and legal migration**, a total of 22 projects have been funded. The cumulative budget of the projects is 7,55 million euro with an EU funding share of 5,67 million (75%). SO 2 aims to promote early integration in cooperation with NGOs, in particular to support the integration of vulnerable third-country nationals; to increase their inclusion and wellbeing and to improve interaction between them and the society. The measures of these projects are also aimed at improving municipal reception capacity and integration services.

Within **SO 3 Return**, a total of 4 projects have been funded. The cumulative budget of the projects is 2,67 million euro with an EU funding share of 2,00 million (75%). SO 3 aims to support the establishment of the system of voluntary return and to develop the contents of detention and its options. The removal procedure will be improved and accelerated by developing identification and obtaining travel documents. As part of SO 3 Finland

participated in specific action MEDCOI4, led by Netherlands, and in the implementation of specific action 5 ERIN - European Re-integration Network, also led by the Netherlands.

During the implementation of the AMIF program there has been a significant change in the operational environment covered by the Fund, as compared to the situation in 2013, when the programme was drafted. The most significant change was the fast and extensive increase in asylum seekers in 2015. The number of asylum applications was ten times higher than average in Finland. During 2015, Finland received the fourth highest number of asylum seekers in the EU, in relation to population size. The increase in asylum seekers reflected also upon the reception centres, actions for integration into society, processing applications, organising voluntary and forced returns for people not granted asylum.

Based on the observations made during the evaluation, the general objectives of the Fund were reached at a fairly reasonable cost. The implementation of the program was started effectively by the Responsible Authority (RA) after the delayed approval of the National Programme (NP). Based on the evaluation, the objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund corresponded to the actual needs of the Member State. The objectives set in the national program are mainly coherent with the ones set in other programs funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work. There are no significant discrepancies in this area.

The key programs considered in the planning and implementation of AMIF were the European Social Fund (ESF), the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and the European Agriculture Fund (EAF). The area of risk in terms of coherence is immigration, as all four funds target immigrants at different stages of immigration. Based on the observations during the evaluation, the objectives are complementary with other policies. The funding instrument most in risk of overlapping with the AMIF targets is the European Social Fund (ESF) with the distinction that as AMIF integration focuses on the early stage of integration, the ESF funded projects are more focused on integration related to employment.

Based on the evaluation, the AMIF funded actions are mainly local or national in nature. However, some actions have an international dimension through knowledge sharing, international cooperation, or applying international standards and methodologies in the funded actions. The current EU support is of significant advantage especially for NGO:s operating as beneficiaries, since they rely heavily on outside funding for their operational activities. Due to the social character of AMIF actions, the coordination of governmental and municipal actors as well as third sector actors is of importance to actions being carried out in an effective and lasting way.

Simplification and reduction of the administrative burden of the beneficiaries has not yet been substantially realized. The change to multiannual program was a welcomed reform. The procedures, reporting and the electronic system still need further development.

The main conclusion and recommendations are:

1. The **electronic system** for application and reporting had several parts which beneficiaries found inconvenient and time-consuming. Thus we recommend to further develop the system and the reporting sheets.

2. In order to ensure that the projects deliver outputs that are aligned with the targets of the fund, the final indicators should be available at the beginning of programming phase. It is recommended, that in the following program period, the EU Commission give a **clear list of**

**indicators** to be collected so that both the national RA and the beneficiaries can better adjust to indicators.

We noted also some **variation in target setting** by projects. If targets are not set in a realistic manner, this may result a situation where some of the projects underperform significantly against the targets set and the high targets also affect the overall performance of the Fund in terms of indicators reached compared to targets. We recommend that the RA makes a more critical evaluation at the project proposal screening stage on whether the proposed targets are realistic.

3. It was noted that the RA has not utilized a log frame approach as part of the planning process for the National plan.  We recommend that a **log frame approach** be used in aligning the project activities and indicators. Using a log frame during the planning phase creates clarity on the impact path between individual activities and long term impacts that the fund aims to have an impact on.

4. **Assessment of sustainability in the final reporting**. The current completion reporting template for beneficiaries does not include a section on where the beneficiary could assess how well the activities of the project has succeeded from the point of view of sustainability. This section could also include planned steps for example for a six month period on how the sustainability of the results could be strengthened after the project has been completed.

5. **Operating support** in ISF-B was a welcome reform and this additional funding made possible to apply funding for operational cost. This supports maintaining and securing the existing important systems as well as promoting usage of uniform EU practices and systems. We recommend to consider whether this can be expanded also to the AMIF.

The National Programme (NP) for the AMIF fund was approved by the European Commission in 2015. The NP that reflected Finland's context and operating environment has changed significantly during the implementation period of 1.1.2014-30.6.2017. At the time the NP was drafted, it was based on the decision that Finland will not participate in the area of solidarity and it was left out of the NP.

The implementation of the fund was delayed as the decision of the EC, regarding the approval of the NP, was delayed and according to AIR approved at the national level in June 2015. Therefore, the first round of calls for new project applications was organised between June 26th and September 4th and the first funding decisions were made in January 2016. Based on our estimate, this created a delay in the implementation of the operations of the fund even though implementation of the program was started effectively by RA. This also had an impact on this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) by the fact that only 5 projects had been completed by 30.6.2017, and a significant number of projects were still in the early stage of implementation.

The operating environment changed dramatically in 2015, as Finland faced an increase in the number of asylum seekers. The number of asylum applications was ten times higher in 2015 than the yearly average in Finland. During 2015, Finland also received the fourth highest number of asylum seekers in the EU in relation to population size. This had an effect on reception conditions, as an increasing number of reception centers had to be established. This effected the projects by increasing the amount of work required for processing immigrants, for example at the Finnish Immigration Service (FIS). Also, the change in the amount of people entering Finland made it difficult to estimate the number of asylum seekers entering the area where a project was operating. This resulted in some projects setting too ambitious targets, as the number of new asylum seekers eventually started to decrease.

Although the number of new asylum seekers decreased from the high numbers of 2015, the pressure in processing the applications to seek asylum, and then directing persons through voluntary and forced returns back to their home countries continued. One of the challenges was the number of people staying in Finland without a permit of residence and not willing to leave through voluntary returns.

Based on the evaluation, there were three challenges that had an effect on the whole fund and how the NP was implemented during 1.1.2014-30.6.2017. Firstly, the delay of the NP approval from the EC delayed the opening of calls for funding proposals until June 26 2015. Compared to the fact that the funding period begun in 2014, we estimate, that this created a delay of at least 12 months in the implementation of the operations of the fund. Due to this, the first funding decisions were made in January 2016.

Secondly, the rapid and significant increase in people applying for asylum in Finland in the second half of 2015 created a challenge in the implementation of the NP. As no funding decisions had been made at this point, this had no direct impact on the project at that time, but the change in the operating environment made it difficult for the project developers to estimate the number of people entering the country during the planned project implementation period. In some cases, this resulted in overestimating the targets number of people to be reached. This tends to create some distortion of the results compared to the target ratio, meaning that when comparing achieved results against the set targets, the results may seem poor, due to the overestimated targets.

Thirdly, there were challenges related to the indicators collected by the Commission. It has been, at least to some extent, unclear until autumn 2017, which are the final indicators of the AMIF fund. In order to ensure that the projects deliver outputs that are aligned with the targets of the fund, the indicators should be confirmed already as the project developers prepare their project proposals.

Other challenges were reported in interviews by the project beneficiaries, concerning operational difficulties, bureaucracy or evaluating the amount of third country nationals (TNC) on the bases of belonging to a certain target group. The IT tool for project reporting was experienced as non-user-friendly. Reporting has caused long loading times and could be more user friendly. Also, an issue regarding the identification of TCNs and whether they belonged to the target group of the fund, was discussed during the implementation period. Based on the beneficiary's experiences, it is often challenging to get reliable information regarding the identity and the status of the person in the asylum seeking process.

**SECTION III: DEVIATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMES IN COMPARISON WITH WHAT WAS INITIALLY PLANNED (IF ANY)**

There have not been any significant changes concerning the NP approved by the European Commission in 2015. Other deviations regarding the NP are that not all target areas defined in the NP received applications through the calls for proposals. However, according to the AIR 2016 the commitment of funds to projects between Specific Objectives was quite even with SO 1 having a commitment rate of 31,5%, SO 2 26,7%, and SO 3 30,4%. Although SO 2 appears to be slightly behind compared to the other SO's, according to the RA, it has received a good number of applications.

| 1 | Effectiveness |
|---|---|

| 1.1 | Specific objective 1: Asylum - Strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System. |
|---|---|
| | The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to strengthening and developing all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension? |
| | During the timeframe of this evaluation, altogether 15 projects have been funded under Specific Objective 1. The cumulative budget of the projects is 5,28 MEUR with an EU funding share of 3,96 MEUR (75 %). Since 30 June 2017, 709 591 EUR (18 %) was disbursed to the projects.<br><br>The aim under SO1 is to improve asylum procedures and reception capacity, prepare a national model for rapid fluctuations in the numbers of asylum seekers and for adapting the reception system, improve reception conditions and ensure sufficient support, legal protection and humane treatment for asylum seekers.<br><br>**1.1. Reception/asylum**, 11 projects funded<br><br>**1.2. Evaluation,** 2 projects funded<br><br>**1.3. Resettlement,** 2 projects funded<br><br>The actions focused on improving the Common European Asylum System by analysing and implementing the best practices experienced among the Finnish public officials on dealing with large number of clients, especially in the early phase of the asylum seeking process. Actions also focused on improving the initial part of the asylum procedure through developing digital solutions to make the flow of information more effective, and to steer the asylum procedure in a coordinated way in the early stages, so that asylum seekers are identified and screened correctly to make the process more effective.<br><br>Actions dealing with data transfer and IT solutions related to improving the Common European Asylum system by connecting UMA information system and the Eurodac register and making use of digital developments by upgrading the UMA actions automatically to the Eurodac system. Also, it was necessary to adjust the IT systems of the Finnish reception system to the changing dynamics in the influx of asylum seekers, as there was a substantial increase of asylum seekers after 2015. This will lead to the asylum service offered being more cost effective and of standard quality for all asylum seekers.<br><br>By improving the statistics on asylum procedure the readiness to collect and analyse qualitative and quantitative data of asylum procedures and reception readiness is made possible.<br><br>The actions focused on promoting the understanding of basic and human rights |

| | among asylum seekers had effects on implementing the legal framework, which in turn improves the Common European Asylum system since asylum seekers are made aware of their rights and obligations in society. |
|---|---|

| 1.1.1 | What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the asylum procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, there were several projects that dealt with strengthening and developing the asylum procedures. Projects that include a more direct impact on reception, are explained in section 1.1.2. The projects that strengthen and develop asylum procedures but have an emphasis on legal framework are explained in section 1.1.3. The projects that strengthen and develop asylum procedures, but have their emphasis in enhancing the Member States' capacity to develop, monitor and evaluate asylum policies and procedures are explained in section 1.1.4.

One project, **Flow - Improving the initial part of the asylum procedure through developing stakeholder cooperation, tools and professional competences** focuses on the practical implementation of the CEAS and on addressing the quality and efficiency challenges faced in the initial stage of the asylum procedure that were caused by changes in the national operating environment. The project utilizes digital solutions which make the flow of information more effective by steering the asylum procedure in a coordinative way in the early stages, by identifying and screening asylum seekers correctly. Thus far training has been provided for 165 persons on asylum related issues.

Another project, **Vamos for young asylum seekers** aims to activate young asylum seekers age 16-29 by developing a therapeutic operating model for increasing their activeness by utilizing a psychoeducational group activity model. The project is active within the Helsinki, Espoo and Vantaa regions where there are many young asylum seekers. This strengthens the quality of life and the performance of the asylum seekers. Also, the readiness to take advantage of integration measures is increased, as asylum seeker youth make Finnish friends and therefore stronger connections to the Finnish society. The project is still ongoing.

Other actions, described in further sections, focused on IT system development. The aim of the IT projects is to increase the effectiveness of the asylum seeking process. The progress achieved through IT projects includes capacity building activities for project staff regarding SharePoint and its possibilities in data management. Other activities are related to the interrogation of TCNs and have been developed in connection to the UMA-system (the national register of aliens). Certain aspects of the interrogation processes are not reported at this stage due to security reasons. Also, international activities have been conducted by increasing collaboration in Scandinavia on identity establishment. The UMA register is under development, but this progress is currently in the planning phase. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Targeting vulnerable groups included building capacity in e.g. psychological welfare and identifying and helping victims of abuse. The actions included organising group sessions by therapists for clients. One of the challenges so far was that there was a lack of shared language among the participants and this affected the collaboration. Also material to support official Finnish government work is being developed. These actions are further explained in the further sections on reception conditions. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1.2 | What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the reception conditions, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | There were several projects targeted towards strengthening and developing the reception conditions. The projects that aimed at developing the quality of reception by enhancing Member State capacity to develop, monitor and evaluate their asylum policies and procedures are described under section 1.1.4.

The project called **services for vulnerable asylum seekers HAPKE 3**, focuses on improving the reception system. The aim of the project is to better respond to the special needs of unaccompanied asylum seeker women who have experienced violence, and to develop preventive measures that can be utilized in reception centres with the current resources. Special attention is paid on single and pregnant mothers, and on building corrective methodologies and knowledge for reception centre workers, in order to support traumatized women. The effects of the actions consist of reception centre workers being better equipped to recognize signs of abuse and risk factors. Information is shared across the national reception system because the functions of the project work in cooperation with the Finnish Immigration Service (FIS) and cover the entire country.

Other funded actions focused on improving reception by improving communication practices between the reception centre staff and the clients. The actions also relate to improving asylum procedures in section 1.1.1. as the improvement in communication has several benefits.

The communication challenges in reception, described earlier also under section 1.1.1., were found to be especially related to the lack of a shared language. It was observed that the lack of communication can delay the efficient implementation of the asylum seeking process, as it may take a relatively long time to acquire translation services to the reception center. It was also seen as a challenge that the illiterate are also the most vulnerable clients. In addition to developing the early phase of the asylum seeking process and reception conditions, the projects also provided input for ensuring the basic human rights for this specific target group.

The language project called **Finnish language says welcome!** aims to support reception centres in receiving asylum seekers by offering accessible language-teaching methods particularly suitable for people in the middle of a crisis and for the illiterate. There has been a rising need for teachers and volunteers to offer |

| | |
|---|---|
| | accessible and easy ways of learning the Finnish language, particularly for vulnerable asylum seekers. The effects of the project consist of giving vulnerable clients access to language learning, which may be otherwise challenging if the student does not have previous knowledge or reading, writing and learning foreign languages. <br><br> **PICCORE - Picore Communication in Reception Centers** aims at adding picture communication in situations where there is no common language, as a tool for communication and support for the interpreter. As a uniform tool for communication, the method will improve the cost efficiency of the reception centres. It will also strengthen the self-expression of the asylum seekers and thereby also strengthen their human rights. The materials gained from the project will help the day to day work in the reception centers with communication problems. The project has commenced in 2017 and is still ongoing. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1.3 | What progress was made towards the achievement of a successful implementation of the legal framework of the qualification directive (and its subsequent modifications), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | The AMIF National Programme states that Finland aims to ensure that asylum seekers have sufficient support, legal security and humane treatment during the asylum process. There were altogether three projects funded under the AMIF contributing to this target area. <br><br> One project called **promoting understanding of basic human rights and preventing crimes of asylum seekers, TURVA-project.** The effects of the project actions consist of promoting the understanding of basic and human rights among asylum seekers and therefore also of the Finnish society as a whole. The project has commenced in 2017 and is ongoing. <br><br> The project called **the state and developing of the general legal advice of asylum seekers in Finland** aims to clarify the current situation regarding the possibility of getting legal services to support the asylum process. The current situation, according to the project implementer, is that the clients are offered legal services by legal professionals in pro-bono group sessions only in the capital Helsinki transit centres. This means that in certain other cities and reception centres asylum seekers are provided legal information only by reception workers or instructional DVD's, which in turn does not guarantee equal status for all. The situation is especially difficult for vulnerable asylum seekers, such as the illiterate, victims of trauma and unaccompanied minors who have even more difficulty in getting access to the necessary legal information. Based on the evaluation the project aim is aligned with the target of providing sufficient support and legal security to asylum seekers. <br><br> **Children's expertise by experience in reception service** targets children as a |

| | |
|---|---|
| | specific vulnerable group and aims to build an experiential model drawing from the experiences of children and unaccompanied minors who have arrived in Finland. The project was considered as a human rights project as it supports the legal security of children and especially children travelling without a parent, but it was also considered to have an integrative element due to the nature of its activities. The project aims at reaching its targets by strengthening the skills of the people working with the target group by developing their capacity to learn how to adopt the experience model when dealing with child asylum seekers. This in turn will lead to the children receiving better protection, active action and information sharing in peer groups and the opportunity to be an active citizen in the future.<br><br>The progress achieved under 1.1.3. includes legal assistance provided for clients. Information was provided for the target group and government officials. People were also interviewed. The difficulties encountered included, for example, the identification of people in need of legal support. Also the number of clients varied which caused the project targets to be relatively high compared to the outcomes reached. Other activities and progress achieved included information sharing through news and photo gallery. Some difficulties were reported in finding volunteers willing to participate as experience experts, which delayed the project activities to some extent. However, despite the challenges faced, the projects contributed to the long term goals of the fund and were able to reach moderate results. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1.4 | What progress was made towards enhancing Member State capacity to develop, monitor and evaluate their asylum policies and procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | The targets defined in the AMIF National Programme state that the data collected from the asylum seeking process and reception system will be produced and compiled into statistics. It also states that information collection and analysis will be developed during this AMIF funding period.<br><br>The projects that were considered to fall under this target in the evaluation focused on the development of information collecting and analysis related to asylum seeking and reception processes. The projects aim at developing the quality of reception procedures. Therefore, these projects also contribute to the development of the reception procedure under section 1.1.2.<br><br>Several projects dealt with the development if IT–systems and data collection. **Euro-Auto dealt with developing UMA-Eurodac data transfer integration**. Because of the Eurodac EU regulation, the Member states have an obligation to save more data than previously and also to enhance the updating of the asylum seeker data. The updating and saving of data is now conducted manually in a separate software (EMC) which makes the follow-up procedures challenging since UMA and Eurodac are not connected. As a result of the project, the |

efficiency of official government work has been improved by automatizing information transfer between the UMA (register of aliens) and the Eurodac systems. The project has also had an international effect as the national system in Finland was compared to systems used on some other EU member states. Based on the evaluation the project has contributed to the AMIF long term targets and achieved the project related targets well.

**Vasuma- Adjusting the IT systems of the Finnish reception network to the changing dynamics in the influx of asylum seekers.** The goal of the project actions is the specification, implementation, testing and adoption of the new Umarek (reception client register) functionalities in the UMA used by the FIS. There is a need to develop the system because of the substantial increase of asylum seekers after 2015. The project is national and covers the entire reception system. The effects of the project consist of making the asylum procedures faster, the reception more cost effective, and improving its equal quality for all asylum seekers. Approximately 1875 reception centre workers will be taking part in the courses.

**Migstat- improving Statistics on Asylum Procedure and the Reception System** aimed to improve the Member States' readiness to collect and analyse qualitative and quantitative data of asylum procedures and reception readiness. The project also meets the national goal of supporting the qualitative reception of asylum seekers and the asylum process by producing info, tools and reports to make the governmental actions more effective and targeted. The project has an effect on both the asylum and the reception conditions. The asylum procedures are made more effective and targeted as the personnel gain access to information on the current status in the reception centres and thereby can act more effectively, e.g. in placing asylum seekers in the reception centres with vacancies.

**LAAVA quality management - as systematic approach for evaluating and creating statistics on the quality of asylum decision making.** The aim of this project is to develop a methodology for allowing to track the quality of the asylum procedures numerically, and to create visual statistics. The effects of the project actions allow systematic comparison on the quality of the asylum decisions, with regard to legislation, timeliness and regional coherence.

Other actions were targeted at health protocol and data collection. **Developing a health examination protocol for asylum seekers** aims at developing a national operating model for evaluating the state of health and welfare of the people seeking asylum. The protocol ensures that systematically collected reliable data can be used to evaluate and follow-up the state of health among the asylum seekers. Based on the evaluation, this aim is aligned with the target of developing the beginning of the asylum seeking process. This is done by creating a clear procedure on how health checks are performed, but it also increases the information for public officers regarding the health of the asylum seekers and contributes to their legal rights on health services.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.1.5 | What progress was made towards the establishment, development and implementation of national resettlement programmes and strategies, and other humanitarian admission programmes, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Based on the evaluation, there were projects that dealt with the establishment, development and implementation of national resettlement programmes and strategies. Both projects were implemented by smaller municipalities with less than 50 000 residents that without previous capacities for receiving resettled persons.<br><br>The **KARIBUNI – welcome** project aims to develop the integration capabilities and initial stage direction and coordination of quota refugees to the municipality of Nurmijärvi. In 2017 27 Congolese persons were expected to move to Nurmijärvi, but the final number included another 16 persons. The project has progressed according to timeline, and a large part of the target group can manage independently in the society using the Finnish language. The project has also been able to modify its actions based on the wishes of the target group, for example by organising an info session on money and financial management, which was much appreciated. The project also gained some information on Swahili refugees that can be shared with other organisations receiving Swahili refugees.<br><br>The **VIEKKU** project aims at creating the readiness to receive and integrate quota refugees in the Rautalampi municipality, which has not previously had the capacity for reception. Rautalampi is planning on receiving 20 quota refugees yearly in the years 2016-2019 (80 persons in total). The project is progressing well. The beneficiaries of the VIEKKU project made a notable observation: Ramadan and the light summer nights of Northern Europe have, to some extent, been stressful to Muslim immigrants and have taken some focus away from the project activities. The activities have included information sharing for example on living conditions and health care services in Finland in the municipalities and among the refugees. Also leisure activities such as food clubs have been organised for the refugees. It should be taken into account that there are some deviations in the number of TCNs in the municipalities which may impact on how the projects manages to reach the set targets.<br><br>Both the funded projects have made progress in the development and implementation of resettlement programmes and strategies on a local level. The knowledge gained from the actions can be shared nationally with regard to the possible future actions in other small municipalities without previous capacities for resettlement. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.2 | Specific objective 2: Integration/legal migration - Support legal migration to the Member States in line with their economic and social needs such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and promote the effective integration of third-country nationals. |

| | The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to supporting legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and to promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals? |
| --- | --- |
| | The aim under SO2 is to promote the integration of third country nationals through early- stage measures carried out in collaboration with NGOs, to support particularly the integration of third-country nationals in a vulnerable position, to increase their social inclusion and well-being and to improve their interaction with the receiving society. Actions include improvement of the reception capacity and integration services of municipalities. Another aim is to carry out information and publicity measures in the countries of origin.<br><br>During the timeframe of this evaluation, altogether 22 projects have been funded under Specific Objective 2. The cumulative budget of the projects is 7,55 MEUR with an EU funding share of 5,67 MEUR (75%). Since 30 June 2017, 636 729 EUR (11%) were disbursed to the projects.<br><br>**2.2 Integration, 19 projects funded**<br><br>**2.3 Capacity, 3 projects funded**<br><br>The fund is contributing towards legal migration by improving the TCNs' mental health and focusing emphasis on creating trust between Finnish health care officials and TCNs. In addition to this, other activities were focused on improving the collaboration of TCNs and municipalities in improving health and social matters.<br><br>Economic and labour market needs were supported by developing a technology service related to immigration procedures of employment based immigrants. The development under this funding period includes connecting the employers into the system.<br><br>The activities towards integration of third country nationals included several different types of projects. Project activities are focused on language learning, supporting the use of Finnish governmental services through online videos, and co-creating activities to support their participation in various leisure activities. Support was provided for the TCNs to making their living conditions home-like.<br><br>The results achieved by the projects by 30 June 2017, under Specific Objective 2, are in total: 918 target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures, 210 assisted through measures focusing on education and training, 135 people received assistance in the area of housing, and finally 573 people assisted through measures related to democratic participation. |

| 1.2.1 | **What progress was made towards supporting legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?** |
| --- | --- |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, there were no projects that dealt with supporting legal migration to the Member States. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.2.2 | What progress was made towards promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Several actions dealt with effective integration of third-country nationals.

**Egalitarian Citizen** aims at increasing the knowledge of society among vulnerable immigrants who seek guidance from mosques in Helsinki, by creating forums for dialogue among the Muslim population and the governmental agencies dealing with integration. The effect of the project is that a connection is established between Muslim actors and government officials.

Some projects were targeted towards coordinating integration efforts with third sector actors. **City of Orimattila Integration** and **Voima – Cooperative force for integration** aims to coordinate the organisation of volunteer work between municipalities and organisations. As a result, more opportunities are offered for TNCs to take part in different spare time activities. **Kick.start for Finland** aims at offering volunteer based immigrants diverse action options in order to support integration in a qualitative way, both in a city and countryside environment.

Other actions were targeted at building actions in areas where there have not been previous cooperative activities or the activities have ended. **Building Bridges** and **Our common municipality** aim at supporting vulnerable asylum seekers' integration through the active participation of the municipality. The effect of the projects is that TNCs receive equal and customer-oriented services in these geographic areas.

Other actions were carried out especially upon building housing efforts to facilitate integration. **Alternative Family Care project - knowledge and skills for working with unaccompanied children and reception families** aims at giving minors coming to Finland without a guardian housing with a family or in family like conditions. **Home in the city - Training in housing skills for refugee youth and families in Espoo and Oulu** provides coaching and practical training in housing skills for immigrants in order to prevent housing problems and homelessness, especially targeting the youth and families with children. The actions of these projects strengthen the integration of third country nationals with regard to basic needs such as housing. This, in turn, strengthens their sense of inclusion in society.

Other projects focused on interactive actions. **KEPELI- Integration through bodily and game related approaches** aims at making integration effective through bodily and game methods for life control and knowledge of society. Thereby the TNCs gain a better knowledge and readiness to apply for schooling and for jobs, which is an integral part of integration into society and meaning of life. **Hundred Apple Trees - Multicultural Finland** aims to support integration services development by workshops that strengthen youth identity and readiness |

| | |
|---|---|
| | to act in society.

Some actions were focused on the integration of TNCs in a bilingual society. Approximately 5.3 % of Finnish residents speak Swedish as their mother tongue (Statistics Finland). **Come In!** aims at improving integration in the bilingual municipalities for better adaptation of refugees into society. **Friends** project aims at increasing the two-way mutual integration with a focus on youth immigrants and majority population through task solving in mixed groups.

Other actions were aimed at targeting integration through a healthcare aspect. **MATEAS - Immigrants as clients at healthcare services project** develops a model for introduction to ease the interaction of TCNs at health stations. The effect of the project is that trust is established and dialogue enhanced. Audio-visual material is distributed in several different languages. **BERRIES - to encourage Integration of Immigrants through the Health and well-being project** promotes immigrant health and future social- and healthcare professionals' knowledge. **MIELI - Preventive mental health model for immigrants** increases the mental wellbeing of TNCs by preventing mental health problems and by developing a model for multidisciplinary cooperation, as the current municipal resources are not adequate to meet the needs.

Other actions are targeted on the development of the IT-system and applications. **Developing cultural functioning measures and mobile application in initial assessment** develops a culturally sensitive evaluation model for performance ability to be used at the initial stage of integration. **The power of associations in integration** creates an IT -system that collects all actors for better effectiveness in immigrant integration. **Finnish in your Pocket project** develops a service portal showing videos of the Finnish way of operating for example when purchasing items from a local store. **MyIntegration** aims at developing an electronic service portal for third sector and other governmental actors. This in turn will make the dialogue between actors more efficient and the initial integration of TCNs more flexible. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.2.3 | What progress was made towards supporting co-operation among the Member States, with a view to safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Based on the evaluation, there was one project that supports cooperation among Member states and capacity building of integration and legal migration.

**Rotating Immigration Officer - RIO** aims to make the immigration of persons coming to Finland more effective by developing a process that is cost-effective and qualitative. RIO develops the actions in cooperation with the representatives of the country of origin. The increase in immigration and reuniting of families brings pressure to make the processes in the first asylum procedures more effective. This is done through visiting countries of origin of those persons that apply for asylum, giving them schooling and conducting interviews with applicants by electronic devices, such as Skype. There is a need to screen |

| | |
|---|---|
| | applicants especially in countries where documents are counterfeited.<br><br>The project is in the early phase of the implementation with no reported progress. The aims is that the ability to target and focus the UMA-registration statistics will give a better picture of the volumes of immigration for political decision-making.<br><br>The project is international in nature, it works in Asia, Africa and the Middle-East. There are several countries that are involved in this process and the RIO needs to travel to these destinations to develop the process and identify the specific challenges in each area. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.2.4 | What progress was made towards building capacity on integration and legal migration within the Member States, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Based on the evaluation, there were three projects targeting capacity building on integration and legal migration. RIO was described more in detail under section 1.2.3. The other actions were targeting immigration authorities, the business industry, employers and foreign workers.<br><br>According to the national **Immigration 2020 strategy** Finland wants to support labour migration based on economic and social needs and the real needs of the labour market. Due to the rising numbers of immigrants, there is a need to clarify the entry procedure and improve its functionality. The **Work it!** project aims at bringing employers their own section in the digital **Enter Finland-**service platform so that a growing number of applications and employer applications can be done also in an electronic format. The Enter Finland network and mobile service was published in June 2015 for job applicants. The project actions will improve the handling and saving of employer notifications in the UMA which makes the information available more up to date. The development of work-related immigration will gain indirect benefit depending on the volume of immigration of approximately 10-40 million euros/year.<br><br>**The theme website for follow-up of integration efforts project** produces a knowledge website on the TNC health and wellbeing indicators. There has not been a common database for this previously. Now it is possible to generate information on a regional level and also to sort this information by specific features, such as education. Information on education and interruption of education is important since these challenges often effect the ability of the individual to find employment. The thematic website is based on the same principle as the indicators reported by the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment. The project has progressed well even though it encountered some delays with the request for indicators from the Ministry. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3 | Specific objective 3: Return - Enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States, which contribute to combating illegal immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit. |
| | The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to enhancing fair and effective return strategies in the Member States which contribute to combating illegal immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit? |
| | During the timeframe of this evaluation, altogether four projects have been funded under Specific Objective 3. The cumulative budget of the projects is 2,67 MEUR with an EU funding share of 2,00 MEUR (75 %). Since 30 June 2017, 261 810 EUR (13 %) was disbursed to the projects. <br><br> The activities and targets of the four projects funded under Specific Objective 3 were related to supporting and accompanying returns, with special emphasis on monitoring and transparency, developing processes to avoid large numbers of people staying in Finland without a permit of residence, and developing systems for voluntary returns. <br><br> The results of the two projects reporting during the evaluation period have provided return-related capacity building for 351 people and monitored altogether 19 removal operations. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3.1 | What progress was made towards supporting the measures accompanying return procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Based on the evaluation, there were three projects targeted towards return and furthermore one project targeted towards forced return. <br><br> The **Establishing voluntary return** project supports the reception centres and Finnish Immigration Services by developing a new system for voluntary return. The task of voluntary return is new for these entities as of 2015. There is a need to develop the necessary initial actions such as changes in the IT-system, schooling of personnel and communicating the changes to clients and stakeholders. The effects of the project actions consist of making the voluntary return of third country nationals more fluent and effective, as there is a process in place for this. <br><br> The **VAPA - enhancing voluntary return** project develops the steering of voluntary returns in reception centres, in order to prevent illegal residence. This is done by communicating the realities of staying in the country as an illegal resident, as some of the asylum seekers that are not given a residence permit may choose to stay in the country even though they are no longer in scope of the integration or reception centre services. <br><br> The need for return measures has increased since a large number of asylum |

| | |
|---|---|
| | seekers will not be given a residence permit. There is also no methodology in use in Finland for the return of unaccompanied minors. This creates a need for training and developing measures for the Police to be able to carry out these actions in an effective way.  The long-term effects of the project actions consist of reducing the number of illegal immigrants receding in Finland, which in turn increases societal safety since, as these people are no longer receiving governmental services. The **Repatriation** project also corresponds to these actions, and is explained more in detail in section 1.3.2. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3.2 | What progress was made towards effective implementation of return measures (voluntary and forced), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | Based on the evaluation, the three projects targeted towards return, and one project targeted towards forced return all correspond to achieving progress in the implementation of return measures.<br><br>**The Repatriation** project is aimed at developing the return operation implemented by the National Police Force. The focus of this project was to prevent a situation where a large number of people would stay in Finland without a permit of residence. The planned activities include the development of procedures related to acquiring travel an identification documentation.<br><br>Other activities that were funded under this target aim at supporting the reception centres and the FIS in developing a new system for voluntary return. Since this task is a new task for these entities as of 2015, there is a need to develop the necessary initial actions such as changes in the IT-system, capacity building of personnel and communicating the changes to clients and stakeholders. The aim is to make the voluntary return of third country nationals more fluent.<br><br>The **VAPA – Enhancing Voluntary Return** project aims at reaching a significant number of people working in the reception centres. They organised a seminar with IOM (International Organisation for Migration) representatives from Iraq. Activities focused also on developing the UMA (register of aliens) and integrating a function for voluntary return into the system.<br><br>Other activities, targeted at voluntary returns, included the making the steering of voluntary return in the reception centres more effective, in order to prevent illegal residence by promoting voluntary returns. This is done by recruiting counsellers to the reception centres to improve the communication of the reality of staying in the country as an illegal resident and emphasising the possibility of voluntary return. This is considered important since some of the TCNs not provided with a residence permit may choose to stay in the country. The target of voluntary returns has not been fulfilled, as according to the project less than 50% of the anticipated returns have taken place. Therefore, this project is targeted towards increasing the knowledge on voluntary return and the negative aspects of staying as an illegal immigrant. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Developing Monitoring of Forced Returns** focused on supporting the/ accompanying of returns. The aim of the project is to develop the independent and external monitoring of the forced returns and make them permanent, according to EU directives and international legislation. Thereby the transparency and due legal processes are strengthened for the immigrants being returned, with regard to basic and human rights. There is international cooperation between the European Boarder and Coast Guard Agency Frontex and other EU Member States who do monitoring of returns. From this perspective, the project also contributes to the section 1.3.3. on co-operation between Member States.<br><br>During the evaluation period, the project gained progress on educating Finnish Police officers, judges and other personnel working with return matters. It was agreed upon that the Police will provide reports of returns of individuals and groups. Procedures regarding reporting the use of excessive force by the Police in return situations were also agreed upon. During collaboration with the **Forced Return Monitoring II Programme** information was received that a specific reporting template for monitoring purposes will be developed and this will be also used in the monitoring work done in Finland. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3.3 | What progress was made towards enhancing practical co-operation between Member States and/or with authorities of third countries on return measures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | No specific projects were targeted on enhancing the practical operational co-operation between the Member States, but this aspect was part of the project activities. There was international cooperation on sharing return related documentation and best practices. Also specialists from third countries visited the projects and provided capacity building and knowledge sharing on return related issues. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3.4 | What progress was made towards building capacity on return, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress? |
| | The projects implemented under Specific Objective 3 include various capacity building activities. Capacity building has, and will, according to the project plans, be provided to Police officers, people supervising return operations, and people working on other return related matters. The capacity building has been focused on supervisory procedures, and sharing best practices among the Member States. Capacity building on voluntary return matters has also been organised for people working in the Finnish Immigration Service.<br><br>The capacity building activities conducted have so far reached good results considering that the implementation is still in progress. There has also been |

| | capacity building for both forced and voluntary return and the activities have included international cooperation among Finland and other Member States. |
|---|---|

| 1.4 | Specific objective 4: Solidarity - Enhance the solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation. |
|---|---|
| | The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to enhancing solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation? |
| | Specific Objective 4: Solidarity was not included in the Finnish AMIF National Programme. |

| 1.4.1 | How did the Fund contribute to the transfer of asylum applicants (relocation as per Council Decisions (EU) 2015/1253 and 2015/1601)? |
|---|---|
| | Specific Objective 4: Solidarity was not included in the Finnish AMIF National Programme. |

| 1.4.2 | How did the Fund contribute to the transfer between Member States of beneficiaries of international protection? |
|---|---|
| | Specific Objective 4: Solidarity was not included in the Finnish AMIF National Programme. |

| 2 | Efficiency |
|---|---|

| 2 | The overall question: Were the general objectives of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost? |
|---|---|
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Based on the observations made during the evaluation, the general objectives of the fund (strengthening the asylum seeker system, integration and legal migration, as well as developing return strategies) were reached at a fairly reasonable cost.

The total cost of the AMIF budget, divided between 41 projects, is 15 513 330 EUR of which EU funding amounted to 11 634 998 EUR. By 30.6.2017 the utilized EU funding was 1 607 131 EUR, which amounts to a total of 14 % of the total EU funding granted for the projects. Since a large number of projects have not yet received funding, it can be concluded that some objectives have yet to gain results and therefore the general picture of the objectives being met can be distorted as their actions have not been finalized. At the time of the evaluation only 5 projects had been completed. The RA does not grant payments in advance, which means that payments follow actions which may have started later than anticipated. This also influences the number of projects finalized at the time of the evaluation.

Based on our interviews, there is an economic analysis in place to evaluate whether the costs are realistic and reasonable. During the evaluation of which actions to fund, the Responsible Authority (RA) does an economic evaluation of the actions with regard to budgeting. The RA does the evaluation based on the background information given and, acquires further information, if necessary.

The RA does a cost evaluation before choosing which projects to fund, taking into consideration whether the costs are realistic or whether they are budgeted higher or lower than necessary. If necessary, the RA cuts the costs of the funded actions in relation to its targets. This is done in cooperation with the beneficiary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.1 | To what extent were the results of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost in terms of deployed financial and human resources? |
| | Of the 41 projects funded by the Fund, there were 14 projects that were HR heavy projects (HR costs amount to over 75 % of the project budget). As can be expected, the HR heavy projects deal mostly with the following matters: the development of operating models and methodologies, protocols, communicational tools, service portals, databases.

The remaining 27 projects, where the HR costs were smaller, dealt mostly with the development of IT-systems or applications, the development of better networks between municipal actors, and cooperation with third sector actors.

SO 3 Return had the highest financial and HR costs (relatively), which is understandable since Finland has not previously had methodologies in place for these types of actions. International cooperation is required in the return missions, and the need for more actions within the area of forced and voluntary |

| | |
|---|---|
| | returns has increased since 2015.<br><br>The human resources costs are evaluated by the Responsible Authority during the application phase in order to detect if the amount of work is reasonable or not. Also there is a benchmarking done against actions taken in previous program periods to decide if the costs of human resources are reasonably budgeted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.2 | What measures were put in place to prevent, detect, report and follow up on cases of fraud and other irregularities, and how did they perform? |
| | The main measures for eliminating fraud and other irregularities are taken by the Responsible Authority (RA) during the evaluation phase, where actions are evaluated based on if they should receive funding. The evaluation process relies on the fact that projects need to meet a certain criteria, for example with regards to the objectives of the National Programme but also what the singular project aims to reach with its targets.<br><br>During the evaluation of which projects to fund, the RA does a comprehensive risk assessment of each chosen project. If possible risks are identified, the RA interferes and takes actions before the decision to fund is taken. The actions may include benchmarking towards previous projects or enquiring additional information from the implementer on the questionable risk. This way the RA attempts to address and intervene into possible risks before any funding is given.<br><br>According to the interviews, more responsibility has been directed to the RA by the EU Commission since the previous SOLID –funding period. This has provided the RA more authority to organize the financial risk management procedures of the fund. However, the EU Commission has provided some requirements to ensure that there is sufficient alignment of controls in each of the Member States.<br><br>During the current funding period, each project is required to conduct an external audit as part of the final project reporting. Financials are also reviewed by the RA during the project implementation period and the RA's comments on the financial reports are documented as part of the reports.<br><br>The funding requirements for the project beneficiaries have been increased since the previous funding period. Within the current fund the RA requires the organisations to have sufficient financial resources to implement the projects until reimbursements are made. Advance payments are possible if the applicant meets a certain criteria and the need for the advance payment is well justified. This is one of the actions that decreases funding risk. On the other hand, this creates challenges for the smaller non-governmental organisations to apply for financing from the Fund. This was also an area of discussion in the interviews with both RA representatives and project developers. The downside is that the current template for funding proposals includes a deductible requirement from each of the project partners.  This funding challenge cannot be overcome by |

| | partnering with a larger partner with more financial and administrative capacity. |
|---|---|
| | When conducting audits there is a check in place in order to make sure that only the realized costs are taken into account. Calculated costs are not accepted. |
| | The administrative support is not fundable and it is mandatory to monitor work time for part time employees. However, the worktime of full time resources is not monitored, and it can be discussed if that should be required as well or if that is against the goal of decreasing the administrative burden. It could also be considered possible that the project beneficiaries are required to confirm that their use of time is as reported. |
| | Based on the evaluation, there were projects that had significant numbers of personnel resources compared to the activities described in the project proposal. These projects create a risk that hours allocated to the project are not entirely used for the project activities. This was discussed with the responsible authority during the evaluation and the project budgets were always critically evaluated as part of the decision process for funding. However, as documentation concerning the time used for the project is mostly prepared by the organisations themselves, extra attention should be put on this aspect in the future as well. |
| | The system could be further developed concerning the reporting of human resources expenses by including a specific follow-up confirmation that the staff working 100% for the project have actually used their entire working time for the project activities. Presently there is a separate decision in place when granting funding for fulltime employees in the application stage. |

| 3 | Relevance |
|---|---|

| 3 | The overall question: Did the objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund correspond to the actual needs? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, the objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund corresponded to the actual needs of the Member State. The rapid increase of the asylum seeker flows to Europe in the late summer and autumn 2015 made the actions more relevant than ever. |
| | Within **SO 1 Asylum,** the changes in the operational environment in 2015 with regards to the influx of asylum seekers, meant that the number of asylum applications was ten times higher than the average in Finland.  This meant also that the number of personnel working at reception units and persons processing applications multiplied in a short period of time. Although the number of new asylum seekers has fallen from 2015 to a more moderate level, the reasons behind the crisis such as wars and conflicts in Europe's surrounding areas have not ended. The objectives and actions funded within SO 1 Asylum are therefore of high relevance as improving the capabilities within asylum procedures are still |

| | |
|---|---|
| | relevant.<br><br>The changes in operational environment with regards to the influx of asylum seekers in 2015, together with the unpredictability of immigration in general, also have implications to **SO 2 Integration and legal migration,** as it is of importance to develop early integration measures and that integration measures in general are effective and improved. The relevance within the objectives set in this SO are therefore justified and of high relevance as well.<br><br>As a consequence of the increase in asylum applicants, the number of persons that have received negative decisions has also increased notably. Asylum seekers, who are receive a negative decision, do not have the right to residence permit or reception services and therefore the need for voluntary return is greater. This has a direct effect on **SO 3 Return,** where the measures involving developing voluntary return become more significant and relevant. |
| 3.1 | Did the objectives set by the Member State in the National Programme respond to the identified needs? |
| | The objectives set by the Member State in the National Programme responded to the identified needs in several different ways.<br><br>Within **SO 1 Asylum,** the objectives set responded to the national needs in several different aspects. Activities were conducted for providing asylum seekers better knowledge of their legal rights and equal treatment, whether they were situated in the metropolitan areas or other parts of Finland. Also learning Finnish language was made easier by applying a functional approach to language learning by teaching language through real life situations rather than through literature and making it an integral part of the integration process. Also IT systems were developed to create more cost-effective and equal services. Capacity building was offered to government officials and to, for example, staff at the reception centres. Asylum seekers also received capacity building and information sharing through the fund, on understanding Finnish society and preventing crime. Understanding vulnerable groups and their needs was also a focus. However, the interviewees pointed out that many of the projects targeting for example children did not, in fact, have a specific focus on children, although they were among the targeted beneficiaries. Based on the interviews, more projects were hoped to be targeting especially vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied minors.<br><br>Within **SO 2 Integration and legal migration,** the objectives set responded to the national needs in different aspects by for example re-opening activities in areas where they were passive. The aim of the objective was to understand multicultural needs by developing professional knowledge and innovative service methodology to make integration more effective and easier, and increasing the inclusion of immigrants to the Finnish society in order to prevent marginalization and in turn radicalization, by targeting the youth and increasing the understanding for cultural differences and promoting integration to society. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Especially minor TCNs were targeted to give them a safe home housing experience and thereby effective integration into the Finnish society. Also promoting housing skills and prevention of homelessness among TCNs is in the focus during this funding period. The health of the TCNs immigrating to Finland is developed to fill a gap in knowledge about immigrations health and give a comprehensive and uniform way of collecting data for different entities to utilize. Activities are also conducted to connect employers to information needed for a TCN to immigrate to Finland. This applies to immigrants, employers and employees and other entities dealing with immigration.<br><br>Within **SO 3 Return,** the objectives set responded to the national needs. The majority of TCNs applying for asylum will receive a negative decision and will be returned. Also EU directives and international legislation require actions that have not previously been taken in Finland, so no previous models or experience was available and had to be developed**.** The interventions responded to the needs by improving the capacity of reception centres to be responsible for the new task of taking care of voluntary returns by increasing knowledge of voluntary return among asylum seekers and reception centre workers, and supporting the formal establishment of the voluntary return system on the foundation developed during SOLID funding period by International Organisation for Migration (IOM). Also the development of the detention process and its alternatives are in focus during this funding period to ensure that the number of illegal immigrants staying in Finland does not grow. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.2 | Which measures did the Member State put in place to address changing needs? |
| | In the previous years the RA has had some concern for the involvement of smaller, third sector actors in applying for AMIF project funding. Since there is a requirement of deductible funding for project actions, smaller actors might find it difficult to participate. The ratio of EU funding share was raised from 50% to 75% in this program period, which is seen as a positive direction with regards to attracting smaller actors to participate in AMIF actions.<br><br>Actions to enable smaller and third sector actors involvement is of importance as there is a large amount of smaller actors active in the AMIF operational environment, especially within integration measures. In the interviews it was brought up that the involvement of nongovernmental organisations and immigrant organisations is still somewhat in the margins in Finland. There may be opportunities in more efficiently utilising the third sector actors and their competence.<br><br>As a part of the Mid-Term review the RA has assessed their needs for the second half of the implementing period (2018-2020) in light of developments and political priorities, both at the EU and national level.<br><br>The commitment rates of the Finnish AMIF Program are at a high level especially for the SO 1 Asylum. The number of persons to be effectively |

| | |
|---|---|
| | integrated has risen significantly during the past 1, 5 years which requires more extensive actions in the area of integration in Finland. Compared to the situation in 2013, the RA has suggested that the National Program should take into account the following changes:<br><br>• establishment of a voluntary return system, pending amendment to decree on an increase to the financial incentives for returnees<br><br>• options for the detention of foreign nationals<br><br>• elimination of the humanitarian protection category<br><br>• development of the residence permit system for investors, entrepreneurs and specialists<br><br>• reforming the Register of Aliens legislation and implementing changes that ensure it is in accordance with the EU Data Protection Regulation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | Coherence |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | The overall question: Were the objectives set in the national programme coherent with the ones set in other programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work? Was the coherence ensured also during the implementation of the Fund? |
| | The objectives set in the National Program are mainly coherent with the ones set in other programs funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work. There are no large discrepancies with regards to this issue.<br><br>The key programs considered in the planning and implementation of the AMIF were the European Social Fund (ESF), the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and the European Agriculture Fund (EAF). The area of risk in terms of coherence is immigration, as all four funds target immigrants at different stages of immigration.<br><br>As the AMIF is mostly concentrating on asylum, integration, legal migration and returns, the ESF is focusing on immigrants who have legal status, to participate in the employment market and to have a residence permit in Finland. The ERDF has the same beneficiary group as the ESF, but as an instrument it focuses more on the employer side than the immigrant side. The EAF, on the other hand, has a focus on non-metropolitan area citizens and companies.<br><br>The activities implemented under the AMIF fund most likely to be linked with ones implemented within the ESF. Previously, the European Parliament and the Court of Auditors have acknowledged that the distinction between the AMIF and the ESF can be hard to measure. However, the RA has established good |

| | collaboration between different funding agencies to avoid incoherence and overlapping between AMIF and ESF.

To summarize, the condition of the AMIF funding of being in coherence with other funding has been met within the funding period of ending 30 June 2017. |
| --- | --- |

| 4.1 | Was an assessment of other interventions with similar objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage? |
| --- | --- |
| | The Responsible Authority does an assessment of interventions with complimentary objectives during the programming stage, when evaluating which efforts to fund.

The highest risk of overlapping within interventions was found within integration, especially between the European Social Fund (ESF) and AMIF. AMIF integration efforts focuses on the early stage of integration, as the ESF funded projects are more focused on integration related to employment. As the risk was observed, the RA took action to coordinate different stakeholders. These actions are explained more in detail in section 5. Complementarity.

Based on the interviews, the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment was especially active in assessing complimentary actions. This was because the ministry is responsible for the ESF fund, which has an element of integration with regards to employment. The element of integration was considered the most likely to have overlapping features with the AMIF fund. The actions related to complementarity are explained more in detail in section 5.2. and section 5.3.

As the AMIF National Programme was being drafted, a statement was requested for the draft version from other ministries, NGOs, and government offices. |

| 4.2 | Were co-ordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established for the implementation period? |
| --- | --- |
| | There are several coordination mechanisms in place. The coordination within Home affairs fund is on a good level as the AMIF and the ISF are located in the same unit in Finland. This means that they work very closely, continuous tracking and meetings are in place if needed, and according to the situation the units take necessary action.

The coordination mechanisms were established for this funding period, as the rise in the number of TCNs entering Finland increased significantly during the second half of 2015. This required improved coordination as different actors became interested in supporting the activities through their own funding |

| | mechanisms. |
|---|---|
| | The RA has established a synergies process and cooperation meetings for the AMIF funded actions, in order to coordinate efforts. The synergies process utilizes a tool for recognizing operational actors in different geographical areas of the Member State. By tracking the different actors and actions, the RA is kept up to date on operational actions and can also coordinate information provided to operational actors, and steer them towards suitable and correct funding. |
| | The monitoring committee of the AMIF fund also supports the RA in the coordination of targets and actions with other EU funded and national actions. |

| 4.3 | Were the actions implemented through the Fund coherent with and non-contradictory to other interventions with similar objectives? |
|---|---|
| | Based on our observations, the actions implemented through the fund were coherent and non-contradictory to other interventions with similar objectives. |
| | The actions of the AMIF and the actions of the ESF had a similar focus on integration, but they were focused on different steps of the integration process and no significant contradictory actions were observed during the evaluation. |

| 5 | Complementarity |
|---|---|

| 5 | The overall question: Were the objectives set in the national programme and the corresponding implemented actions complementary to those set in the framework of other policies, in particular those pursued by the Member State? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the observations during the evaluation, the objectives of the program are complementary with other policies. |
| | The funding instrument in most risk of overlapping with the AMIF targets is the European Social Fund (ESF) with the distinction that as the AMIF integration focuses on the early stage of integration, the ESF funded projects are more focused on integration related to employment. |
| | The risk of overlapping was observed as integration and publically funded projects received extra attention due to the significant increase of TCNs applying for asylum in late 2015. However, as this risk was observed, measures were taken by the RA in coordination between the different stakeholders. |

| 5.1 | Was an assessment of other interventions with complementary objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, an assessment of other interventions taking place in Finland has been carried out during the programming stage. When the objectives and actions of the programme were defined, it was checked that they were aligned with the national strategy and in relation to other funding programmes.<br><br>With regards to the ISF, there is an assessment of similar objectives for example with regards to anti-radicalisation measures that are linked to integration measures. There is an assessment done of what the division of actions is and from where the funds should be applied. Also a discussion is in place for the current actions taken and what aspect should be taken into account. Although AMIF is not funding actions aimed against radicalisation but for example related to integration, these may reduce the risk of radicalisation. The actions of the ISF and the AMIF are in that sense complementary, as ISF deals with anti-radicalisation measures.<br><br>The challenges related to coherence within the AMIF were mostly observed in the area of migration. The rising number of TCNs entering Finland in 2015 raised the issue into focus, as many parties were willing to support the integration activities. This was especially noted when the local Centers for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment managing European Social Funds were willing to participate. |

| 5.2 | Were co-ordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established to ensure their complementarity for the implementing period? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, there were coordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established to ensure complementarity.<br><br>As explained previously, the AMIF and the ISF are in the same unit in Finland and therefore coordination measures are in place between these funds.<br><br>A working-group on immigration was organised to facilitate the discussion concerning working priorities and the essence of the AMIF fund. The working group on immigration coordination includes, apart from the AMIF, also the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, Finnish Red Cross, Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment ELY Centers, and the Ministry of Education and Culture.<br><br>The matters have also been discussed among the different funding organisations to agree on the division of work between the government agencies. The project ideas have been discussed among funding entities as to which fund would be best |

| | |
|---|---|
| | suited for a particular action.<br><br>According to the interviews conducted during this evaluation, the Finnish government representatives have received positive feedback from other EU Member States regarding the collaboration between state agencies in Finland. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 5.3 | Were mechanisms aimed to prevent overlapping of financial instruments put in place? |
| | The actions implemented through the fund were aligned with the targets of the fund. During the evaluation, no breaches were observed between the AMIF and other interventions with similar objectives.<br><br>The most significant risk area was integration which was recognised during the implementation of the fund. Based on the evaluation, the RA conducts coordination between the different stakeholders to mitigate the risk of overlapping. This was done by creating a map of national actors and the progression path of asylum seekers in the Finnish system. This created an overview of national and regional actors that work for the same client in different matters.<br><br>Also, as previously mentioned, a working group on immigration coordination was established. The working group includes different governmental actors, civic organizations and The Centres for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY center).<br><br>There were also forums organised, that were directed towards new AMIF applicants. Different speakers were invited to participate in the forums. In the forums both the AMIF, the ESR, the Funding Centre for Social Welfare and Health Organisations (STEA) and the Finnish Agency for Rural Affairs (Mavi) were represented. In the forums information was provided on possible overlapping actions and interventions, and also information about what the guidelines are in each fund.<br><br>The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment also provide information on the different funding organizations on their webpage. The webpage contains also information about the time schedule for applications and instructions on which fund to apply to for a certain type of action. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | EU added value |

| 6 | The overall question: Was any added value brought about by the EU support? |
|---|---|
| | Based on the evaluation, the AMIF funded actions are mainly local or national in nature. However, some actions have an international dimension through knowledge sharing, international cooperation, or applying international standards and methodologies in the funded actions.

The EU added value can be difficult to assess due to several different reasons. Firstly, some actions are mandatory in nature. Secondly, actions that are seemingly small or isolated, and might not have value at the EU level, may still lead to further actions at a later time, and therefore be of benefit at the union level. Thirdly, several AMIF actions have yet to be executed and only few projects have been concluded at the time of this evaluation. A large number of actions are set to take place at a later stage of the programme and have yet to gain results.

The societal impact of the integration measures taken within the AMIF actions can be seen as highly important for the EU as a whole, especially with regards to the changes in migration in the EU area. As migration rose substantially in 2015, the need for effective integration and reception was accentuated. The EU funded actions signify that focus could be placed on integration actions that contributed to the diminution of societal insecurity and radicalisation, which has an impact on a union level as well. The need for better immigration efforts, increasing asylum and reception possibilities, as well as return methodologies in Finland is more relevant than ever before.

The current EU support is of great advantage especially for NGOs operating as beneficiaries since this group does rely heavily on outside funding for their operational activities. Due to the social character of the AMIF actions, the coordination of governmental and municipal actors as well as third sector actors is of importance to actions being carried out in an effective and lasting way.

The EU support is also of significant benefit for the development of shared IT platforms, which are cost heavy in nature. Even though some of the actions would have been carried out without the EU support, the support gives the implementers the possibility to target actions where they are needed, instead of having to prioritize internal funding and possibly sacrifice some of the actions that have now been able to be carried out. |

| 6.1 | What are the main types of added value resulting from the support by the Fund (volume, scope, role, process)? |
|---|---|
| | The societal impact of the integration measures taken within the AMIF actions can be seen highly important.

The most significant area, that the support from the fund has affected, is the volume of activities implemented and the speed of progress due to increased resources. There has, for example, been more resources in place to improve |

| | processes related to reception and migration in general.<br><br>It is also likely that in the previous economic situation there would not have been the necessary budget to implement the funded actions to such a large degree without added support from the EU.<br><br>The development of asylum procedures has been a priority since the previous government administration and required long-term development actions geared towards this matter. Certain EU funded actions, such as the development of ICT-projects, influence the functionality of the asylum procedures as a whole. By developing these actions it has been possible to secure the asylum activities without necessarily increasing the amount of personnel resources. This is of particular benefit if there is an increase in the volume of asylum seekers.<br><br>The added value due to development of digitalisation efforts has meant that the cooperation of government entities has improved. The changes to IT -systems means that governmental actors gain up-to-date information on when refugees and asylum seekers have entered the country, which in turn has made actions steered towards integration and reception. |
|---|---|
| 6.2 | Would the Member State have carried out the actions required to implement the EU policies in areas supported by the Fund without its financial support? |
| | Based on the evaluation, part of the activities would not have been implemented without the funding provided.<br><br>As during the previous SOLID funding phase, a significant part of the activities implemented in the area of integration were carried out by third sector organisations. As explained in the previous section 6, NGOs and the third sector are heavily dependent on funding provided from public resources. By the end of June 2017, there have been altogether 11 projects implemented by non-governmental educational institutions. It is unlikely that these actions would have taken place if no EU funding had been provided.<br><br>It can also be discussed whether the Member State could have budgeted more national resources into developing the activities carried out under the AMIF fund. Due to the unexpected changes in the operational environment caused by the rapid increase in the number of asylum seekers in 2015, it is however unlikely that the Member State could have budgeted more resources. The EU support can therefore be seen as a vital part of the actions being carried out through the AMIF fund.<br><br>The EU funding serves also a larger purpose as a general framework in developing certain agendas or themes in each of the Member States. The EU support has provided a clearer direction on values that the EU wishes to have implemented in the Member States. |

| 6.3 | What would be the most likely consequences of an interruption of the support provided by the Fund? |
|------|------|
|  | The most likely consequences of interrupted support would be that a significant part of the projects might not be carried out. This opinion is based on the fact that third sector organizations and non-governmental organizations are active within the AMIF actions, and have implemented altogether 12 projects (29%). Third sector organisations and non-governmental organisations are especially dependent upon external funding for their activities. Since 8 of the 12 projects were implemented under SO 2 Integration, it can be assumed that the most significant consequences would be caused to integration actions taken by the third sector. |
|  | The funded actions taken by third sector and non-governmental organisations support in particular the development of integration services and third country national youth integration. The actions funded have an innovative character as they utilise new and innovative methodologies in integration, such as games, workshops and simple task-solving. As these actions are focused upon strengthening especially youth identity and the readiness to act in society, the outcome of the actions not being funded would be that especially vulnerable TNC´s would not have achieved as effective integration measures. This can be seen particularly in making friends with majority population, learning the Finnish language, and the ability to apply for schooling or employment later on. The actions mentioned also have a strong effect on preventing marginalisation in youth, which is of increased concern also with regards to integration of a larger group of TNC's into the Finnish society. The prevention of marginalisation is of importance as it may have an effect on preventing radicalisation. |
|  | Since the actions of NGOs have a strong networking aspect, the aspect of building networks between organisational actors would have been lost if there were no funding. |
|  | The projects implemented by government agencies would possibly have been implemented to a certain degree, but with limited personnel resources some activities would have been left out. This also applies to activities implemented by partners such as the development of IT -systems. |
|  | Without EU funding, there may have been funding for activities considered critical, such as improving the reception procedures during the autumn of 2015.Considering the rapid pace and influx of asylum seekers to Finland in 2015, it may, however, not have been possible to make the needed budgetary adjustments without external funding. |
|  | Also, starting the development activities within a short period of time might not have been possible without EU funding. From that perspective the EU funding provided a possibility to highlight long term development needs that may have not otherwise been in the interest of a particular nation to develop – or at the very least, to develop actions at the same pace that was done with the support of the fund. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |

| 6.4 | To which extent have actions supported by the Fund resulted in a benefit at the Union level? |
|---|---|
| | A number of projects funded under the AMIF fund have an international element. However, there were no projects that were fundamentally international and the international element was mostly related to individual activities such as benchmarking or knowledge sharing. Nevertheless, the activities are considered to support the AMIF targets at the Union level.

Under SO 1 there are altogether four projects that can be considered having Union level results. For example the project called **Services for vulnerable TCNs HAPKE 3** responding to the needs of victims of violence includes activities for sharing their final project report internationally. Also the project **Flow - Improving the initial part of the asylum procedure through developing stakeholder cooperation, tools and professional competences** focuses mainly on Finland but aims to conduct international experience sharing to facilitate the communicating of results to other Member States. In **Migstat- improving Statistics on Asylum Procedure and the Reception System** project, benchmarking from other Member States is used to develop the reception processes through software development. Also the project **LAAVA quality management - as systematic approach for evaluating and creating statistics on the quality of asylum decision making** organized a cooperative seminar where the results are shared with the EASO, the UNHCR and the Refugee Advice Centre. However, it must be noted that only one of the projects has been completed during the evaluation period, and whether planned activities will be successfully implemented in the future is still unclear. As a conclusion, it can be stated that the beneficiaries of these actions have a firm international cooperation in place, which the project actions have supported.

Under SO 2, a significant number of projects had an international element. For example the **Egalitarian Citizen** project aims at increasing the knowledge of Finnish society among immigrants who seek guidance from local mosques. This project aims at reporting their results as part of the MINDED (Multi-Media semantic data integration platform for Policing to Support Enhanced detection and Prevention of Organized Crime and Terrorism). The **Work It!** project is integrating employers into the digital Enter Finland-service platform by developing a specific section for the software. Although the project is national it has an international dimension in utilizing best practices in electronic practices.

The international elements included in the project funded under SO 3 are focused on developing measures and monitoring returns in Finland. Both projects **Repatriation** and **Developing monitoring of Forced Returns** are national but have an international element in terms of contacting other state colleagues or the EMA network, doing international cooperation between the EU boarder control agency Frontex and other EU Member States on return surveillance. |

| 7 | Sustainability |
|---|---|

| 7 | The overall question: Are the positive effects of the projects supported by the Fund likely to last when its support will be over? |
|---|---|
|  | Within the AMIF the actions funded are quite different in nature, which means that the assessment of effects and results can be difficult to make.<br><br>The lasting positive effects of the projects supported by the AMIF Fund are evaluated by the RA when granting funding. Sustainability is a criteria for evaluation and all applicants are required to give an estimate of sustainability or a plan for sustaining actions after the project has concluded. The grant proposals include a specific section where the project applicant can elaborate on their plans regarding sustainability.<br><br>The actual sustainability of positive effects can, however, be seen only once the projects have been completed, and in reality, only sometime after that. Since a large part of the AMIF projects are still ongoing, the sustainability of results can be difficult to assess at this time.<br><br>It should also be noted that a certain project may provide valuable information although the results are not as expected and sustainability therefore may not be as desired. For example, a project may provide valuable information about whether or not certain actions are possible to be carried out in the Member State, by a certain authority, or in the specific operational environment. This information in itself is of value, even though the effects may not be positive or lasting in nature.<br><br>Some actions also have predetermined life spans, such as developing software or integrating systems where there is an operational timeline of usually up to 10 years. The predetermined life spans can guarantee a certain amount of sustainability even after the funding and the project has ended.<br><br>For the project processes, the main driver for sustainability appears to be an organisation that is able to adopt the project results (processes and practices) as part of its daily operations. In that way the sustainability of the project is also ensured through minimal added resources, as the knowledge gained is made part of operational activities and does not necessarily require added funding.<br><br>Another low cost option for ensuring sustainability of positive effects is sharing project results through a website. This measure was especially popular among language projects that are not sensitive in nature, and results can easily be shared online for future use. |

| 7.1 | What were the main measures adopted by the Member State to ensure the sustainability of the results of the projects implemented with support of the Fund (both at programming and implementation stage)? |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|      | The activities planned for project sustainability are focused on ensuring that the sustainability aspect is taken into account in project planning, as it is part of the assessment that the RA does before granting funding. The sustainability and effectiveness of project actions are part of the selection criteria when choosing actions for funding in the programming stage. If actions deal with the development of actions or operations, actions that have higher sustainability are preferred compared to actions with little or no sustainability. |
|      | After the project has ended, the estimation of sustainability is harder to predict. The options may be to conduct follow-up for example after six months from the project completion. However, this has to be assessed against the administrative burden it creates for the RA and for the project beneficiaries. It should also be noted that the project staff may no longer be employed at the organisation after the project has been completed. |
|      | One observation, however, was made when reviewing the project completion reports. The current completion reporting template does not include any section on where the project implementer would assess how the activities regarding sustainability have succeeded. That section could also include planned steps for example a six month period on how the sustainability of the results could be strengthened after the project has been completed. |

| 7.2 | Were mechanisms put in place to ensure a sustainability check at programming and implementation stage? |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|      | The sustainability and effectiveness of project actions is part of the awarding criteria when choosing actions for funding in the programming stage. |
|      | Sustainability has also been addressed by using steering groups for each of the project that consist of different stakeholders relevant to the project scope. This works also as an information sharing platform for project achievements and makes sure that the relevant partners are engaged and committed to continuing with the project outputs and results after the project has been completed. |

| 7.3 | To what extent are the outcomes/benefits of the actions sustained by the Fund expected to continue thereafter? |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|      | Due to the delays in the early phase of the Programme, most of the projects have not been completed at the time of the evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation of the sustainability of activities can only be done to a limited extent. Also the |

| | completion report template does not include a specific section where the project beneficiary would assess the sustainability of the project at the completion stage. Therefore, in the following we provide examples and analyses of actions that the projects have planned for reaching sustainability.

Under **SO 1** the most common planned actions to ensure sustainability were related to raising further funding, connection to existing processes of operators that have a more solid funding base, such as government agencies. This also includes sharing material to other actors thorough Internet and seminars. Capacity building of government officials was one method of reaching sustainability.

Projects under **SO 2** had very similar actions towards sustainability as projects under SO 1, such as information sharing and establishing connections to existing structures, which are both good approaches in general but may perhaps be considered quite traditional. However, creating connections to existing processes and structures is still considered a valid method for reaching sustainability.

Under **SO 3** the activities are related to integrating IT systems and producing handbooks regarding voluntary returns. The project **developing monitoring of forced returns** mentioned that actions can be maintained by 1 person (surveillance) after the project has ended, since the methods can then be utilized fully after the development phase.

The general challenge with actions related to sustainability are that the plans to reach sustainability are not concrete. Many of the projects had not planned for actual actions on how they will reach sustainability, although some general level ideas had been shared. Based on our experience, this also makes reaching sustainability more difficult as no clear outline of plans and responsibilities have been defined.

One possibility regarding sustainability is also to involve municipalities and other actors into the project to reach the desired impact. For example, if the project implementer can justify that the model they have developed will save money by reducing processing times, the municipalities or other parties would be committed to fund the further development of the project outcomes. This approach would follow the so called Social Impact Bond (SIB) –model where public financing of the project is based on the impacts achieved. |
|---|---|

| 8 | Simplification and reduction of administrative burden |
|---|---|

| 8 | The overall question: Were the Fund management procedures simplified and the administrative burden reduced for its beneficiaries? |
|---|---|
| | During the implementation period of the Programme, the EU Commission has highlighted the aspect of reduced administrative burden, which in turned has |

| | |
|---|---|
| | effected the actions of the Member State RA. The management is still, however, somewhat burdensome due to different aspects. The reduction of administrative burden for beneficiaries, alongside with the commissions requirements of quality tracking and eliminating fraud or irregularities, signifies that the RA is under pressure from both angles.

As it is now, it is time consuming for the Ministry to conduct the tracking needed, and the measures needed from the beneficiaries are also time consuming and require administrational know-how. Currently the RA estimates that the review process of the project completion report takes between two to six months based on how well the project developer provides the required information. Therefore, the overall margin for flexibility could be made more effective for the Fund. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 8.1 | Did the innovative procedures introduced by the Fund (simplified cost option, multiannual programming, national eligibility rules, more comprehensive national programmes allowing for flexibility) bring about simplification for the beneficiaries of the Fund? |
| | The simplified cost models are seen as a good option and have provided some relief to the administrative burden. However, lump sum funding has not been used. The reasons for this are that the maximum lump sum funding has previously been confined to EUR 10 000, which is very low in comparison to the projects being funded under the AMIF actions which may in fact be up to the scale of EUR 100 000 or more. The upcoming rise of the lump sum maximum amount to EUR 100 000 will probably impact the use of this model in the future and make it more attractive for beneficiaries, as it is closer to the funding needed for these measures. It must be noted, however, that this option is seen as quite risky by the implementers since the model does not require the tracking of costs during the project implementation, and funding may be lost in case the targets are not reached in the project. This entails a significant risk for the implementer, which therefore also effects the willingness to utilize this option.

The utilisation of flat-rate financing for indirect costs regarding the funded projects has facilitated the beneficiaries since travel costs do not need to be tracked in bookkeeping. This has simplified reporting and auditing on behalf of the RA as well.

The funding application process has been made electronic, which has also facilitated the work of the RA since all relevant documents are stored in one place and the communication with beneficiaries is simplified. However, the evaluation revealed that the electronic system was not that technically flexible which meant that beneficiaries had to reserve a significant amount of time just to process the information through the system which was perceived as slow.

During the current funding period the RA has established a web-based reporting portal enabling the project implementers to provide reporting online. The reporting template, compared to the SOLID- funding period, also includes a |

specific section for indicator tracking as in the previously used model the indicators were included within the narrative text making it more burdensome to track. Although this has been a good development, the project implementers reported that there had been some challenges with the usability of the portal and updating and signing documents electronically took sometimes a significant amount of time.

The structural change of the programme from the annual programmes to the multiannual programme has allowed better and more rational planning and implementation of the actions as the projects can be longer. This simplifies administration. However, the mismatches with reporting frequencies between the projects and the programme are still causing extra work.

Description of three 'success stories', among all the projects funded

| Example 1 |
| --- |
| One of the projects that is considered as successes in this evaluation is the **Hundred Apple Trees – Multicultural Finland** project implemented by the Turku University of Applied Sciences (01.01.2016-31.03.2018). The project focused on the Specific Objective 2 Integration.<br><br>The project's aim is to improve the integration of TCN youth by involving them in leisure activities with local youth. The project also intends to improve the cultural sensitive competence of the municipality officials and people working in the third sector. At the time of the evaluation the project is still being implemented and the estimated completion is in March 2018.<br><br>The planning of the project started between Brahea Centre of the University of Turku and the Turku University of Applied Sciences. The idea was to find ways to integrate TCNs in to Finnish culture through leisure activities, such as sports. Especially the foundation of the activities had to be where the youth usually spend their time rather than take them somewhere else to participate in the project activities. Other elements considered in the planning of this project was improving language skills and acknowledging the fact that TCNs may not share the same background for sports as Finnish people, for example through physical education organised through the school system.<br><br>In general, the project managed to implement the planned activities well. It has managed to reach 175 youth in the target group of the Fund, which already exceeds the target set at 150. However, other indicators have not yet been reached.<br><br>In terms of sustainability, the project approach is to create natural connections between third sector organisations and TCNs. The aim is that the connection will remain after the project activities have been completed. Sustainability is reached by connecting the TCNs with Finnish organisations providing possibilities for leisure time activities.<br><br>Challenges reported by the project had to do with identifying the people belonging to the target group. Asking formal questions for identification were possibly experienced as offensive and not creating a mutual trust between the project staff and the TCNs. However, the project reported that they had found an agreement with the RA that if the organisation supporting the TCNs confirms that they are part of the project target group that could be accepted. The rationalisation was that the organisation has, most likely, the best knowledge of the youth and their situation. They have, most likely, also developed a certain level of mutual trust, which does not exist when the project staff meets the youth for the first time.<br><br>Concerning the lessons learnt from the project, the beneficiary feels that in the beginning the project plan should have been focused on just a few organisations, as having many official partners in the project makes the administrative work more burdensome. There were also some challenges with the electronic application form. Concerning the project focus and activities, the lesson learnt was that the meeting between the TCNs and the local youth |

| Example 1 |
| --- |
| should have been even more in the focus of the project from planning phase. It was also noted that the TCN women were also interested of participating in the activities and actually engaging into sports rather than acting in the role of caretaker as may normally be expected from them in their own culture.

As a summary, the project has had a good start with implementing the planned activities. They have managed to contact a good number of TCNs in their target group and done good collaboration with the local agencies and government officials. There is, however, still work to be done to reach all the target indicators and an overall successful project completion. |

| Example 2 |
| --- |
| The second project chosen as a success story is also still being implemented. The project is titled **Egalitarian Citizen** and was implemented by the City of Helsinki (1.4.2016-30.9.2017). The project focused on the Specific Objective 2 Integration.

The project's aim is to increase the well-being and participation of TNCs within the information sharing services and to provide them a possibility to have equal services compared to in the municipality. The project was based on information received for example from local Mosques, who indicated that that they did not have enough information regarding the locally provided services for example on health issues. The project aims to reach its targets by engaging into collaboration with the local Mosques and developing service models to support Muslim communities as information providers. The planning and the beginning phases of the project included a lot of discussion between stakeholders and defining the key areas where support was needed. At that time there was also an increasing challenge with people leaving to fight in the war in Syria.

The project targets were set at establishing service guidance activities in collaboration with Mosques, arranging a specific day to enhance active people from the Muslim organisation to have a dialogue with the officials working for the municipality. Also specific educational activities were arranged for the municipality workers. A few Mosques were engaged in the beginning and one of the challenges was that the Mosques were run by only a few active individuals and finding time to participate was sometimes challenging.

At the time of the evaluation the project is still being implemented. The project has managed to arrange nine workshops or seminars for information sharing with altogether 113 participants. Also knowledge development activities on mental health issues were organised for people active in the Mosques. Other knowledge development activities were also organised for people working in the municipality or third sector. Altogether 119 people participated in the events. Based on the feedback collected by the beneficiary 75% of the people who answered the feedback felt that participating in the event had increased their awareness towards Islam.

Based on the evaluation the project has been able to implement the planned activities and reached a good number of people in the target group, although the activities are still being implemented. Extra attention should be paid to ensuring the sustainability of the activities in |

| Example 2 |
| --- |
| the last period of the project implementation. |

| Example 3 |
| --- |
| The third project chosen as a success is called **Migstat - improving Statistics on Asylum Procedure and the Reception System** and was implemented by the Finnish Immigration Services FIS (01.01-2016-31.01.2017). The project focused on the Specific Objective 1 Asylum.<br><br>The project aimed at developing the data collection and management of the reception and asylum seeking process. It also aims to make sure that the deviation in the length of the processes was decreased. The ideal length of the process according to interviews would be six months, but in the beginning of the project it was in some cases up to from nine to twelve months.<br><br>The project targets were set at gaining a good understanding of the information needed in the asylum and reception process, to having the ability to fully utilise the information collected of the process, and to developing the reporting process through more user-friendly software. The existing software allowed mostly the creation of PDF- type reports with no interactive elements.<br><br>One of the practical examples of how the circumstances changed during the implementation of the project is that the hearing of people seeking for asylum used to be done by the national police, although the FIS was responsible of the asylum seeking process. During the project the hearing was handed over to FIS who was then fully responsible of the process. This general change was respectively taken into account also in the project.<br><br>The project beneficiary has filed the completion report on 4 July 2017, so it is assumed that the reported project activities were completed by 30 June 2017 which is the final day of the period under this evaluation. According to the completion report the project managed to reach the awareness of information required in the asylum seeking process. Also the information model piloted in the project was able to provide better reporting compared to the previous system. One of the international activities that consisted of best practices–visits took place, as only Denmark was visited instead of also visiting the Netherlands. However, another visit was made to the Eurostat conference "Towards more agile statistics" in Luxembourg. One of the outcomes of the project was that it turned out that there is no need to leave out the basic reporting system for the asylum seeking process. However it was noted that there is a need to support the system with more developed functions such as a new dashboard to guide the asylum seeking process more effectively.<br><br>In the first reporting provided by the project beneficiary to the RA, they reported that competence development on the asylum seeking was received by eight people. However, according to the project beneficiary, since the first report they have managed to educate 40 people which was also the target set in the project proposal. However, as the completion report was filed in July 2017 only the ones reported previously were considered as reported outputs in this evaluation. |

**Example 3**

Description of one 'failure', among all the projects funded

| Example |
| --- |
| The project that was chosen as a "failure" was **the state and developing of the general legal advice of asylum seekers** project implemented by the Refugee Advice Centre (01.01.2016-28.02.2017)**.** The project focused on the Specific Objective 1 Asylum.<br><br>The aim of the project was to provide legal support and advice to asylum seekers. The need for the project was to ensure the legal security of asylum seekers by providing them with equal access to legal services nationally. The challenge has been that the possibility to get legal services varies significantly based on the location of the reception centre. Also a significant part of the project was to evaluate the current status of legal support provided to asylum seekers in Finland.<br><br>The project target indicators were very ambitious and the project did not manage to meet them. This was the main reason why the project was considered as a failure in this evaluation. During the project application period the number of asylum seekers was rapidly growing in Finland and therefore the project beneficiary estimated the number of target people as large. After the project implementation begun the number of people seeking for asylum begun to decrease which resulted in poor indicator results against the high targets. However, it should be noted, that the project managed to interview the management of the reception centres and analyse the need for legal services among the target group, so despite the low result indicators the project managed to contribute to the targets of the fund. In a situation where the immigration system is under significant and unexpected pressure all activities that improve the process and the system can be considered valuable.<br><br>The fact that some projects present very high targets in the project proposals is problematic. Firstly funding is provided more or less against the expected outputs and in cases like these it can be questioned whether the funding was used in an efficient way. Secondly the challenge with high targets is that they rise the target indicators for the whole Fund which creates a poor representation of the targets as a whole. Thus one or two projects with very high targets and poor results can make the overall results look worse than they actually are. |

## SECTION VI: METHODOLOGY

This evaluation had a primary focus in the alignment of the funded project portfolio compared to the targets set by the European Commission. The purpose was to make sure that the Fund is progressing in the right direction. Also the facts that at the time of the evaluation only a few of the projects had been completed with results indicated that the value of this evaluation would be rather in the alignment of activities rather that measuring outcomes against set targets. Nevertheless, also indicators were evaluated to provide understanding of the current progress towards targets.

The data used for this evaluation has been collected from many sources, by combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. In order to support this evaluation process and, especially to make sure that all the data and information is relevant to the reporting templates of the Commission, the RA had established a tool to collect information regarding project outputs from the project developers. The new web-based tool for data collection is a good improvement compared to the data collection methods during the previous SOLID funding period. During the SOLID funding period the data was mainly collected out of written reports with no possibility to convert the data into the excel format.

The new reporting format had been to some extent a challenge for the project beneficiaries as it had some problems with functioning at least in the early phase of the project. The RA also had to correct some of the data manually as it had been incorrectly entered into the system. The data was also reviewed by the evaluator by comparing the numbers in the tool with the ones presented in the project reporting.

The reporting provided by all the projects funded within this funding period was collected and analysed in this evaluation. As the reporting of every individual project was reviewed, the evaluator evaluated the nature of the activities and results to meet with the definitions stated in the templates.

Some of the projects funded under the National Programme did not match directly with the areas defined in the EC declaration and the reporting template. In those cases the evaluator analysed the content of the projects and made sure that all relevant information was included under the fields in the reporting template. This was done to ensure that all the contributions done by the projects were included in the evaluation.

The qualitative data gathered from the project reports was supported by interviews conducted with the personnel of the Ministry of the Interior of Finland, but also to other relevant government officials such as the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Employment as they are mainly responsible for the integration of TCNs. Interviews were also conducted with the project beneficiaries especially to evaluate the sustainability of the results and the reasons behind the successes and failures. Publications on the specific issues was also used as supporting documentation to review the current state of this governance sector.

The actual evaluation of the results and possible impacts was conducted by triangulating the information provided by the project implementers, government officials, and official government reports. Also the data collected by the European Commission into the SFC system was compared to the indicators reported by the projects. This was mainly done to evaluate whether the indicators are similar and a possible impact of the project can possibly

be seen through the data collected by other agencies.

**Main conclusions**

| Conclusion 1 |
| --- |
| **The electronic system and reporting.**<br><br>**The electronic system for reporting was considered non-user friendly.** The electronic system for reporting was considered welcome by the RA, since it made the handling of reports more effective. However, the beneficiaries reported that the system was technically not flexible and the user interface was not user friendly. The inconvenience experienced dealt with the fact that the system was experienced as very slow, it did not allow jumping and returning between pages and working off-line was not possible .This made filling in the forms somewhat challenging and the beneficiaries had to reserve a significant amount of time just to process the information through the system.  It was also stated out that the storing function did not serve the beneficiary. |

| Conclusion 2 |
| --- |
| **Uncertain indicators and variation in target setting**<br><br>**Uncertain indicators.** The final indicators for the AMIF fund actions were still uncertain in the autumn of 2017. This means that the project applicants have difficulty in assessing the targets of their actions, and therefore also the RA has difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of the projects in relation to indicators.<br><br>The unavailable or delayed indicators also complicated the evaluation work, as the premises are that indicator information should be used as a source for the evaluation.<br><br>Based on the evaluation there appears to be **great variation in how the target indicators are set** for each project. The sudden and rapid increase of asylum seekers also affected the project targets in a way that made the projects to some extent over optimistic concerning how many people from the target group they would involve during the implementation of the project. This may result in a situation where some of the projects significantly underperform against the set targets and high targets set also affect the overall performance of the fund in terms of indicators reached compared to targets. |

| Conclusion 3 |
| --- |
| **Log frame.** The RA has not utilized a log frame approach as part of the planning process for the National plan. The result of this is that it is hard to clearly align objectives in the |

**Conclusion 3**

National Programme with the areas presented in the European Commission regulation and this evaluation report template. Using a log frame during the planning phase creates clarity on the impact path between individual activities and long term impacts that the fund aims to have an impact on. This also works as a risk mitigating measure to decrease the risk of choosing wrong activities, target groups, or approaches on how to implement those activities.

**Conclusion 4**

**Assessment of the sustainability** in the completion reporting. The current completion reporting template for beneficiaries does not include any section for assessing how well the activities of the project regarding sustainability have succeeded. This section could also include the planned steps for example for a six month period on how the sustainability of the results could be strengthened after the project has been completed.

**Conclusion 5**

**The operating support** was found very welcome. Based on our observation there are two main aspects why the operating support is an important addition.

It enabled funding for mandatory ongoing activities, which was not possible previously. The maintenance and updates of equipment and IT systems as well as having enough human resources are important also in a tight economic situation, as the maintenance expenses are usually relatively high. The additional funding made it possible to conduct and place focus on these efforts instead of having to find budgeting elsewhere, and some other function might have had to cut back on their operations instead. The operating support contributes to maintaining and securing the existing important systems and equipment and thus promotes sustainability of the activities based on EU regulation.

Secondly, based on our interview, there has been cases where the funding has been drawn back due to different interpretations of new developments. It has not always been easy to draw the line between a new development and updating the current one. The operating support answers this problem as well.

Thirdly, the operating support is an effective tool to promote the usage of the uniform practices and systems in the EU. In practice it enables for instance opening international system interfaces more effectively than through national development actions

Operating support is currently available only for ISF-B.

**Recommendations**

| Recommendations 1 |
| --- |
| **Improvements to the electronic system for reporting.** We recommend to take actions to improve the technical system qualities in order to make the system more user friendly. |

| Recommendations 2 |
| --- |
| **Final indicators and RA evaluating project target**<br><br>**Final indicators available at the beginning of programming phase**. In order to ensure that the projects deliver outputs that are aligned with the targets of the fund, the indicators should be confirmed already as the project developers prepare their project proposals.<br><br>We recommend that in the following program period, the EU Commission gives a clear list of indicators to be collected so that both the national RA and beneficiaries can better adjust to these indicators in the implementing stage. This also makes the follow-up of actions taken easier, and the results indicated give a more accurate description of the actual situation.<br><br>**Realistic targets.** We recommend that the RA evaluates more critically at the project proposal screening stage whether the proposed targets are realistic. Also a certain ratio could be applied for example on how much funding is provided compared to a target group person per capita to be reached by the project activities. This approach is also emphasized in the European Commission Best Regulation Toolbox document regarding the economic efficiency of the projects. |

| Recommendations 3 |
| --- |
| **Log frame approach.** We recommend to use a log frame approach in aligning the project activities and indicators. The use of a log frame also creates clarity on which activities are intended to have an impact on which targets. |

| Recommendations 4 |
| --- |
| **Assessment on sustainability in completion reporting.** The completion reporting template for beneficiaries could include a section on where the beneficiary would assess how well the activities of the project regarding sustainability have succeeded in the project. The section could also include planned steps for example for a six month period on how the |

| Recommendations 4 |
|---|
| sustainability of the results could be strengthened after the project has been completed. |

| Recommendations 5 |
|---|
| We recommend to consider whether **the operating support** can be expanded also to the AMIF as it supports maintaining and securing the existing important systems and equipment, it reduces misinterpretations which may lead to claims for recovery and promotes usage of uniform practices and systems in the EU. |

**Provide an assessment of the mid-term review carried out in accordance with Article 15 of Regulation (EU) No 514/2014. If relevant, summarize the main changes having an impact on your activities in the policy areas covered by the Fund, and how your National Programme was/will be adjusted.**

**Main changes in the operating environment**

In 2015 Finland received nearly 33 000 asylum seekers - 10 times the level of the previous years. Since 2015 the number of applications has decreased. In 2014 there were 18 reception centers in Finland. Their number exceeded 200 after the 2015. Currently there are 56 centers housing 13 000 people of which 11 000 have their case pending.

Operational environment has changed since 2015. Some countries of origin refuse to accept their own nationals. The return queue has grown. Voluntary return is the primary option for return for those who have received a negative decision or have discontinued their application process. The government has taken significant efforts to develop the voluntary return.

Economic and labour market situation have improved in Finland since 2015.

**Changes to the programme:**

The Fund has played a role in building up the capacity of the Finnish Immigration Service to maintain preparedness for sudden large-scale fluctuations. Should there be top-up funding made available in the AMIF, Finland proposes to use it to continuously implement the Common European Asylum System and to implement integration measures.

Finland considers the Resettlement of refugees a safe, well-managed and functional mechanism to offer international protection. Finland has long traditions in resettlement and welcomes the increased utilisation of the system among the Member States.

Following the significantly increased number of asylum seekers in 2015, the number of enforceable negative decisions also increased significantly, starting from late 2016. There is a need to make returns work and make certain third countries to accept their own nationals. Focus should be especially on voluntary return for its benefits. One side of this is to emphasize re-integration in third countries to make return sustainable and durable solution.

The integration services will be needed more because of the increasing amount of immigrants. Adequate resources for the integration need to be assured.

Support is needed for the utilisation of opportunities offered by digitalisation, automation and robotics in the official process related to immigration.

It is important to speed up the transition stage from reception centre to municipal services; as well as to secure sufficient housing capacity for the target groups.

55

**SECTION IX: COMMON RESULT AND IMPACT INDICATORS**

|  |
|---|
| 56 |

# 1 - Indicators by specific objectives

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | Number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems supported under the Fund: | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO1 C1) | 1,871.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | i) number of target group persons benefiting from information and assistance throughout the asylum procedures | Number | | AIR (indicator SO1 C1.a) | 461.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | ii) number of target group persons benefiting from legal assistance and representation | Number | | AIR (indicator SO1 C1.b) | 409.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | iii) number of vulnerable persons and unaccompanied minors benefiting from specific assistance | Number | | AIR (indicator SO1 C1.c) | 81.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R2 | Capacity (i.e. number of places) of new reception accommodation infrastructure set up in line with the common requirements for reception conditions as set out in the Union acquis and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in accordance with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under the Fund. | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO1 C2.1) | 0.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R2 | The percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity | Percentage | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO1 C2.2) | 0.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R3 | Number of persons trained in asylum-related topics with the assistance of | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO1 C3.1) | 397.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the Fund | | | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R3 | That number as a percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics | Percentage | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO1 C3.2) | 0.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | (a) Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund | Number | | Project Reporting | 0.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | (b) Total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors | Number | | Member States | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors. | Percentage | | / | 0.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I1 | Stock of pending cases at first instance, less than 6 months | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 2) | 15,520.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I1 | Stock of pending cases at first instance, more than 6 months | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 2) | 11,454.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I2 | Share of final positive decisions at the appeal stage | Percentage | 78.26 | Eurostat (migr_asydcfina) | 0.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I3 | Number of persons in the reception system (stock at end of the reporting period) | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 7) | 15,520.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | (a) Number of persons in the reception system | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 7) | 15,520.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | (b) Number of asylum and first time asylum applicants | Number | 3,210.00 | Eurostat (migr_asyappctza) | |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|----|------|--------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|------|
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants | Ratio | | / | 0.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | (a) Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors | Number | | Member States | |
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | (b) Number of asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors (Eurostat migr_asyunaa) | Number | 160.00 | Eurostat (migr_asyunaa) | |
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) as compared to the number of unaccompanied minors | Ratio | | / | |
| SO1 | I | SO1I6 | Convergence of first instance/final instance recognition rates by Member States for asylum applicants from a same third country | Percentage points | -41.87 | Eurostat (migr_asydcfina) | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R1 | Number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures supported by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | AIR (Indicator SO2 C1) | 0.00 |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies | Number | 0.00 | AIR (Indicator SO2 C2) | 918.00 |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | i) number of target group persons assisted through measures focusing on education and training, including language training and preparatory actions to facilitate access to the labour market | Number | | AIR (indicator SO2 C2.a) | 153.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | ii) number of target group persons supported through the provision of advice and assistance in the area of housing | Number | | AIR (indicator SO2 C2.b) | 103.00 |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | iii) number of target group persons assisted through the provision of health and psychological care | Number | | AIR (indicator SO2 C2.c) | 0.00 |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | iv) number of target group persons assisted through measures related to democratic participation | Number | | AIR (indicator SO2 C2.d) | 390.00 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I1 | Share of third-country nationals (TCNs) having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs | Percentage | 0.41 | Eurostat (migr_reslas) | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I2 | Employment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -20.80 | Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_ergan) (lfsa_ergacob) | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I3 | Unemployment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | 13.20 | Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_urgan) (lfsa_urgacob) | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I4 | Activity rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -13.10 | Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_argan) (lfsa_argacob) | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I5 | Share of early leavers from education and training: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | | Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (edat_lfse_02) | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I6 | Share of 30 to 34-years-olds with tertiary educational attainment: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -17.00 | Eurostat (edat_lfs_9911) | |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO2 | I | SO2I7 | Share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | 23.30 | Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (ilc_peps05) | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R1 | Number of persons trained on return-related topics with the assistance of the Fund | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C1) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R2 | Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C2) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | (a) persons who returned voluntarily | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C3) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | (b) and persons who were removed | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C4) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund | Number | | AIR | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R4 | Number of monitored removal operations co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C5) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | (a) Persons who were removed (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund) | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C4) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | (b) Total number of returns following an order to leave | Number | 3,155.00 | Eurostat (migr_eirtn) | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave | Ratio | | / | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | (a) Number of persons returned in the framework of joint return operations (assisted-voluntary and forced) | Number | | Project Reporting | 0.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | supported by the Fund | | | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | (b) Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund | Number | | AIR | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | Number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund | Ratio | | / | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | (a) Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C2) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | (b) Persons who returned voluntarily (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund) | Number | 0.00 | AIR (indicator SO3 C3) | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | Number of returnees who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund | Ratio | | / | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | (a) Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund | Number | | Project Reporting | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | (b) Total number of places in detention centres | Number | | Member States | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres | Ratio | | / | 0.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | (a) Number of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave (migr_eirtn) | Number | 3,155.00 | Eurostat (migr_eirtn) | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | (b) Number of third-country nationals ordered to leave (migr_eiord) | Number | 4,330.00 | Eurostat (migr_eiord) | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave | Ratio | | / | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I2 | Return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 8a) | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I3 | Effective returns of rejected asylum applicants | Number | | EASO (EPS Indicator 8b) | 2,100.00 |
| SO4 | R | SO4R1 | Number of applicants and beneficiaries of international protection transferred from one Member State to another with support of the Fund. | Number | | AIR (indicator SO4 C1) | |
| SO4 | R | SO4R2 | Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on enhancing solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States supported under the Fund. | Number | | AIR (indicator SO4 C2) | |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | Number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems supported under the | Number | | | |

**EN**          **EN**

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Fund: | | | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | i) number of target group persons benefiting from information and assistance throughout the asylum procedures | Number | 450.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | ii) number of target group persons benefiting from legal assistance and representation | Number | 450.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R1 | iii) number of vulnerable persons and unaccompanied minors benefiting from specific assistance | Number | 252.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R2 | Capacity (i.e. number of places) of new reception accommodation infrastructure set up in line with the common requirements for reception conditions as set out in the Union acquis and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in accordance with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under the Fund. | Number | 0.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R2 | The percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity | Percentage | 0.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R3 | Number of persons trained in asylum-related topics with the assistance of the Fund | Number | 89.00 | 11.00 | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R3 | That number as a percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics | Percentage | 2.00 | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | (a) Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) | Number | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | supported by the Fund | | | | |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | (b) Total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors | Number | 1,500.00 | 1,000.00 | 0.00 |
| SO1 | R | SO1R4 | Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors. | Percentage | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I1 | Stock of pending cases at first instance, less than 6 months | Number | 19,398.00 | 30,097.00 | 3,465.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I1 | Stock of pending cases at first instance, more than 6 months | Number | 15,687.00 | 28,887.00 | 2,570.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I2 | Share of final positive decisions at the appeal stage | Percentage | 42.45 | 67.65 | 78.57 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I3 | Number of persons in the reception system (stock at end of the reporting period) | Number | 19,398.00 | 30,097.00 | 3,465.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | (a) Number of persons in the reception system | Number | 19,398.00 | 30,097.00 | 3,465.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | (b) Number of asylum and first time asylum applicants | Number | 11,176.00 | 26,361.00 | 2,866.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I4 | Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants | Ratio | 1.74 | 1.14 | 1.21 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | (a) Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors | Number | 1,300.00 | 2,400.00 | 150.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | (b) Number of asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors (Eurostat migr_asyunaa) | Number | 401.00 | 3,024.00 | 196.00 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I5 | Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) as compared to the number of unaccompanied minors | Ratio | 3.24 | 0.79 | 0.77 |
| SO1 | I | SO1I6 | Convergence of first instance/final instance recognition rates by Member States for asylum applicants from a same third country | Percentage points | 6.30 | -58.31 | -54.69 |
| SO2 | R | SO2R1 | Number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures supported by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies | Number | 0.00 | | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | i) number of target group persons assisted through measures focusing on education and training, including language training and preparatory actions to facilitate access to the labour market | Number | 57.00 | | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | ii) number of target group persons supported through the provision of advice and assistance in the area of housing | Number | 32.00 | | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | iii) number of target group persons assisted through the provision of | Number | 0.00 | | |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | health and psychological care | | | | |
| SO2 | R | SO2R2 | iv) number of target group persons assisted through measures related to democratic participation | Number | 183.00 | | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I1 | Share of third-country nationals (TCNs) having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs | Percentage | 0.68 | 0.27 | 0.30 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I2 | Employment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -25.60 | -23.10 | -21.60 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I3 | Unemployment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | 16.40 | 13.20 | 12.80 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I4 | Activity rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -17.50 | -16.90 | -15.20 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I5 | Share of early leavers from education and training: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | | | |
| SO2 | I | SO2I6 | Share of 30 to 34-years-olds with tertiary educational attainment: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | -18.90 | -16.60 | -14.80 |
| SO2 | I | SO2I7 | Share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals | Percentage points | 33.30 | 31.90 | 31.30 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R1 | Number of persons trained on return-related topics with the | Number | 61.00 | 290.00 | |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|----|------|--------|----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|
|  |  |  | assistance of the Fund |  |  |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R2 | Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | (a) persons who returned voluntarily | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | (b) and persons who were removed | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R3 | Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R4 | Number of monitored removal operations co-financed by the Fund | Number | 9.00 | 12.00 |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | (a) Persons who were removed (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund) | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | (b) Total number of returns following an order to leave | Number | 5,455.00 | 3,330.00 | 2,529.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R5 | Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave | Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | (a) Number of persons returned in the framework of joint return operations (assisted-voluntary and forced) supported by the Fund | Number |  |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | (b) Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 |  |  |
| SO3 | R | SO3R6 | Number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return | Ratio | 0.00 |  |  |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|----|------|--------|----------------------|-----------|------|------|------|
| | | | operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund | | | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | (a) Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund | Number | 0.00 | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | (b) Persons who returned voluntarily (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund) | Number | 0.00 | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R7 | Number of returnees who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund | Ratio | 0.00 | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | (a) Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund | Number | | | |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | (b) Total number of places in detention centres | Number | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SO3 | R | SO3R8 | Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres | Ratio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | (a) Number of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave (migr_eirtn) | Number | 5,455.00 | 3,330.00 | 2,529.00 |
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | (b) Number of third-country nationals ordered to leave | Number | 15,252.00 | 4,583.00 | 2,660.00 |

| SO | Type | Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (migr_eiord) | | | | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I1 | Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave | Ratio | 0.36 | 0.73 | 0.95 |
| SO3 | I | SO3I2 | Return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants | Number | | | |
| SO3 | I | SO3I3 | Effective returns of rejected asylum applicants | Number | 4,800.00 | 3,180.00 | 2,800.00 |
| SO4 | R | SO4R1 | Number of applicants and beneficiaries of international protection transferred from one Member State to another with support of the Fund. | Number | | | |
| SO4 | R | SO4R2 | Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on enhancing solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States supported under the Fund. | Number | | | |

## 2 - Indicators on efficiency, added value and sustainability, as foreseen in Regulation (EU) No 514/2014

| Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | Baseline value | Source of data | 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1 | Number of Full Time Equivalent in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of the Fund and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to: | Number | | Member States | 6.00 |
| H1 | (a) the number of projects implemented | Number | | AIR | 17.00 |
| H1 | (b) the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year | Amount in EUR | | Accounts | 9,001,748.00 |
| H2 | (a) Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost | Amount in EUR | | Member States | 291,738.00 |
| H2 | (b) Amount of funds claimed for the financial year | Amount in EUR | | Accounts | 9,001,748.00 |
| H2 | Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost of projects as compared to the amount of funds claimed for the financial year | Ratio | | / | 0.03 |
| H3 | Amount of the annual expenditure submitted by the Member State | Amount in EUR | | Accounts | 1,065,460.00 |
| H3 | Total amount of funds allocated to the national programme. | Amount in EUR | | Accounts | 68,817,405.00 |
| H3 | Absorption rate of the Fund | Ratio | | / | 0.02 |

| Ind ID | Indicator description | Meas unit | 2016 | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1 | Number of Full Time Equivalent in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of the Fund and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to: | Number | 6.00 | 6.00 | 3.00 |
| H1 | (a) the number of projects implemented | Number | 5.00 | 19.00 | 0.00 |
| H1 | (b) the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year | Amount in EUR | 15,687,583.00 | 0.00 | |
| H2 | (a) Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost | Amount in EUR | 656,599.00 | 204,263.00 | 0.00 |
| H2 | (b) Amount of funds claimed for the financial year | Amount in EUR | 15,687,583.00 | 0.00 | |
| H2 | Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost of projects as compared to the amount of funds claimed for the financial year | Ratio | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| H3 | Amount of the annual expenditure submitted by the Member State | Amount in EUR | 15,687,583.00 | 0.00 | |
| H3 | Total amount of funds allocated to the national programme. | Amount in EUR | 66,264,277.00 | 44,138,777.00 | |
| H3 | Absorption rate of the Fund | Ratio | 0.24 | 0.00 | |

**Table 1: Progress in financial implementation, by specific objectives (in Euro)**

| National objective / Specific Action | A<br>Total paid | B<br>Total paid | Total paid (A+B/SO) programmed (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| SO1.NO1 Reception/asylum | 151,316.94 | 390,585.18 | 10.23% |
| SO1.NO2 Evaluation | 43,154.99 | 0.00 | 4.07% |
| SO1.NO3 Resettlement | 85,574.02 | 39,434.00 | 14.74% |
| **TOTAL NO SO1** | **280,045.95** | **430,019.18** | |
| **TOTAL SO1** | **280,045.95** | **430,019.18** | **9.85%** |
| SO2.NO1 Legal migration | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| SO2.NO2 Integration | 185,391.21 | 336,673.90 | 8.80% |
| SO2.NO3 Capacity | 20,182.60 | 94,481.61 | 4.92% |
| **TOTAL NO SO2** | **205,573.81** | **431,155.51** | **6.99%** |
| SO2.SA8 Legal migration | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **TOTAL SA SO2** | **0.00** | **0.00** | |
| **TOTAL SO2** | **205,573.81** | **431,155.51** | **6.99%** |
| SO3.NO1 Accompanying measures | 127,892.70 | 0.00 | 7.54% |
| SO3.NO2 Return measures | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| SO3.NO3 Cooperation | 132,918.19 | 0.00 | 12.54% |
| **TOTAL NO SO3** | **260,810.89** | **0.00** | **5.35%** |
| SO3.SA5 Joint return | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| SO3.SA6 Joint reintegration | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| **TOTAL SA SO3** | **0.00** | **0.00** | |
| **TOTAL SO3** | **260,810.89** | **0.00** | **5.35%** |
| **TOTAL NO SO4** | | | |

| TOTAL SO4 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pledges (Union priorities) | 23,790,000.00 | | 188.06% |
| Pledges (Others) | 1,908,000.00 | | 17.46% |
| Transfers & relocations | 4,512,000.00 | | 36.19% |
| Admission from Turkey | 786,500.00 | | 11.69% |
| **TOTAL Special Cases** | **30,996,500.00** | | **72.46%** |
| Technical Assistance | 666,914.89 | | 1.56% |
| **TOTAL** | **32,409,845.54** | **861,174.69** | **50.21%** |

**Table 2: Number of projects and EU contribution to finished and open projects, by specific objectives (in Euro)**

| | Number of projects and EU contribution 01/01/2014-15/10/2016 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Nr of finished projects | Total EU contribution to finished projects | Total Nr of open projects | Total EU contribution to open projects |
| SO1 - Asylum | 0 | 0.00 | 11 | 280,045.95 |
| SO2 - Integration/legal migration | 0 | 0.00 | 10 | 205,573.81 |
| SO3 - Return | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 260,810.89 |
| SO4 - Solidarity | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| SO5 - Technical assistance | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Total 1** | **0** | **0.00** | **24** | **746,430.65** |

| | Number of projects and EU contribution 16/10/2016-30/06/2017 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Nr of finished projects | Total EU contribution to finished projects | Total Nr of open projects | Total EU contribution to open projects |
| SO1 - Asylum | 1 | 27,497.68 | 14 | 402,521.50 |
| SO2 - Integration/legal migration | 0 | 0.00 | 22 | 431,155.51 |
| SO3 - Return | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 |
| SO4 - Solidarity | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| SO5 - Technical assistance | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| **Total 2** | **1** | **27,497.68** | **40** | **833,677.01** |
| **Total 1+2** | **1** | **27,497.68** | **64** | **1,580,107.66** |

**Table 3: Number of projects and EU contribution, by types of beneficiaries and by specific objectives (in Euro)**

| | | Project beneficiaries 01/01/2014-15/10/2016 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SO1: Asylum | SO2: Integration / Legal migration | SO3: Return | SO4: Solidarity |
| State/federal authorities | Nr of projects | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| State/federal authorities | EU contribution | 134,771.09 | 20,182.60 | 260,810.89 | 0.00 |
| Local public bodies | Nr of projects | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Local public bodies | EU contribution | 85,574.02 | 68,548.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Non-governmental organisations | Nr of projects | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-governmental organisations | EU contribution | 59,700.84 | 16,797.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| International public organisations | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International public organisations | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| National Red Cross | Nr of projects | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| National Red Cross | EU contribution | 0.00 | 23,895.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| International Committee of the Red Cross | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International Committee of the Red Cross | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Private and public law companies | Nr of projects | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private and public law companies | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Education/research organisations | Nr of projects | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Education/research organisations | EU contribution | 0.00 | 76,150.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | Project beneficiaries 16/10/2016-30/06/2017 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SO1: Asylum | SO2: Integration / Legal migration | SO3: Return | SO4: Solidarity |
| State/federal authorities | Nr of projects | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| State/federal authorities | EU contribution | 298,213.40 | 94,481.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Local public bodies | Nr of projects | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Local public bodies | EU contribution | 39,434.00 | 132,055.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Non-governmental organisations | Nr of projects | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-governmental organisations | EU contribution | 0.00 | 2,487,025.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| International public organisations | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International public organisations | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| National Red Cross | Nr of projects | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| National Red Cross | EU contribution | 0.00 | 59,750.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| International Committee of the Red Cross | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International Committee of the Red Cross | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies | Nr of projects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies | EU contribution | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Private and public law companies | Nr of projects | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private and public law companies | EU contribution | 35,692.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Education/research organisations | Nr of projects | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Education/research organisations | EU contribution | 0.00 | 119,997.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

**Table 4: Special cases**

| Special cases | | 2014-2015 | 2016-2017 | 2018-2020 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Resettlement Union Priorities | Pledged | | | | |
| Resettlement Union Priorities | Actual | 15,060,000.00 | 8,730,000.00 | | 23,790,000.00 |
| Resettlement Others | Pledged | 20,650,000.00 | 2,930,000.00 | | 23,580,000.00 |
| Resettlement Others | Actual | 1,458,000.00 | 450,000.00 | | 1,908,000.00 |
| Transfer & relocation | Pledged | 0.00 | 12,468,000.00 | | 12,468,000.00 |
| Transfer & relocation | Actual | | 4,512,000.00 | | 4,512,000.00 |
| Admission from Turkey | Pledged | | 6,727,500.00 | | 6,727,500.00 |
| Admission from Turkey | Actual | | 786,500.00 | | 786,500.00 |
| Total | Pledged | 20,650,000.00 | 22,125,500.00 | 0.00 | 42,775,500.00 |
| Total | Actual | 16,518,000.00 | 14,478,500.00 | 0.00 | 30,996,500.00 |

**Documents**

| Document title | Document type | Document date | Local reference | Commission reference | Files | Sent date | Sent By |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

**Latest validation results**

| Severity | Code | Message |
|----------|------|---------|
| Info | | Evaluation report version has been validated. |