



This project is co-funded by the European Union



MINISTERO
DELL'INTERNO

2014-2020 ASYLUM, MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION FUND (AMIF)

INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

FINAL VERSION

Ongoing, interim and ex-post evaluation service on the actions co-financed by the 2014-2020
Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)

22 December 2017



This document reports the results of the research carried out by the Consortium Gruppo CLAS SpA –Archidata, in collaboration with the *Centro interuniversitario Dagum*, *Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, University of Catania, University of Rome “La Sapienza”.

Coordination (Gruppo CLAS SpA)

General Coordinator: *Cinzia Lombardo*; Scientific Advisor: *Gian Carlo Blangiardo*; Technical Coordinator: *Giovanni Paolo Bossi*.

Working Group

Laura Belloni, Valentina Salis, Claudia Striato, Alberto Vergani, Davide Zanon, Paola Zito (Gruppo CLAS SpA); *Emiliano Bona, Marcello D'Amico, Alessio Menonna, Mauro Palumbo, Valeria Pandolfini* (Archidata); *Vincenzo Mauro, Barbara Pacini, Monica Pratesi* (Centro interuniversitario Dagum); *Marco Caselli, Ennio Codini, Oana Marcu, Egidio Riva, Renata Viganò* (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore); *Giulio Ghellini, Maria Teresa Consoli, Carlo Pennisi, Francesco Mazzeo Rinaldi, Venera Marina Tomaselli* (University of Catania); *Elena Ambrosetti, Anna Di Bartolomeo, Alessio Buonomo, Oliviero Casacchia, Fiorenza Deriu, Alessandra Derose, Cristina Giudici, Jana Kopečna, Luisa Natale, Filomena Racioppi, Cecilia Reynaud* (University of Rome “La Sapienza”).

Layout and graphics by *Mariuccia Azzali* (Gruppo CLAS SpA).

CONTENTS

INDEPENDENT EXPERTS (AS REQUIRED IN ART. 56(3) OF THE REGULATION (EU) NO 514/2014)	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
SECTION I: CONTEXT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF AMIF DURING 01/01/2014-30/06/2017	10
SECTION II: CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME.....	11
SECTION III: DEVIATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMES IN COMPARISON WITH WHAT WAS INITIALLY PLANNED (IF ANY)	12
SECTION IV: EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	14
1 Effectiveness	14
2 Efficiency	34
3 Relevance	40
4 Coherence	43
5 Complementarity	47
6 EU added Value	51
7 Sustainability	56
8 Simplification and reduction of administrative burden	60
Section V: Project examples	62
Section VI: Methodology	66
Section VII: Main conclusions and recommendations	68
Section VIII: Mid-Term Review	71
Section IX: Common results and impact indicators.....	72
ANNEX: DATA.....	83
DOCUMENTS - ATTACHMENTS	88
Attachment 1 – Note on “Annex:Data”	89
Attachment 2 – Summary table on integration services available in Italy by region	90

List of abbreviations used in the Report

AA	Audit Authority of Italy's 2014-2020 Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund identified within the Ministry of the Interior, Department for Civil Administration staff and for material and financial resources
AB	Awarding Body
AMIF	2014-2020 Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund
ANCI	<i>Associazione Nazionale Comuni Italiani</i> (National Association of Italian Municipalities)
AVR	Assisted Voluntary Return
AVR & R	Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration
CARA	<i>Centri di Accoglienza per Richiedenti Asilo</i> (Reception Centres for Asylum Seekers)
CAS	<i>Centri di Accoglienza Straordinaria</i> (Extraordinary Reception Centres)
CIE	<i>Centro di identificazione ed Espulsione</i> (Identification and Expulsion Centres)
CMEF	Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
CPIA	Centri Provinciali per l'Istruzione degli Adulti (Provincial Centres for Adult Education)
CPSA	<i>Centro di Primo Soccorso e Accoglienza</i> (Centres for First Aid and Reception)
CPR	<i>Centri Permanenti per il Rimpatrio</i> (Permanent Centres for Return)
DA	Delegated Authority (under art. 25, par. 1, lett. c) of EU Reg. n. 514/2014) identified within the Ministry of Labour and Social Policies, Directorate-General for Immigration and integration policies
DLCI	<i>Dipartimento per le Libertà Civili e l'Immigrazione</i> (Civil Rights and Immigration Department)
EB	Executing Body
EBF	External Border Fund 2007-2013
EIF	European Integration Fund
EQ	Evaluation Question
ER	Enforced Return
ERF	European Refugee Fund
ERIN	European Reintegration Network
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
IGRUE	Inspectorate General for Financial Relations with the European Union
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MAE	<i>Ministero degli Affari Esteri e della Cooperazione Internazionale</i> (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
MEF	<i>Ministero dell'Economia e delle Finanze</i> (Ministry of Economy and Finance)
MC	Monitoring Committee
MIUR	<i>Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca</i> (Ministry of Education, University and Research)

MLPS	<i>Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali</i> (Ministry of Labour)
MS	Member State(s)
NO	National Objective
NOP	National Operational Programme
NOP SPAO	National Operational Programme on Systems for Active Employment Policies
NP	National Programme
RA	Responsible Authority of Italy's 2014-2020 Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund identified within the Ministry of the Interior, Civil Rights and Immigration Department
RF	European Return Fund
Si.Ge.Co	<i>Sistema di Gestione e Controllo</i> (Management and Control System)
SO	Specific Objective
SOLID	General Programme 2007-2013 "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows"
SPRAR	<i>Sistema di protezione per richiedenti asilo e rifugiati</i> (System of Protection for Asylum Seekers and Refugees)
TCN	Third-Country National
UAM	Unaccompanied minors
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

INDEPENDENT EXPERTS (AS REQUIRED IN ART. 56(3) OF THE REGULATION (EU) NO 514/2014)

Italy's evaluation of the National Programme (NP) of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) has been entrusted to an external Body to the Administration which is functionally independent from the Responsible Authority (RA), the Audit Authority (AA) and the Delegated Authority (DA).

This Body is the Consortium consisting in Gruppo CLAS Spa (leading group having a mandate) and Archidata Srl (as principal) which has been identified through an open tender of Community relevance (see call for bids published in the OJEU 2015/S 229-416796).

The entrusted service envisages the development of the *ongoing*, *interim* and *ex post* evaluation of the actions co-financed by AMIF; it has been started in September 2016 and will be concluded in September 2024.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EFFECTIVENESS

At 30/06/2017, the NP has had a two-year implementation, funding 304 projects of which 27 have been completed. Over 60% of the finished projects achieved or exceeded their expected results while in the other cases the gap between expected and achieved results is mainly due to external factors to the NP.

The NP's first results are mainly concentrated on SO1. On this SO, the NP's contribution is twofold: on the one side, it contributes to the creation and qualification of the UAMs' reception and first integration system (a system that did not exist before 2014); on the other side, it contributes to supporting the management of emergency situations (in terms of first aid, assistance and very first reception) deriving from the significant arrival flows, especially by sea. Aside from these first results the still limited number of finished projects makes the research of visible effects on the national asylum system, TCN integration in Italy and national return strategies premature.

At this stage, the effectiveness of the NP can be assessed mainly in potential terms, analysing if and how the 304 funded projects have the potential to contribute to achieving the Fund's objectives. On the Asylum system, a positive element is the fact that the contribution of SO1 has gradually shifted from an emergency-management perspective to a more structural approach. This can be clearly observed on projects concerning UAMs: compared to the first funded projects, new projects last longer (multi-annual) and do not focus only on first reception but on the whole reception process (from UAMs' arrival to their integration into SPRAR Centres). In future the Fund will contribute to speeding up asylum procedures on the one side and, on the other, to strengthening monitoring of reception services. On this last point it should be mentioned that an important project, which aims at defining the methodological approach for monitoring the services including the definition of homogenous reception standards, has started.

On integration, significant investments have been made on the training of TCNs as the knowledge of the host-country language is a necessary condition for the start of the integration process. The implemented courses have already involved 15,000 TCNs and aim at involving over 40,000 of them. It is a broad training offer that allows to answer both to the increasing need for higher-level training (linked to the increasing number of migrants settling in the country) and to the needs of persons with low school education level. On this theme, a positive element is represented by the NP's attention to providing a standard training offer by implementing operational tools created in 2016. A significant contribution to reaching the NP's set target value (involvement of 882,500 TCNs over the whole programming period) will be provided by the implementation of the 76 Regional intervention plans for the integration of TCNs (over 200,000 target group persons), that have started from March 2017, as well as by experimental language training services for vulnerable targets (7,000 persons) and the international civil service actions in favour of 3,000 beneficiaries of international protection.

Furthermore, the analysis on projects aimed at strengthening capacity and promoting the exchange of good practices on integration and on the context in which they operate shows that these initiatives will contribute to enhancing basic services that often are weak in the territories in which they are implemented.

In reference to SO3, the objectives set in the NP are still far from being reached. Up to the first semester of 2017 implementation has mainly focused on Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration interventions. The results currently achieved on these interventions are below expectations. This can be explained by the difficulties in intercepting potential target group persons due to a limited awareness of this measure. As far as Enforced Returns are concerned, an important intervention has started in the second half of 2017 whose beneficiary is the State Police.

EFFICIENCY

At 30/06/2017, in line with the NP's life-cycle, financial commitments account for 44% of the NP's financial budget. Payments are still low (10% of the budget) but in 2017 there has been a strong acceleration on this front. Developments after 30/06/2017 show that the target set at 15/10/2017 will be exceeded and that there will be no risk of incurring in automatic de-commitment by the EU.

In terms of project efficiency, out of the 17 projects that have fully met expected results, almost all (14) have generated savings, on average of 6.5%.

RELEVANCE

The objectives of the NP (according to the version approved in 2015) show a good level of correspondence to the needs identified by the programming authority. This is confirmed by the value of the relevance index that has been assigned to each operational objective by consulting a panel of experts.

The analysis on interventions funded at 30/06/2017 shows that the projects are able to give a good response both to the needs identified in the NP and to the needs that have emerged in the first implementing period (2015 – June 2017). This confirms the standing of the Programme in relation to the changes in migratory trends, which justify the need for intervention.

COHERENCE AND COMPLEMENTARITY

The NP's coherence and complementarity with other Programmes funded by the EU has been ensured through coordination tools between the RA, the DA and national institutions responsible for other Programmes funded by EU Funds. The coordination mechanisms currently put in place have encouraged strategic cooperation between the different actors while cooperation at operational level is still limited (in terms of implementation of joint/complementary actions).

EU ADDED VALUE

The added value resulting from the Programme mainly concerns the availability of additional financial resources (volume effect). The interruption of the Fund's support would affect results differently depending on the SO considered. Interventions falling under SO1 are likely to be more or less affected depending on their nature: emergency actions are likely to be continued with other resources while for actions on the system it would be harder to replace AMIF funds; interventions on SO2 would be the ones to have greater difficulties (as they are not emergency actions); interventions on SO3 would only be partially affected (at least in reference to AVR).

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability assessment has been carried out on 19 (out of the 27) finished projects at 30/06/2017 for which documents (describing the projects, their implementation and their final assessment) were available and for which answers have been given to the survey carried out by the evaluator in June 2017.

The analysis carried out show a good probability that the achieved results will last once the support of the Fund is over; this assessment is based on the frequent inclusion in the projects of elements that are a precondition for future sustainability (e.g. partnership agreements, use of national resources, focus on specific products or services, etc.).

Almost 80% of the answers to the survey carried out by the evaluator shows a high probability that "the results achieved by the project are to last at least one year after its completion". It should be noted that for projects that had more "structural" expectations (see initiatives in the UAM extension projects of UNHCR, ANCI, Save the Children and IOM) these expectations were confirmed even after almost a year from their completion.

SIMPLIFICATION AND REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

The changes introduced by AMIF point in the right direction for the simplification of procedures. However, the fulfilment of national and EU requirements are still perceived by the beneficiaries as factors that slow down implementation.

In this view, the RA's initiatives aimed at encouraging a common regulation and procedures framework for beneficiaries are appreciated. The RA has encouraged communication with all beneficiaries since the very first implementation stage by organising meetings aimed at discussing reporting and monitoring procedures and the use of the information system. The RA has also involved the beneficiaries in the review of the projects' indicators.

SECTION I: CONTEXT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF AMIF DURING 01/01/2014-30/06/2017

RECEPTION AND ASYLUM

The most significant phenomena are: the growing migratory pressure (170,000 illegal arrivals by sea in 2014, over 180,000 in 2016 and over 83,000 in the first semester of 2017); the increase of UAM (unaccompanied minors) arrivals (13,000 in 2014, doubled in 2016 and over 7,000 in the first semester of 2017); the increase of applications for international protection (from 63,000 in 2014 to over 123,000 in 2016 and about 73,000 in the first semester of 2017); Italy's participation to the European resettlement plan and its commitment to the resettlement of 1,989 persons in the period 2014-2017.

INTEGRATION

As at the 01.01.2017 foreigners residing in Italy are just over 5 million (8.3% out of the total residents); TCNs are on the same date 3.7 million (-5.5% compared to 2016). Italian citizenship has been obtained by 184,638 persons in 2016 (about 50,000 in 2011); entries for work purposes have decreased (5.7% in 2016 and -41% compared to 2015) and family reunifications have increased (45% of the new entries); new permits for asylum and international protection reach an unprecedented peak (77,927; 34% of the total).

The unemployment rate of foreigners (16.1% in 2016) is higher than that of Italians (11.4%), in particular for women and older workers. The absolute number of persons employed increases, in 2012-2016 asylum seekers employment contracts double and companies owned by Third Country Nationals increase (+19%).

TCNs are 7% out of the total students in Italian schools. 27.3% of foreign students do not pass the school year (Italians stop at 14.3%). Over one third of foreign young people (36.2% in 2015) are NEET. Although considered as fundamental, integration services in favour of Third Country Nationals turn out to be weak or absent in some regions.

RETURN

The increasing phenomenon of illegal arrivals by sea has contributed to an increase in the number of irregular stayers, with almost 141 thousand units more between the 1st January 2014 and the same date in 2017. 5,790 returns have been carried out in 2016 out of 32,365 expelled foreign citizens and of 491,000 foreign citizens living in situations of irregularity throughout the territory (435,000 in 2015). AVR's have decreased (from 919 in 2014 to 136 in 2016). Enforced returns in the period 2014-2016 are limited (less than 20%) compared to TCNs with an order to leave. The bearing on total returns is however high (77.8% in 2016).

SECTION II: CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME

Despite the increase in reception capacity, the transfer between the different reception modalities is still difficult due to the increasing migratory pressure. Issues concern the insufficient UAM reception capacity of the SPRAR system and the setting up of a network among the different reception systems. In relation to the ability to examine asylum and international protection applications, critical issues persist both in terms of the time necessary to reach a final decision (with impacts on the reception system) and because of the heterogeneity of judgments among the different Territorial Commissions and between these and the Courts.

Another challenge that has emerged in recent years is linked to the change in the profile of foreigners residing in Italy due to the arrival of persons with a less clear project and with lower educational and training resources compared to the first migrants (economic migrants). Even though migrants' participation in the labour market has increased, more than half of 2016 recruitment has concerned unqualified profiles. TCNs seem to prefer self-employment, which is however particularly difficult for the access to credit and for the necessary requirements (even in consideration of language difficulties). Figures confirm a persistent and important *gap* between Italian and TCNs students with regard to educational success and a difficult management of new arrivals during the school year.

Furthermore, in the reference period some changes in the system occurred (cuts to public resources, or reconfiguring of Authorities covering wide areas as a consequence of provinces' abolition), which have intensified the territorial differentiation in administrative efficiency of services in favour of migrants. Concerning "returns", a high bearing of enforced returns has been registered out of the total returns carried out in 2016 (that is 77.8% out of the total returns). For the management of expelled migrants which have not been returned, CIEs have been replaced by the new Permanent Centres for Return (D.L. 13 of 17/02/2017).

In consideration of the identified challenges, it has been observed that actions planned in the NP are currently able to respond to the context (described in Section I) and needs (described in par. 3.2).

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

Italy's National Programme has been approved by European Commission Decision C (2015) 5343 of 03/08/2015.

The majority of the "main actions" reported in the Programme have started in the expected year by using the different operational instruments available (Executing body mode, Awarding Body mode).

Table III.1: Start of the AMIF NP implementation compared its initial expectations

SO	NO	Main action	Expected start of implementation phase	Actual start of the implementation*	Modality
SO1 - Asylum	NO1 - Reception / asylum	Strengthening the first-assistance and second-level reception services	2016	2016	AB
		Strengthening reception services and specific assistance for unaccompanied minors	2016	2016	AB
		Reception, support and orientation for Asylum applicants under the Dublin Regulation	2017	not activated	n.a.
	NO2 - Evaluation	Monitoring the quality of procedures	2016	2016	EB
		Monitoring the reception system	2015	2015	AB EB
	NO3 - Resettlement	Creation of a resettlement office	2015	2015	EB
SO22 - Integration / legal migration	NO1 – Legal Migration	Pre-departure orientation for reunification beneficiaries	2016	2016	AB
		Pre-departure training aimed at entering in Italy	2016	2016	AB
	NO2 - Integration	Language training and civic-orientation	2015	2015	AB EB
		Encourage access to services	2015	2016	AB
		Preparatory actions to help access to the labour market	2015	not activated	n.a.
	NO3 - Capacity	Governance of services	2015	2015	AB EB
		Interventions to fight against discrimination	2016	2015	AB
		Exchange of best practices	2015	2015	AB
SO 3 - Return	NO1 – Accompanying measures	Creation of an Institutional network on AVR	2016	2016	AB
		Creation of a monitoring system on enforced return	2016	2016	AB
		Restructuring of not viable places in identification and expulsion centres	2015	not activated	n.a.
	ON2 – Return measures	Carrying out assisted voluntary return and reintegration	2015	2015	AB
		Enforced return operations and training of staff involved in escort operations	2016	not activated	n.a.
	ON3 - Cooperation	Establishment of AVR guidelines	2016	not activated	n.a.
		Meetings with Third Country stakeholders	2016	not activated	n.a.

** (year in which the Call was released and/or in which the beneficiary was identified when using Direct Award or Executing Body modes)*

At 30/06/2017 the actions that have not been activated are:

- Reception, support and orientation for Asylum applicants under the Dublin Regulation, falling under let. f) of SO1NO1; the fact that this action has not been implemented is linked to the RA's strategic choice to give priority during the implementation stage to the creation and qualification the UAMs' reception and first integration system.
- Preparatory actions to help access to the labour market, falling under let. b) of SO2NO2; on these actions, it is expected that the DA will release calls in 2018 (on this point see recommendation n.2).
- Restructuring of not viable places in identification and expulsion centres (CIE), falling under let. f) of SO3NO1; initiatives on this theme are currently funded with national resources also following the release of the "Minniti Decree" that replaces CIEs with "Permanent Return Centers" (CPR).
- Enforced return operations, falling under let. h) of SO3NO2; on this theme, in July 2017 a procedure was carried out that lead to the selection in August of a significant national project (the beneficiary is the State Police). This project has a budget of 27 million Euros.
- Cooperation actions, falling under SO3NO3; on this theme it should be mentioned that, externally to AMIF programming, Italy has signed agreements with some Third Countries for the readmission of citizens forcibly returned from Italy implementing joint return operations with other Member States (see section IV, par. 1.3.3).

It should also be taken into account that a long time may pass from the publishing of the Calls to the start of the interventions as it may take several months for applicants to present their projects, for the Administration to finalise the selection of interventions and publish the list of projects selected for funding and the start of the related projects following the grant agreement.

Reminding that the NP has been approved in August 2015, it should be highlighted that all 9 calls published in 2015 were released in December and that the 2016 calls have been published from April. Therefore physical and financial implementation has been completed at a later date compared to what was originally planned.

SECTION IV: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1 EFFECTIVENESS

1.1 (A) HOW DID THE FUND CONTRIBUTE TO STRENGTHENING AND DEVELOPING ALL ASPECTS OF THE COMMON EUROPEAN ASYLUM SYSTEM, INCLUDING ITS EXTERNAL DIMENSION?

Based on the implementation at June 2017, the contribution of SO1 related to the topic addressed in the Evaluation Question is twofold: on the one side, it contributed to the **start, creation and definition of the UAMs' reception and first assistance system**; on the other side, it contributed to **supporting the management of emergency situations (in terms of first aid, assistance and very first reception)** deriving from the significant arrival flows, especially by sea.

As a positive element it should be noted that, in time, the contribution of SO1 has gradually shifted from an emergency-management perspective to a more structural approach. This can be easily observed on projects concerning UAMs: compared to the first funded projects, new projects last longer (multi-annual) and do not focus only on first reception but on the whole reception process (from the UAMs' arrival to their integration into SPRAR Centres). In future the Fund will contribute to speeding up asylum procedures on the one side and, on the other, to strengthening monitoring of reception services. On this last point it should be mentioned that an important project (MIRECO), which aims at defining the methodological approach for monitoring the services including the definition of homogenous reception standards, has started.

Achievement level of the targets set for Common Indicators on SO1 at 30/06/2017

	TARGETS REACHED	TARGETS LIKELY TO BE REACHED	TARGETS FAR FROM BEING REACHED	TARGETS NOT COVERED BY CURRENT PROJECTS
SO1NO1		<p>SO1R1 - Number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems</p> <p>Actual achievement: 48,7% (6.328 out of 13.000)</p> <p>Estimated achievement: 220,6% (28.681 out of 13.000)</p>	<p>SO1R2- Number of places of new or improved reception accommodation infrastructure</p> <p>Actual achievement: 33,2% (1.659 out of 5.000)</p> <p>Estimated achievement: 35,4% (1.768 out of 5.000)</p>	
		<p>SO1R3 - Number of persons trained in asylum-related topics</p> <p>Actual achievement: 57,1% (2.284 out of 4.000)</p> <p>Estimated achievement: 84,8% (3.390 out of 4.000)</p>	<p>SO1R2 - Percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity</p> <p>Raggiungimento effettivo: 33,2% (2,03 out of 6)</p> <p>Estimated achievement: 35,4% (2,16 out of 6)</p>	
SO1NO2	<p>SO1.C5 - Number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate asylum policies in MS</p> <p>Actual achievement: 100% (6 out of 6)</p>			
SO1NO3		<p>SO1.C6 – Number of persons resettled with support of the Fund</p> <p>Actual achievement: 53,2% (1.059 out of 1.989)</p> <p>Estimated achievement: 85,4% (1.699 out of 1.989)</p>		

N.B: the table above ranks the CMEF indicators based of the actual target achievement level at 30/06/2017 registered by the RA. It also provides the potential target achievement (estimated achievement) based on the targets set in funded projects at 30/06/2017 (resulting from projects' documentation and available monitoring sheets).

Considering the time still available for the actions' implementation, the current values of Common indicators on SO1 are overall in line with the possibility to reach the targets set by the NP. However, at the present state, the target set for indicator SO1R2 (places in new or improved reception infrastructures) will not be

reached due to the RA'S operational choices, oriented at implementing services rather than increasing reception places. The evaluator approves this direction as it positively defines the NP's contribution to the reception system.

Apart from this specific case, the progress on outputs and results is in line with the financial progress of SO1. SO1, with commitments at 30/06/2017 of over 140M Euro, has a leading role in the implementation of the NP (that has committed in the same time period 252M Euro).

1.1.1 a. (i) What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the asylum procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

Italy has intensified information and assistance activities aimed at migrants upon arrival. These activities are important not only for humanitarian reasons but also to identify potential asylum seekers and help them to correctly apply for protection.

In reference to the length of procedures and to the differences in asylum-granting ratios, no significant progress is registered, this is also due to the constant increase in the number of applications. The increase in the number of applications coincided with an increase in the number of pending cases (indicator SO1I1) and to a reduction in the positive decisions at the appeal stage (SO1I2). On this, in the last three years, Italy has undertaken a relevant number of organizational and regulatory measures.

NP implementation status

In order to promote a greater efficiency of procedures, AMIF has invested 10.3M Euro, funding 4 projects (all currently under implementation). Two of these projects are directly linked to asylum procedures (SO1NO2); the other two projects – whose connection to the theme is indirect - concern the strengthening of the Ministry's Offices (SO1NO1).

The NP has also funded 4 projects (two are finished while the other two are under implementation) that include training of staff on asylum-related topics. Similarly, there are some projects on reception that also include information and legal support activities to help with applying for international protection.

The NP's current contribution

The NP supports the shift of the asylum and reception system from an emergency-management perspective (implemented before the start of the Programme) to a more structural approach.

At 30/06/2017, over 6,000 persons were individually assisted in the field of reception and asylum systems (indicator SO1R1). The achievement ratio compared to the expected target (13,000) is almost at 50%. The extensiveness of information activities upon landing (or in the stages immediately following arrival) should also be noted: through these initiatives 429,000 people have been generally informed.

Finished projects have also contributed to increasing the capacity to manage the extraordinary flow of arrivals by sea, providing assistance and very first information (also on asylum procedures) and, in the case of one of the projects, support for family reunification.

Interviews to beneficiaries highlight the interventions' contribution in improving the ability to manage emergency landings in terms of quality and timeliness of the information, diversification of information/assistance for specific target groups, early identification of vulnerable cases.

AMIF has assisted the training of 2,284 persons on asylum-related topics (indicator SO1R3), that is 57% of the total expected number of persons trained. Two of the finished projects have registered an excellent performance on this aspect, training over 1,250 persons compared to the expected 290.

With regard to the greater speed and quality in managing procedures, the currently open projects have not yet registered any documented result as they are still far from being completed and are amongst the projects with the lowest ranking in the effectiveness index (lower than 10).

However, during some interviews to the beneficiaries of the NP, a first increase in the Ministry of the Interior's (DLCI) ability to manage the workload deriving from the application of the Dublin 3 Regulation has been mentioned. This was made possible thanks to the NP's funding of one intervention that allowed to increase the number of staff in the Dublin Unit Office.

The NP's expected contribution

The NP has provided little contribution to improving the quality of procedures for granting international protection because on this policy area Italy already invests important resources through other funds.

The projects that are currently being carried out are aimed at:

- increasing the number of persons trained or assisted on asylum-related topics. This will lead to fully achieve the target set for indicators SO1R3 (4,000 persons trained) and SO1R1 (13,000 persons assisted);
- speeding-up asylum procedures through the implementation of new information systems for the drafting of minutes of the asylum-seekers' auditions and by connecting and integrating the already existing information systems. This will allow to: decrease the time taken for the procedures, decrease the number of appeals against the decisions of Territorial Commissions and decrease the burden on Prefectures and the RA's Offices;
- improve the Ministry of the Interior's governance of migration flows, introducing specific skills and know-how.

The NP, according to the beneficiaries, is positively contributing to:

- Reducing management time for the individual procedure of each migrant;
- Reducing the workload of each Prefecture;
- Increasing efficiency in expenditure (certainty on the cost for each migrant).

1.1.2 a. (ii) What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the reception conditions, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

The MS's main progress concern:

- the increase in the ability to manage sea arrivals;
- the structuring and definition of the reception system (especially for UAMs and vulnerable groups);
- the increase in the abilities and skills of Staff involved in the system.

The number of persons in the reception system (SO1I3) has increased from 82,000 in 2015 to over 161,000 in 2016. This is in line with the increase of asylum seekers (from 79,600 in 2015 to 114,700 in 2016). This has affected the ratio of Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants (SO1I4): in 2015 this ratio was 1.03 while in 2016 it increased to 1.41.

NP implementation status

On this area of intervention, AMIF has invested 109,112,522.32 Euros, funding 104 projects, implementing 74 of them, of which 20 are finished. Most of the funded projects (71 out of 104) aim at strengthening reception for UAMs. This is coherent with the last three years' arrival trends and helps support the creation of a reception system for UAMs (such a system did not exist in Italy before 2014). For target groups other than UAMs, the Programme has focused its intervention on the reception system on the provision of services on health and second-level reception.

The NP's current contribution

The NP has represented, after the allocation of 40 Meuro foreseen in the Stability Law for 2014, the main funding source for the creation of a UAM-specific reception system. At 30/06/2017, 1,659 places were made available for UAMs in new (or improved) reception accommodation infrastructure (indicator So1R2), reaching over 30% of the target set in the NP.

The finished projects allowed the reception of 971 UAMs showing a high effectiveness (confirmed by the fact that the effectiveness index was on average above 100). However there have been weaknesses in the implementation due to the projects' short duration (almost none of the projects has supplied the total number of reception days originally estimated) and to the SPRAR's limited capacity to receive minors (461 UAMs were transferred by the end of the projects).

The contribution of the NP to the creation of a national system for UAM reception has also been acknowledged by the interviewed beneficiaries. However, the beneficiaries notice the following critical issues:

- the complex management of the network in charge of the project's implementation, especially if it involves big players (IOM, UNHCR, Save the Children, ANCI);
- the SPRAR's difficulties in receiving UAMs due to the limited number of places available;
- the short-term duration of the projects that lead to difficulties to their full implementation (as mentioned above);
- the far distance between the reception centres to the landing point of minors.

The projects that are currently under implementation are also contributing to strengthening the reception system in terms of:

- the increase in the ability to provide first health assistance at sea;
- the increase in UAMs information and knowledge on the system, the procedures and their rights;
- the increase in operators' abilities and skills;
- the first implementation of psychological and health services for vulnerable international protection holders, including UAMs. The best performances on this were registered by projects (2) that were undertaken by beneficiaries with experience on these themes and therefore able to plan a realistic and balanced project.

The NP's expected contribution

Further contributions are expected in terms of:

- strengthening of the transfer between first-level and second-level reception of UAMs;
- improvement in the management capacity of the reception system through the increase of the skills of the operators involved;
- development of the SPRAR System's ability to accompany the persons hosted to social and labour integration.

Except for the specific case of UAMs, the NP has not funded projects aimed at increasing reception places (as they are already funded with national resources). The NP has concentrated on implementing services (on health and second-level reception) through projects that are still under implementation.

The evaluator approves this direction for two reasons: a) it allows the NP to respond to real needs that emerge from the changes (from emergency to structural) to the migration phenomenon; b) it is coordinated with the other interventions carried out with national funds. However, this address may hinder achieving 5,000 places in new or improved infrastructure (target set for indicator SO1R2): the completion of the

currently funded projects will lead to achieve at most 35% of said target. The RA should consider reviewing the set target of this indicator in the NP

1.1.3 a. (iii) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

Italy has adopted Directive 2011/95/EU through Legislative Decree of 21 February 2014 (O.J. n.55 of 7 March 2014). The major new element concerns the need to draft (in order to plan measures aimed at promoting integration of beneficiaries of international protection) a National Plan that identifies every two years the lines on intervention to ensure effective integration of beneficiaries of international protection, with particular attention to social and labour integration (also promoting specific programmes for the matching of labour demand and supply), to access to health and social assistance, to accommodation, to language training and education as well as to fight discriminations. This Plan, has currently not been adopted.

Legislative Decree 142/2015 implements Directive 2013/33/EU (on reception of applicants for international protection) and Directive 2013/32/EU (on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection). Through this Legislative Decree significant changes are introduced to the national asylum framework, amongst which the re-design of the Italian reception system and the definition of measures aimed at improving the governance of the national reception system at national and regional level. Legislative Decree 142/2015 has been widely implemented with the exception of Regional Boards in some regions.

NP implementation status

On this theme, AMIF has not funded specific projects: at June 2017 there are no projects (finished, open or merely selected for funding) that directly and explicitly refer to the "successful implementation of the legal framework of the qualification directive". However, the Directive is always correctly mentioned in the Calls of the SO for which it provides an information base and consequently constitutes an indirect objective.

1.1.4 a. (iv) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

From 2014, controls have been implemented on the service and detention standards of reception structures. Controls have concentrated on monitoring and inspections on the work of the managers of the reception centres, through the creation of tools and devices useful for the implemented activity (grids, sheets, minute's templates, drafts of service standards, database). To this end, the Ministry of the Interior Decree 7 March 2017 is important: it contains new specifications for the management of reception structures and it establishes, within the Ministry of the Interior (DLCI), the permanent Observatory on the reception system. One of the Observatory's task is to strengthen sharing and fine-tuning on reception quantitative and qualitative standards and monitoring. To carry out this task the Observatory will have to define a better monitoring method for the services offered by reception structures.

NP implementation status

In this field, AMIF has invested 15,074,303.00 Euro, funding 6 projects. Specifically, at June 2017, there are three finished projects. The other three projects are being implemented though the "Executing Body" method. However, the first two of these projects are more related to the theme of speeding up asylum

procedures (see par. 1.1.1) and therefore the only project that contributes to answering this question is “MIRECO - MONITORING AND IMPROVEMENT OF RECEPTION CONDITIONS”.

The NP's current contribution

In regard to the AMIF Programme, a positive sign is registered by the achievement of the expected target (6 projects supported under the Fund) on monitoring and evaluating asylum policies (see indicator SO1C5). These interventions were absent before the start of the Program.

Considering the persons trained with AMIF assistance (SO1R3), the NP has funded some NO cross-cutting projects. Amongst the objectives of these projects is the strengthening of information services and assistance at landing areas by training staff in the area.

The NP clearly pays attention to the monitoring of services and structures while it pays less attention to the monitoring of asylum procedures and to the evaluation of the asylum system as a whole. This direction seems correct considering that monitoring of services (and the re-organisation of such services as a consequence) is not yet adequate considering the public opinion's sensitivity to these themes.

Finished projects concerning this field, apart from having started the systematic implementation, have led to two types of results that have also been confirmed by the interviewed beneficiaries:

- increase in the control of reception structures and services, also through checks to service standards;
- increase in the Ministry of the Interior's (DLCI and local branches) ability to monitor and evaluate the reception system.

Funded projects, in order to inspect reception centres and carry out the related monitoring activities, have developed specific support tools and report templates that will be at the RA's disposal also for future use. At the same time, besides making available information and proof of the situation in monitored Centres, the projects allowed to provide advice for the improvement of the situations in the centres.

The open projects have not yet achieved any result as they are still far from being completed and the nature of the projects does not allow for partial results.

The NP's expected contribution

Amongst the initiatives currently under implementation, the MIRECO project should be mentioned. This project aims at creating a comprehensive monitoring system for reception services. From a financial point of view, the project is significant (5.5M Euro and should be finished by August 2019) and therefore there are important expectations on results, both in terms of methodology (organizational structure, instruments, procedures, system information) and of contents (training of staff in charge of the monitoring, inspections, mapping of best practices). Both these areas are being implemented and therefore the outputs of the project are starting to benefit the RA and the management of the reception system.

1.1.5 a. (v) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

For the first time Italy has a resettlement programme. The NP is playing a crucial role in the implementation of the Resettlement Programme by funding the Resettlement Office (placed under the responsibility of the International Relations Office- Office III of the Ministry of the Interior). The activities carried out by this Office prove Italy's progress on this theme.

Apart from activities falling under NO3, the Ministry of the Interior has recently (June 2017) signed an agreement with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Italian Embassy in Beirut for the strengthening of visa

issuing services for refugees that are currently in Lebanon and that could potentially be involved in the National Resettlement Programme.

NP implementation status

AMIF has invested 1,211,554 Euro in activating, since January 2016, the Resettlement Office within the Ministry of the Interior – DLCl. The office will continue carrying out its activities until 2020. The Office is in charge of implementing Italy's Resettlement Programme as set out in Chapter 4 of the AMIF NP (Special Cases). The experts currently working for the Office are also in charge of the definition of protocols, tools and procedures to be used in the management of resettlement cases (also other administrations are involved in these activities; i.e. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Public Security of the Ministry of the Interior, IOM, UNHCR, SPRAR Central Service). It should be noted that the management of the individual resettlement case is a particularly complex process, both in terms of procedures and implementation. In order to make this process easier, the following agreements have been signed:

- two memorandums of understanding on cooperation modalities between the Resettlement Office and the Forensic Police concerning resettlement activities from Turkey and Jordan;
- one agreement on cooperation modalities between the Resettlement Office and Carabinieri Police concerning resettlement activities from Lebanon and Sudan.

Finally, a contribution to the Office's functionality is given by the UNHCR's SO1-support project that has foreseen an activity line (line 5) aimed at strengthening the expertise of the staff involved in the Resettlement office in order to have a more solid management of the resettlement programme.

The NP's current contribution

At 30/06/2017, the Resettlement office (through the assessment of 1,974 cases) has contributed to the resettlement of 1,059 persons (indicator SO1C6) coordinating all the resettlement operations in Italy.

At 27.09.2017, it should be mentioned that Italy is one of the few (11) MS who has presented resettlement commitments based on what the Commission requested in occasion of the 8th Resettlement and Relocation Forum of 4 July 2017.

The NP's important contribution has also been acknowledged by the staff of the Resettlement Office that has confirmed that the implementation of the Resettlement Programme (based on what has been done up to June 2017) would not have been possible without AMIF contribution.

Despite the Office's efforts and the relevant number of applications it examined, the NP has some difficulties in achieving the set target (1,989 resettlements by 2017). This is shown by the fact that only 419 resettlements were carried out of 500 expected from the 2014-2015 pledging on Special Cases, and that also for the 2016-2017 there are difficulties in reaching the 1,489 resettlements expected before end of December 2017. This last number is hard to reach as it would mean the resettlement of 849 persons in the next 6 months (while the estimated number of resettlements for the second half of 2017 are 640 persons). The factors that hinder reaching the target are external and therefore beyond the Office's functionality and the Programme's control in general, in particular they refer to:

- the high rate of beneficiaries that, due to language and cultural obstacles, finally decide to not depart. This has been especially the case of resettlements from Turkey;
- the complexity of the procedure that requires the involvement and coordination of different actors in different stages with the consequence that any obstacle in the procedure (for example a delay in the Embassy issuing the visa or the lack of places available in SPRAR Centres) affects all the successive stages.

Although the achievement of the final target for resettlements should be monitored, it is not currently considered a critical element of the Programme as the same Commission (through Commission Recommendation on enhancing legal pathways for persons in need of international protection of 27 September 2017) foresees the possibility to carry out resettlements remaining from the current pledges in 2018.

1.2 (B) 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 progress of the projects financed under SO2 is still limited: most of them (124 out of 183) have been started in the first semester of 2017. This inevitably affects the results reached, which are in general limited as at 30/06/2017. Even looking ahead, the projects currently selected for funding do not offer any guarantee on the achievement of the NP expected targets.

The Fund has not yet provided a significant contribution to legal migration as the only project selected for funding (which will allow to reach only part of the NP's expected target) has not yet started.

Concerning the integration of TCNs, the only concluded project under SO2NO2 (also mentioned as success story n. 3 in this Report) has made available Pre-A1 and B1 protocols and syllabi, which have been then adopted in the guidelines for the implementation of the actions set by the call "Piani regionali per la formazione civico linguistica dei cittadini di Paesi Terzi" (Regional Plans for TCN civic and language training). The projects implemented under this call have provided a first contribution to improving TCNs' language skills. Under the same NO, over 70 Regional intervention plans have been started in the second quarter of 2017 for the integration of TCNs (with a target of over 200,000 TCNs) which will contribute to indicator SO2R2 (Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures). Furthermore, the projects funded by the call "Servizi sperimentali di formazione linguistica" (Experimental services on language training) will contribute to the improvement of civic orientation and language integration of vulnerable targets (7,000 persons).

However, currently funded projects will not allow the achievement of the NP target for indicator SO2R2.

Achievement level of the targets set for Common Indicators on SO2 at 30/06/2017

	TARGETS REACHED	TARGETS LIKELY TO BE REACHED	TARGETS FAR FROM BEING REACHED	TARGETS NOT COVERED BY CURRENT PROJECTS
SO2NO1			SO2R1 - Number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures Actual achievement 0,0% Estimated achievement 72,0% (5.400 out of 7.500)	
SO2NO2			SO2R2 - Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures Actual achievement 2,2% (19.589 out of 882.500) Estimated achievement 38,2% (336.773 out of 882.500)	
SO2NO3	SO2.C4 - Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on the integration of third-country nationals Actual achievement: 162,5% (13 out of 8)	SO2.C3 - Number of frameworks/measures/tools in place for the integration of third- country nationals and involving civil society and migrant communities Actual achievement: 60,8% (304 out of 500) Estimated achievement: 265,2% (1.326 out of 500) SO2.C5 - Number of projects to develop, monitor and evaluate integration policies in MSs Actual achievement: 50% (1 out of 2)		

N.B: the table above ranks the CMEF indicators based of the actual target achievement level at 30/06/2017 registered by the RA. It also provides the potential target achievement (estimated achievement) based on the targets set in funded projects at 30/06/2017 (resulting from projects' documentation and available monitoring sheets).

With regard to the cooperation with other Member States on immigration systems, as at the 30/06/2017 the Fund has activated 13 projects – exceeding the expected NP *target* (indicator SO2C4) – which are still at their early stage.

Projects in progress are also strengthening the competences of public and private organisations' operators on the *governance* of integration processes. The *target* concerning the number of tools supporting the *governance* (indicator 2.C3, with target 500), should be exceeded without difficulty: the current value is at almost 61% and the expected value of projects that have signed a grant agreement would allow the activation of more than double of the tools expected by the NP. At last it should also be mentioned that one of the two projects set for the monitoring or the evaluation of integration policies (indicator 2C.5) has been funded.

1.2.1 b. (i) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

After an increase of two percentage points between 2014 and 2015 (going from 58.2% to 60.9%), the share of TCNs who have received long-term residence status out of all TCNs (indicator SO2I1), has remained stable in 2016 (60.8%).

NP implementation status

With the purpose to support legal migration, the AMIF NP has allocated 6M Euros and identified a *target* of 7,500 target group persons to be involved and trained (*target* indicator SO2R1). In this field, AMIF has invested 2,994,506 Euros, by selecting for funding only one project in June 2017 (and started on the 13th of September). Therefore, it has not yet been able to influence the pertinent result indicator (SO2R1 - which concerns the number of persons who participated in pre-departure measures).

The NP's current contribution

The NP's contribution is evaluated both in potential terms and with reference to the only project currently funded. This project will be able to provide a remarkable contribution to the NP target achievement, because of its double objective:

- to speed up inclusion and integration paths in our Country of 5,400 TCNs through services and tools supporting the acquisition of language and civic orientation skills and a good knowledge of the host country's culture;
- to contribute to the development of an advanced and replicable model for pre-departure guidance and civic orientation and language training.

In particular, the project will contribute to:

- the development of an information and mobile learning platform, which will foster accessibility, usability and custom-tailoring of services;
- the definition of a procedure registering social and cultural characteristics of the target group persons, which will guide the identification of the services to be offered to TCNs; this procedure will feed a social and cultural profiling model to be used also while organising and managing future measures in support of legal migration.

The project has been selected based on a Call which has pre-determined some of its characteristics by identifying *target* Countries on the basis of the analysis of the most numerous TCN communities in Italy. Moreover, the project is distinguished by some choices which led to give higher significance to EGT activities (education, guidance and training) in the language field, to the detriment of some others (cultural; civic orientation; safety at work), which however play an important role in the effectiveness of integration paths. Furthermore, the voluntary-basis and the lack of significant incentives to the participation in the project has

determined the target group persons universe as a probable “positively selected” sample, i.e. consisting in persons already “inclined” and “prepared” to a personal growth experience and to the socialisation with the institutions of the destination Country. This may also have negative consequences on the development of the model, which may require too high levels of initial preparation, with inevitable implications on the future replicability. More generally, the activation of participation incentives should be evaluated, as for example the evaluation of the participation in pre-departure measures on the occasion of the signing of the Integration agreement.

Finally, it should be noted that the funded project does not allow to reach the target set by the NP (7,500 persons) and, therefore, other initiatives in this field will have to be activated. Among the objectives of the approved project there is the definition of an integrated intervention model for pre-departure measures, which will be available during 2018 and will usefully guide subsequent initiatives. The new selection of interventions, in particular, will have to be started by the end of 2018, considering that (based on current experience with the only funded project) it takes almost one year from the publication of the call and the start of the project and that these kind of initiatives should last at least 12 months.

1.2.2 b. (ii) What progress was made towards promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

The employment (indicator SO2I2) and activity (SO2I4) rates of TCNs between 2014 and 2016 turn out to be constantly higher than those of Italians. At the same time, the unemployment rate of TCNs proves to be constantly higher than that of Italians (SO2I3).

With regard to education, there is a persistent gap in early school leaving of over 20% between TCNs and Italians (SO2I5). The gap between TCNs and Italians with a high school diploma (SO2I6) is steadily unfavourable for TCNs of over 15% in the period 2014-2016.

The *gap* of TCNs at risk of poverty or social exclusion (SO2I7) grew considerably in 2014 and was then reduced in 2015, but still registers very high values.

NP implementation status

With the purpose to support the effective integration of TCNs, the NP has invested 63,424,340 Euros, by funding 120 projects, 98 under implementation and one which has been completed. .

The NP's current contribution

Project on SO2NO2 started at the end of 2016, thus its implementation status is still at an early stage.

The reference indicator (SO2R2) reveals a certain progress compared to 2016, but values (19,589) as at the 30/06/2017 are still far from the expected *target* (882,500). The expected results of the projects funded so far do not allow the achievement of this *target*.

The implementation of SO2NO2 is linked to the DA's choice to first use national funds for experimenting projects in favour of particularly vulnerable targets and then assess the replicability of such projects using AMIF resources.

The DA has linked the funding of regional TCN integration plans to the planning and creation of a partnership that ensures complementarity with other interventions taking place in the territory. Besides these obligations, another factor that slowed down the start of the projects is related to the preliminary checks carried out by the MEF and the Court of Auditors on the grant agreements.

The only concluded intervention (see success story n.3) has reached the expected results and has made some tools available, which have been then adopted in the guidelines for the fulfilment of TCNs' civic orientation and language training.

For the projects that are currently under implementation, results can be ascribable to **Regional plans for language and civic orientation training**, which **started 1,118 courses** (out of the expected 2,664) and **involved 15,480 TCNs** (about 43% of project targets). This has provided a first contribution to the improvement of TCNs' language skills.

The interviews carried out by the beneficiaries revealed the following positive and potentially replicable elements of the funded initiatives:

- a) the expansion of the educational offer in response both to the increasing demand for more advanced training of TCNs who have been living in Italy for longer, and to the demands of illiterates or persons with a low education level who recently illegally arrived by sea. **The increasing number of persons with a low level of education suggests the inclusion of these pilot services within the ordinary educational offer of CPIA (Provincial Centres for Adult Education);**
- b) the activation of some services (such as workshops and distance learning services), which have been appreciated by TCNs, so that courses have been favourably attended.

On the other hand, beneficiaries reveal a critical issue concerning the impossibility for asylum seekers and refugees to access to civic orientation and language training courses (as the current initiatives do not provide support to this target group).

It should also be mentioned that three Regional plans have not yet started training activities, mainly because of the difficulties encountered in the selection of teachers and external collaborators: the RA is recommended to activate a specific support through the Technical Assistance.

The NP's expected contribution

The over 70 Regional intervention plans for the integration of TCNs (started in 2017) and the projects for the improvement of civic orientation and language integration of vulnerable targets (7,000 persons) will provide a significant contribution to the increase of the number of persons assisted through integration measures (SO2R2).

Some critical issues concern the actual participation of minors in a project aimed at involving UAMs hosted by the reception system in sport activities. **The evaluator suggests to strengthen the connection among the associations/NGOs which have a direct and daily contact with UAMs, and which may contribute to their real involvement.**

The DA will suggest a reduction of the NP *target* for indicator SO2R2 in the first semester of 2018, considering the choice of:

- envisaging (among the measures supporting social and labour market integration of TCNs) an action aiming at strengthening the capacity building of employment centres under SO2ON3, by re-organising the remaining budget on SO2NO2 to cover this intervention;
- envisaging the activation of personalised interventions in favour of TCNs, by concentrating resources on a lower number of target group persons.

1.2.3 b. (iii) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

Co-operation actions fostered by Italy are connected to the enhancement of exchange activities and of the active comparison of *best practices* in Member States. These result from the impossibility of directly

harmonising National judicial systems in the field of TCNs' integration and from the attempt to promote and strengthen integration through exchange.

NP implementation status

These actions completely fall under AMIF, which has invested 4,591,745 Euros in this field, by funding 14 projects, 13 of which are still at their early implementation stage, while one has not been started yet.

The NP's current contribution

Indicators SO2.C3 (Tools for the integration of TCNs) and SO2.C4 (Co-operation projects with other Member States on the integration of TCNs) register positive signals. First of all, the number of co-operation projects with other Member States (indicator SO2.C4), which had already exceeded the expected value of the NP in this field (8) in December 2016, has further increased (13 projects). Also the *target* related to the number of tools supporting the *governance* (indicator SO2.C3, with target value 500), should be exceeded without any particular difficulty: the actual value has already reached almost 61% of the NP *target*, while the expected value of the projects granted funding would allow the activation of over double the tools set by the NP *target*.

Only 7 projects out of a total of 14 funded, show an implementation status higher than or equal to 40% and, in only one case, it exceeds 68%. The activities funded with the support of the Fund concern:

- in most cases (8 out of 14), research activities for the identification of good practices in the integration process, mainly oriented towards labour market inclusion, educational measures and housing inclusion;
- in 3 cases, the experimentation of new services, which were almost absent throughout the territory, such as skills profile and measures in support of family reunification;
- in 3 cases (2 of which selected through a call and only one project through direct selection), the organisation of exchange and discussion occasions through workshops, data collection, meetings and seminars.

The projects funded show some recurring characteristics, some of which (the first two) can make a difference in the opportunities for TCNs to access new services:

- there is a weak response of some territories to the opportunities offered by the NP (Liguria, Trentino Alto Adige, Marche, Umbria, Abruzzi, Basilicata and Sardinia) and the concentration of projects in Lazio, Piedmont, Lombardy and Tuscany;
- partnerships are limited: only one project reveals a high number of Partners (9), while most of the projects envisages the implementation of the activities in collaboration with 2 to a maximum of 4 partners;
- in most cases, among the target group persons of the activities, there are operators of mainly public institutions that provide services in favour of immigrants (operators, managers, policy makers, teachers).

The NP's expected contribution

On the whole, it is possible to highlight that:

- funded activities perform in fields where the related services throughout the territory turn out to be weak or completely absent in some Regions. Therefore, these fundamental services require an enhancement, to which the projects funded will contribute;
- the experimentation of new intervention models reveal many potentialities and will contribute to structuring innovative services. It is crucial to define modalities and paths to supply the whole territory with innovations, in order to strengthen continuity and integration for some specific categories of target group persons (women, minors and beneficiaries of international protection) between first and second level reception.

The analysis of project activities and of carried out interviews reveals that:

- the partnership and the network – both at European and at local level – essentially pre-existed the project and, in some cases, they are managed by institutions which have been working for a long time on the phenomenon (*Caritas, Università Cattolica, Centro Italiano Rifugiati*); the risk is to penalise the places where these institutions are absent. In order to avoid this risk, it is crucial to define, already during the project's implementation, ways to transfer and replicate results. The RA is recommended to increase the beneficiaries' awareness on this need and to require, if not already set among the project outputs, a specific document on conditions and modalities in order to replicate the experimented good practices;
- competences required for a better *governance* of integration processes are increasingly more connected, before supplying or experimenting the service, to the ability of managing and dealing with complicated situations, of interacting with very different stakeholders and of collaborating and working in the territory with direct and indirect target group persons.

1.2.4 b. (iv) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

The need to support *capacity building* experiences is even more compelling compared to the programming stage of the NP, due to the reconfiguring of the political and administrative landscape promoting services, as in particular:

- the cuts to public resources destined to the services and the freeze on *turnovers* because of fewer transfers;
- the reconfiguring of Authorities covering wide areas as a consequence of Provinces' abolition;
- the centralised refocusing of social policies and of interventions on migratory phenomena.

The analyses carried out by the evaluator reveal that the financed activities perform in those fields where the related integration services throughout the territory turn out to be particularly weak. The projects funded will contribute to the enhancement of these fundamental services and to the experimentation of innovative integration services.

NP implementation status

In this field, AMIF has invested 23,051,027 Euros, by funding 50 projects, 1 of which has been concluded, while 44 are still in progress. As the projects started at the end of 2016 (and most of them will be concluded in 2018), the assessment of the achieved results is not possible yet. However, in the first semester 2017 a progress has been registered, both with regard to the evolution of expenditure (which for SO2NO3 goes from 3% as at the 31/12/2016 to 31% as at the 30/06/2017) and in terms of implementations (as at the 30/06/2017 over 1.400 operators have benefited from training of professional updating paths).

The NP's current contribution

The only concluded project in this field has accomplished a film on the reception of applicants and beneficiaries of international protection consisting in 6 short documentaries (in 6 SPRAR centres). For this purpose the operators and the persons hosted by SPRAR structures have been actively involved.

The *target* of the number of tools supporting the *governance* (indicator 2.C3, with target value 500), is supposed to be exceeded without any particular difficulty: the current value is of almost 61%, while the expected value of projects in agreement would allow the activation of over the double of the tools expected by the NP. Eventually, one of the two projects set for the monitoring and evaluation of integration policies (indicator 2C.5) has been funded.

Projects in progress have provided a first contribution to strengthening the competences of operators on the *governance* of integration processes. In particular, projects funded in response to the call "Qualificazione dei

servizi pubblici a supporto dei cittadini di Paesi terzi” (Qualification of public services in favour of third-country nationals) have already allowed the professional training of 1.290 operators out of the 3.455 set.

With reference to the call “*Prevenzione e contrasto alle discriminazioni*” (Preventative and counter-action measures against discrimination), the projects have implemented activities (awareness raising, information, training of the operators) which are preparatory to the contact with final target group persons.

The NP’s expected contribution

So far, the kind of activities financed by the Fund are aimed:

- at the training and enhancement of the competences of managers, municipal officials and social operators;
- at strengthening territorial networks providing integration services;
- at enhancing Territorial Councils for immigration as analysis Authorities of the migratory phenomenon, of local needs, of participation and consultation platforms for migrants;
- at the promotion of Single Desks.

Within the projects implemented under SO2NO3 through direct selection, it is worth to point out that two projects reveal some critical issues: the RA is therefore recommended to carry out careful controls. One project (whose beneficiary is ANCI) shows many deviations from the planning and, although started more than 6 months ago, indicators register a zero value implementation level. The other project (whose beneficiary is MIUR) reveals critical issues due to National regulations governing the transfer of funds among central Administrations. These regulations set that these resources must transit through the management of the MEF (Ministry of Economy and Finance). It is recommended to verify if an agreement for a specific procedure with MEF-IGRUE is possible, in relation to the transfer of EU funds among central Administrations. The timely availability of the Funds is a condition to avoid the risk of losing these resources.

The SO2NO3 Capacity - letter k of the NP (Training plan for school heads and teachers) expects among its results the decrease of UAM’s early school leaving rate. In this regard, the RA is recommended to define the reference baseline and the target value to be reached in order to allow its future evaluation.

1.3 (c) 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?

The results achieved so far under SO3 are limited due to scarce implementation: in June 2017 8 projects had been financed, and the results have up to now focused almost exclusively on Assisted Voluntary Returns.

From a financial perspective, SO3 generated a limited volume of commitments (about 14.7 million euros), corresponding to 17% of the budget for returns. For a decisively implementation speed up, the RA’s efforts should immediately focus on this objective.

3 projects were financed under NO1, for a total amount of about 3.1 million euros. Two of these projects were launched between April and June 2017, thus no significant progress has been registered.

5 projects were financed under NO2, all related to AVR&R, for a total value of 11.6 million euros (no projects funded under NO3). These projects allowed for the voluntary return of 445 people, equal to about 15% of the project’s *target* (2,905) and 4.7% of the *target* set by the PN (9,500). The overall picture is worrisome: the completion of these interventions is set at 31.03.2018, and the deadline for AVR&Rs completion is set at 31/12/2017 (extension granted in September by the RA) in order to leave time for accompanying activities and the monitoring of reintegration paths. It is therefore unlikely that the projects will fill the gap accumulated so far and reach results close to the expected ones.

Achievement level of the targets set for Common Indicators on SO3 at 30/06/2017

	TARGETS REACHED	TARGETS LIKELY TO BE REACHED	TARGETS FAR FROM BEING REACHED	TARGETS NOT COVERED BY CURRENT PROJECTS
SO3NO1			<p>SO3R2 -Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance Actual achievement: 5,7% (539 out of 9.500) Estimated achievement: 30,6% (2.905 out of 9.500)</p> <p>SO3R4 -Number of monitored removal operations Actual achievement: 0,2% (7 out of 3.000) Estimated achievement: 7,2% (215 out of 3.000)</p>	
SO3NO2			<p>SO3R3 -Number of persons who returned voluntarily Actual achievement: 4,7% (445 out of 9.500) Estimated achievement: 30,6% (2.905 out of 9.500)</p>	<p>SO3R3-Number of persons who were removed (target: 18.500)</p>
SO3NO3	<p>SO3C6 -Number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate return policies in MS Actual achievement: 100% (3 out of 3)</p>	<p>SO3R1 -Number of persons trained on return-related topics Actual achievement: 0,0% (0 out of 850) Estimated achievement: 470,6% (4.000 out of 850)</p>		

N.B: the table above ranks the CMEF indicators based of the actual target achievement level at 30/06/2017 registered by the RA. It also provides the potential target achievement (estimated achievement) based on the targets set in funded projects at 30/06/2017 (resulting from projects' documentation and available monitoring sheets).

Beneficiaries report that the main obstacle in AVR&R is the difficulty to identify its potential recipients due to fact that most migrants, but also some stakeholders involved in AVR&R procedures, are not aware of this measure. Moreover, the same beneficiaries identify as facilitating elements of the interventions the presence of a consolidated network, the implementing Body's administrative/management capability, the simplicity of selection procedures and the compliance with implementation timing.

The presence of elements external to the project is very important as facilitating element, and in this regard, beneficiaries have mentioned the ability of all stakeholders on the territory to cooperate in the AVR&Rs implementation.

1.3.1 c. (i) What progress was made towards supporting the measures accompanying return procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

At 30/06/2017, the actions carried out in Italy to support the return accompanying measures had been almost exclusively financed thanks to AMIF. As related projects have only recently been funded, the progress made by Italy in this area is still very limited.

NP implementation status

Under NO1 - Support to return measures - Three interventions were financed, with the aim of: a) implementing an integrated communication campaign on AVR&R (project not started yet); b) consolidating the national stakeholder network promoting and implementing AVR&R interventions (started on June 1, 2017); c) developing a system for monitoring forced returns (started on April 5, 2017).

The NP's current contribution

The project relevant to the monitoring of forced returns allowed to monitor 7 operations (against the expected 215, *SO3R4* indicator), which involved 38 removed third-country nationals (against a target of 1,000). It should also be noted that these returns were not actually carried out by FAMI resources, since no relevant action had been initiated as of June 30, 2017.

There are five projects related to NO2 - Returns (thus focused on AVR&R interventions) launched in 2016 and currently underway, which include some return accompanying actions. Following awareness-raising activities prior to the implementation of return procedures, these projects have already intercepted almost 34,500 potential targets of AVR&R measures, far exceeding the overall target envisaged in the projects (equal to 20,000 people intercepted). As of 30/06/2017, the number of people assisted within the voluntary return totalled 539 (*SO3R2* indicator), a figure still far from the overall target of the projects (2,905) and especially from the NP target (9,500).

The NP's expected contribution

The awareness-raising activity carried out by AVR&R projects does not seem sufficient: based on the interviews with AVR&R project representatives, as well as on the indicators of returns effective implementation, the awareness of AVR&R measures is not widespread yet. This results in the difficulty to intercept recipients and carry out planned returns, a circumstance confirmed by the still small number of repatriated persons.

The two projects focused on return accompanying activities (NO1) are expected to be an effective tool to make all third-country nationals potentially interested in the AVR&R measure aware of it, thus contributing to increasing the number of actual AVR&Rs. Specifically, the project (already started) aimed at consolidating the national network involves the activation of 21 AVR&R information and guidance offices spread all over the nation, the distribution of 100,000 information leaflets, and the activation of a toll-free number to provide information about AVR&R. The second intervention, which has not been started yet, is also in line with the ongoing one, aiming to create an integrated communication campaign on AVR&R.

As for the monitoring of forced return operations, in order to analyse the effectiveness of the project in monitoring return activities and in reaching the target set by the NP, it will be necessary to wait for the development of return activities.

1.3.2 c. (ii) What progress was made towards effective implementation of return measures (voluntary and forced), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

Between the end of 2016 and June 2017, AVR&R procedures were resumed in Italy. As for forced returns (FR), their number is still small compared to the orders to leave: in 2016, about 4,500 forced returns were implemented, accounting for 13.8% of 32,600 orders issued (*SO3I1* indicator).

NP implementation status

At 30/06/2017, 5 AVR&R projects had been initiated under the NP, while no FR interventions had been made.

The NP's current contribution

The results achieved by the funded projects are still unsatisfactory. As of 30/06/2017, against a target of 2,905 AVR&Rs, 445 interventions had been made (*SO3R7* indicator), corresponding to 15.3% of the target envisaged by the projects and 4.7% of the NP target.

The achievement of ongoing projects' target (whose conclusion is set for March 2018) is alarming whereas projects deadline to carry out returns (extended from 30.09.2017 to 31/12/2017) entails a shortening of reintegration monitoring times (when projects started, the monitoring phase had been planned to last at least 6 months).

Furthermore, about 75% of the returns carried out so far are linked to a single project (which has an expected target of 2,000 returns), which was suspended on 15.05.2017 because the beneficiary, IOM, received the mandate from the Ministry of Interior for the implementation of a similar project under national funds. In general, therefore, it is likely that planned objectives will not be achieved either at a project level or at a Program level.

Based on interviews with beneficiaries, stakeholders and the Ministry of the Interior, it emerges that the intended target could not be achieved also because of a lack of knowledge on the AVR measure: by potential recipients, who are therefore difficult to intercept and involve; but also by entities involved in the AVR&R procedures, such as some embassies, Prefectures and Police Headquarters, with consequent delays in carrying out their procedures.

The lack of knowledge can be attributed to two factors: the suspension for more than one year of AVR&R procedures in Italy – due to the depletion of the previous Programme and the delayed start of AMIF; and the delayed start of the projects critical for AVR&Rs implementation. Aimed at making AVR&R measures known to potential recipients, these projects were launched after the ones aimed at implementing the AVR&Rs themselves. This happened because it was necessary (as also reported by the EC) to prioritize AVR&R interventions.

A further slowdown in AVR&Rs implementation is due to the lack of interest in this measure by migrants within the reception system. In fact, it is plausible that these people prefer to wait for their application outcome rather than return to their countries of origin before a judgement is issued.

The NP's expected contribution

Despite these difficulties, ongoing projects are succeeding in intercepting an increasing number of potential AVR&R recipients, also thanks to some awareness-raising and communication actions. Moreover, as emerged during the interview with the representative of SO3 at the RA, the activities of the aforementioned project by IOM should resume in the coming months.

In order to allow the NP to reach the total target of 9,500 AVR&Rs, the RA has planned to publish new calls aimed at financing AVR&R projects.

It should however be noted that the audience of potential beneficiaries is restricted, since not all the organizations working with migrants are equipped to carry out the activities necessary for AVR&Rs. For example, for the first published call, only 5 of the 10 submitted applications reached the minimum score to be eligible for funding. Furthermore, no applications at all were submitted for the following call, published in February 2017.

In addition to AVR&Rs, the NP also provides for the implementation of 18,500 FRs. As of 30/06/2017, there are no interventions underway. This negatively affects AVR&Rs too (apart from the number of FRs, which are very limited in Italy): the irregular migrant, given the scarce probability of an FR, is less prone to apply for an AVR (as emerged during interviews with stakeholders and as declared by Minister Minniti on 28.02.2017). The concern on this point is partly mitigated by a recent interview with SO3 representative who confirmed the imminent start of a project (in Executing Body mode) that will allow to reach the target envisaged by the NP.

1.3.3 c. (iii) 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?

Italy's progress in this field

The main progress made by Italy to strengthen the cooperation on return measures mainly consisted in signing agreements with some Third Countries for the readmission of citizens forcibly returned from Italy.

These countries include: Ivory Coast, Senegal, Algeria, Guinea, Gambia, Mali, Sudan, Bangladesh, Morocco, Pakistan, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Tunisia, Egypt. Still referring to forced returns, joint return operations were carried out with other Member States. Such actions were performed outside AMIF Programme.

The NP's current contribution

As of 06.30.2017, no project has been funded or announced yet under NO3 - Cooperation. However, within the 5 ongoing projects aimed at implementing AVR&R interventions (NO2), some activities were planned – and partially implemented – to strengthen the cooperation with Third Countries. Relations with the consular authorities of the AVR&R destination countries to obtain the required documents were started or intensified; relations with agencies in third countries were started or strengthened in order to prepare the conditions for an effective migrant reintegration, as well as to monitor the relevant outcomes. Within one of these projects, awareness-raising meetings were also held on the territory of three countries of destination of AVR&Rs. However, despite these activities, as of 30/06/2017, the Programme's contribution to strengthening practical cooperation with third-country authorities on return measures is extremely limited.

On the other hand, as far as practical cooperation between MSs on return measures is concerned, no applications were submitted for the call under ERIN specific action. This failure is probably due to several causes; on one hand, the procedures envisaged in the ERIN project are very different from those adopted by Italy to carry out AVR&Rs, and this was an obstacle considering the response capacity of potential beneficiaries. On the other hand, at the time the call was issued, the stakeholders best equipped to deal with returns had just obtained funding for the projects under NO2 - Returns, and were therefore busy with the start of relevant activities.

Since no other similar projects had been funded or put out to tender, the Programme hasn't contributed yet to strengthen the cooperation between MSs on return measures.

The FAMI Program may contribute to strengthen practical cooperation with third-country authorities on voluntary return measures through projects based under NO3, with reference to the following actions:

- NO3 letter i: implementation of guidelines for AVR&R measures for third-country authorities;
- NO3 letter j: organization of meetings with qualified representatives of top Third Countries to share information on reintegration plans progress, to identify priorities and requirements of AVR interventions, to foster the creation of a network with third-sector associations of Third Countries aimed at facilitating returnees reintegration.

Conversely, there are no actions within the AMIF Programme aimed at fostering cooperation with Third Countries on forced returns because, as confirmed by the SO representative at the RA, this form of cooperation is the goal of interventions external to AMIF Programming.

On the other hand, as regards the strengthening of practical cooperation on return measures between MSs, AMIF Programme can contribute through the funding of projects under:

- NO1, letter e (Implementation of training courses and/or update on European standards for escort operations);
- NO2, letter g: with reference to the selection of AVR&R recipients whose reintegration path will be implemented under ERIN project;
- NO2, letter h: with reference to the implementation of joint return operations with other MSs, in cooperation with FRONTEX;
- Specific action 5 "Joint return operations", which provides for Italy to join ERIN project, coordinated by the Netherlands and aimed at improving the cooperation between MSs and European agencies for return operations, and the sharing of best practices for migrants identification and joint return operations implementation;
- Specific action 7 "Joint initiatives for family reunification and reintegration of unaccompanied minors", coordinated by France.

1.3.4 c. (iv) What progress was made towards building capacity on return, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?

Italy's progress in this field

No noteworthy progress was made with regard to return capacity, with the exception of the work carried out by the National Body in charge of the safeguard of the rights of people detained or deprived of their freedom with respect to CIEs and forced returns monitoring. This activity resulted in the Report to Parliament submitted on March 21, 2017. The activities that led to this Report drafting were carried out outside of AMIF Programme.

The NP's current contribution

AMIF aims to improve return capacity through projects under NO1, with particular reference to the actions provided for in subparagraphs:

- NO1, letter "c2" - Training courses on AVR&R addressed to professionals, and
- NO1, letter "e" - Implementation of training courses and/or update on European standards for escort operations.

As of 30/06/2017, no interventions related to action "e" had been financed yet, while a project involving interventions on action "c2" is underway. It is the RE.V.ITA project, aimed at consolidating the national network of the stakeholder promoting and implementing AVR&R interventions. The project, managed by IOM, also provides for the creation of training for institutions and operators involved in AVR&R. However, the indicator measuring training activities (SO3R1) does not record any progress, because the project was started only in June 2017.

Looking ahead, the project will significantly contribute to achieving the NP target as it aims to train 4,000 people (exceeding the 850 provided for in the program). The programme is also expected to contribute to forced return capacity, and in fact the target of 850 trained people (as reported in the NP) includes:

- 250 Public Security escort operators, in order to make forced return operations more compliant with European standards and fully respectful of the principles of international and humanitarian law;
- 600 operators from the bodies involved in AVR&R activities, favouring both a greater capability of projects to intercept potential final recipients of the measure, and a faster fulfilment of administrative procedures to finalize AVR&R interventions.

Instead, it should be noticed that the target related to SO3C4 indicator has already been reached. As a whole, the three projects funded under the ON1 - Support for Return Measures address the goal of developing, monitoring and evaluating Member States' return policies. These projects provide for the creation of an integrated communication campaign on AVR&R, the consolidation of the network of stakeholders operating in AVR&R, the creation of a system for monitoring forced returns.

1.4 D) 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?

Italy's AMIF NP has not envisaged the implementation of Specific Objective 4 "Solidarity".

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))?

Italy's AMIF NP has not envisaged the implementation of Specific Objective 4 "Solidarity".

1.4.2 How did the Fund contribute to the transfer between Member States of beneficiaries of international protection?

Italy's AMIF NP has not envisaged the implementation of Specific Objective 4 "Solidarity".

2 EFFICIENCY

WERE THE GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE FUND ACHIEVED AT REASONABLE COST?

The reasonableness of the costs incurred was assessed after a small number of projects were finalised as of 30/06/2017, and therefore with a degree of achievement of the Fund's objectives still far from set targets. Nevertheless, the analysis, focused on the items indicated in the Community guidelines, allow to formulate a positive opinion.

In terms of human resources, even if in an under-dimensioned context perceived by the Administration, the staff seems adequate to ensure the quality of procedural activities, also considering the activation of a technical assistance service to support the Programme management since the start of the NP.

As for CMEF indicators, if compared with similar measurements carried out under the SOLID programs, the data on the first two years of implementation show a tangible increase in efficiency linked to eg. the increase in the number of interventions and managed financial resources compared to the human resources employed (the latter are fewer than in the previous programme).

Field surveys on beneficiaries, while showing some procedural problems, have highlighted that these issues have not affected projects implementation.

The analysis of beneficiaries' perception, carried out through a CAWI survey, confirms the success of procedural activities: 70% of the beneficiaries of the projects funded as of 31.05.2017 (127 out of 187) declare they have not perceived any issues in projects implementation. The remaining 30%, the interviewees report delays and/or problems mainly at the signing of the Grant Agreement (being the official contractual reference for project management and implementation): this phase is considered too long.

In fact, the monitoring documentation analysis shows it takes a long time to formalize the contracts between beneficiaries and Administration: on average, it takes 123 days. However, it should be noted that starting the activities earlier allowed to reduce to 98 days the time lag between the ranking publication and the start date of the activities (as calculated on the 226 projects of which the Convention signing date and the activity starting date are available).

This figure is partly justified by the time necessary for integrating any adjustments requested to the beneficiary relevant to timings, indicators and budgets, (required to correct beneficiaries' errors when filling out forms), and for the Ministry to subsequently verify that the required integrations have been correctly implemented (Source: Si.Ge.Co.). As confirmed by interviewed Administration representatives, beneficiaries' difficulty to use the information system to submit the required documentation sums up to the aforesaid. This difficulty is increased by the use of a platform still being updated by the Administration. In this context, it has to be noted that the RA paid great attention to the people involved in project implementation: in order to cope with the above issue, the RA organised specific initiatives, including creating guidelines for drafting the monitoring tools and organising a round of meetings addressed to the people involved in project implementation.

In the survey, beneficiaries were asked the causes of budget adjustments (which under AMIF can be requested with greater flexibility than the previous programme). The match between the answers and the causes of implementation delays is rather poor; in fact, the procedural problem is caused by a decrease in the time necessary to carry out the intervention in just 17 cases.

Table 2.1 - Main outcomes of CAWI survey carried out among beneficiaries on procedural stage quality

	TOTAL	OF WHICH SO1	OF WHICH SO2	OF WHICH SO3
Delays in activities implementation				
Delays in project document presentation/selection	1		1	
Delays in signing the Grant Agreement	39	15	23	1
Delays in monitoring	12	3	9	
Delays in financial management/reporting	11	6	5	
Need to remodel the budget due to:				
New needs compared to those identified in the project proposal	53	28	24	1
Decrease in due time for completion	46	12	32	2
More complex activities than provided for in project proposal	23	6	16	1
Other	41	15	25	1

Note: The beneficiaries of 128 projects state they have remodelled the budget as a consequence of delays/issues encountered in various procedural stages; 163 responses are associated to them (multiple answers were allowed).

Financial data appear to be consistent with Programme life cycle (which was launched in mid-2015). The resources supplied by 30/06/2017 amount to 10% of the total budget, with a strong acceleration in financial progress capacity, which was equal to 4% in 2016. It should be noted that the fast increase in spending allowed to recover the initial financial progress gap and to avoid, as of 15 October 2017, the automatic de-commitment of resources. Also worthy of note is the presence of significant cost savings, equal to 6.2% of the total budget of the projects considered. Finally, with regard to resource flows, no delays or other issues had been reported at 30/06/2017.

The analysis of the NP financial circuit has been carried out taking into account (i) the administrative aspects within the Administration, (ii) the outcome of the CAWI survey among beneficiaries of projects financed at 31.05.2017, (iii) the outcome of the interviews with the Administration staff (specifically, Payments Supervisor).

Generally speaking, both Beneficiaries and Administration report payments are very fast when allocating resources. Part of this result is surely due to the simplification introduced in the resource accreditation process compared to the previous SOLID funds programming. (See Section IV para. 8).

An additional element for the benefit of AMIF beneficiaries (compared to SOLID funds) is the method of payment of the interim deposit. In the past, the deposit was paid net of advance, while the AMIF programming allows to report any expenditure without the need to exceed the amount of the advance paid.

The speed of expenditure at 30/06/2017 (22.8%) has doubled compared to the end of 2016 (formerly equal to 10.5%). In previous analyses, as of 31/12/2016, the evaluator pointed out that, in many cases, project beneficiaries had not yet requested the deposit payment, thus contributing to keeping both the speed of expenditure and the NP overall financial progress capacity slow. The late request for the deposit was in many cases due to the need to submit a surety guarantee backing the sum paid as advance by the RA, as set by project implementation Vademecum. The complexity of the preliminary investigation and of documents requested by the credit institution to verify the eligibility for credit (creditworthiness) – in the case of small organizations or associations – could result in a delay in obtaining the guarantee and, consequently, the request of the deposit.

After the initial phase, the deposits requested have significantly increased: the survey outcome shows that the deposit had not been requested only in a few cases (13 projects). Furthermore, the speed of expenditure has significantly increased also because, in addition to deposits, the incurred expenses – for any amount of expenditure – have been reported without the need to exceed minimum quotas.

Finally, the measures taken to prevent and detect cases of fraud and irregularities, and consequently, to make the Programme implementation more efficient are considered adequate.

2.1 TO WHAT EXTENT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE FUND ACHIEVED AT REASONABLE COST IN TERMS OF DEPLOYED FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES?

As suggested by EU Guidelines, the assessment of NP efficiency accounts for two levels of analysis structured by (a) Programme and by (b) single project.

At a Programme level, efficiency gains are considered in terms of dedicated human resources and financial resources used.

As for human resources, as of 30/06/2017, 42 people were involved in NP implementation, a number slightly lower than the one for SOLID programming (46). This is also due to the elimination of the Certification Authority, whose functions have been assimilated by other Authorities and partially delegated to external figures (Independent Auditor and Legal Expert).

Table 2.2 - Dedicated resources by Fund and Authority

	RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY	CERTIFYING AUTHORITY	AUDIT AUTHORITY	TOTAL
AMIF	30	0 (abolished)	12	42
EIF	12	9	7	46
ERF	9			
RF	9			

The CMEF requires employee commitments to be quantified with respect to active projects and volume of managed financial resources. As of 30/06/2017, every employee of the NP works on an average of 7.4 active projects and manages over 6 million committed euros and about 1.4 million euros of expenses. Over the last six months the workload of AMIF employees increased significantly (as of 31/12/2016 there were 5.3 million euros of committed resources and about 500,000 euros of resources spent per employee).

Table 2.3 - CMEF Indicator on the efficiency criteria

CMEF INDICATOR	N. OF PERSONS	N. OF IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS N. OF PERSONS	AMOUNT OF THE FUNDS CLAIMED FOR THE YEAR 2017 / N. OF PERSONS
H1 - Number of Full Time Equivalent in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of AMIF and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to the number of projects implemented and to the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year	42	7.38	Amount on commitments = € 6,179,226.95 Amount on payments = €1,410,986.80

The figure is significant both in an internal perspective of the Programme (as an estimate of the average productivity of used resources) and in an external perspective and in comparison with what was recorded during the previous Programming period (as a proxy of efficiency gains in terms of activity volume and resources managed by the staff).

Considering the first two years of SOLID programmes implementation (based on the implementation Final Reports for individual funds and years), it should be noted that each employee managed, on average, less than 4 projects (compared to the over 7 projects managed by AMIF staff), with around € 1.3 million in commitments (€ 6.2 million in AMIF) and € 1.2 million in expenses per employee. Therefore, an increase in efficiency compared to the previous programme is recorded.

During some interviews with the Ministry of the Interior staff, the importance of the procedures and the fulfilment of national and EU legal requirements against the inadequate provision of human resources, has been underlined. According to respondents' perception, staff shortages has led to a work overload considered as problematic. However, it has not affected Administration activities performance.

With regard to the **financial resources** used, the Guidelines suggest to focus the analysis) on the possible presence of economies of finished projects, and on the financial progress of the Programme.

Considering the 17 projects completed at 30/06/2017 whose effectiveness is in line with or has exceed expectations, 14 of them have registered **cost savings** amounting to € 380,459.11, equal to 7.12% of the total budget of the projects considered. The phenomenon does not seem to be related to the financial dimension of the projects.

Table 2.4 - Savings from completed projects whose effectiveness is in line with or exceeded expectations

PROJECT	TOTAL PROJECT COST	SAVINGS	% ON TOTAL COST
PROG-PRAESIDIUM 1	155,038.19	36,022.92	23.23%
PROG-RECEPTION	239,232.74	37,796.88	15.80%
PROG-ACCESS	1,118,450.88	171,786.82	15.36%
PROG-655	40,000.00	3,176.26	7.94%
PROG-439	496,405.00	34,099.28	6.87%
PROG-434	496,405.00	23,657.76	4.77%
PROG-446	496,405.00	19,785.32	3.99%
PROG-488	496,405.00	17,318.77	3.49%
PROG-448	476,548.80	11,140.05	2.34%
PROG-436	495,951.10	10,740.39	2.17%
PROG-441	496,405.00	10,202.29	2.06%
PROG-DOCUFILM	152,500.00	3,108.56	2.04%
PROG-638	91,000.00	1,470.39	1.62%
PROG-658	91,000.00	153.42	0.17%
TOTAL	5,341,746.71	380,459.11	7.12%

Analysing the financial progress of the Programme as of 30/06/2017, the allocations already provided for are approximately 58% (mainly concentrated in SO1) of the total budget, and the commitment capacity (44% on the budget) is in line with NP life cycle. SO1 is playing a driving role also with respect to commitments, having already committed 62% of available resources.

Table 2.5 - Implementation progress of the NP as of 30/06/2017

	TOTAL BUDGET	ALLOCATIONS	COMMITMENTS	PAYMENTS	DECISION CAPACITY	COMMITMENT CAPACITY	PROGRESS CAPACITY	SPEED OF EXPENDITURE
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	b/a	c/a	d/a	d/c
TOTAL Specific Objectives (SO)	584,711,554	337,771,118	259,527,532	59,261,446	58%	44%	10.1%	22.80%
TOTAL SO1 - Asylum	244,211,554	232,870,396	151,545,876	31,671,615	95	62%	13.0%	20.90%
SO1.NO1 Reception/asylum	234,000,000	201,802,006	121,092,265	26,641,456	86%	52%	11.4%	22.00%
SO1.NO2 Evaluation	9,000,000	14,919,265	15,074,303	840,065	166%	167%	9.3%	5.60%
SO1.NO3 Resettlement	1,211,554	1,211,554	1,211,554	290,094	100%	100%	23.9%	23.90%
NOs cross-cutting projects	-	14,937,571	14,167,754	3,900,000	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	27.50%
TOTAL SO2 - Integration/legal migration	253,000,000	88,341,553	93,242,576	23,944,572	35%	37%	9.5%	25.70%
SO2.NO1 Legal Migration	6,000,000	3,000,000	2,994,506	0	50%	50%	0%	0.00%
SO2.NO2 Integration	219,000,000	61,692,143	62,667,403	15,218,465	28%	29%	6.9%	24.30%
SO2.NO3 Capacity-building	28,000,000	23,649,410	27,580,667	8,726,107	84%	99%	31.2%	31.60%
TOTAL SO3 - Return	87,500,000	16,559,169	14,739,080	3,645,258	19%	17%	4.2%	24.70%
SO3.NO1 Accompanying return measures	16,000,000	3,119,169	3,119,169	399,584	19%	19%	2.5%	12.80%
SO3.NO2 Return measures	70,900,000	13,440,000	11,619,911	3,245,673	19%	16%	4.6%	27.90%
SO3.NO3 Cooperation	600,000	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0.00%

As of 30/06/2017, supplies amounted to 10% of total budget, with a strong acceleration in financial progress capacity, which was equal to 4% in the previous six months. The fast increase in spending allowed to recover the initial financial progress gap and to avoid, as of 15/10/2017, the automatic de-commitment of resources. The speed of expenditure (ratio between expenditure and commitments) is significant: it's equal to 22.8% and rising sharply compared to 10.5% at 31/12/2016.

On a project level, the Community Guidelines ask "What kind of operation for each target group was more efficient and why?" in terms of unit costs per output unit. Given the comparative nature of the analysis, it cannot be carried out for Italian NP because almost all projects concluded at 30/06/2017 were concentrated under a single instrument (the *Proroghe MSNA* call in SO1NO1); therefore, the analysis needs to be postponed until a more significant implementation status is reached.

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 measures taken to prevent and detect cases of fraud and irregularities are, in the first instance, the establishment of specific structures with human resources committed to detect activities and, secondly, the adoption of an internal control system, such as 'a set of procedures supporting the prevention and detection of irregularities and fraud'.

As of 30.06.017, since the payments made and the expenses reported by the beneficiaries were quite limited, the control activity is still at an early stage. At the same date, no cases of fraud or irregularity had been reported by the competent bodies.

For the purposes of the evaluation analysis, reference has been made to Community provisions on the subject, as well as to what is reported in administrative sources (mainly the Management and Control System of AMIF NP rather than the 1st level controls Manual), and to what emerged during direct interviews with the Administration staff.

Community legislation requires Member States to combat fraud and other illegal activities affecting EU financial interests through measures that are dissuasive and provide effective protection in Member States. This legislation is based on two assumptions:

- the infringement of a Community rule;
- the existence of financial damage.

It is necessary to adopt legislative, regulatory and administrative measures and any other measures necessary to ensure the effective protection of Union's financial interests, specifically to:

- a. ensure the legality and regularity of operations financed by public funds;
- b. ensure an effective prevention of fraud, especially in areas at higher risk, by introducing measures that can act as deterrent, taking into account the costs and benefits, and the appropriateness of the measures themselves;
- c. prevent, detect and correct irregularities and fraud;
- d. impose effective and dissuasive sanctions, commensurate with EU directives or, if absent, with national law and, if necessary, initiate legal proceedings in this regard;
- e. claim back non-interest-rate payments and initiate, if necessary, legal proceedings in this respect.

Recognition of irregularities and fraud can occur throughout the entire process of management and control, from the programming to the redeployment stage, and even later on through ex post controls carried out by national and EU Authorities.

As indicated in the AMIF Management and Control System (in the different versions adopted by the Responsible Authority and the Delegated Authority), detection of irregularities can be carried out by:

- Responsible Authority;
- Delegated Authority;
- National bodies (MEF, IGRUE, Court of Auditors, etc.);
- Community bodies (OLAF, the European Court of Auditors, etc.).

For the purpose of preventing and detecting cases of fraud and irregularities, specific structures with human resources dedicated to assessment activities accompanied by the adoption of an internal control system will be established. The person who identifies the irregularity during an administrative or legal investigation must notify the responsible structures through the AMIF information system (Irregularities and Recoveries Management), and will initiate the process of handling irregularities to the eventual recovery of the unduly paid sum. Specifically, for the RA, the structure is the Payments Unit; for the DA, the designated structure is the Division I - Financial Affairs.

Each responsible person implements the following measures:

- activates and maintains a custom recovery record;
- periodically (quarterly) notifies the EC in case of proven irregularities;
- proceeds to the recovery of irregularities (to be returned to the Rotation Fund);
- submits the OLAF card in case of "suspected fraud".

On the subject under consideration, the CMEF requests the relationship between fraud and irregularities to be verified after measures have been taken. To supplement the information provided, it is recommended that the RA (recalling the provisions in annex 1 of February 2017 Inception report) also associates the quantitative data with other qualitative data, such as:

- Presence of measures against fraud and irregularities (already applied at 30/06/2017);
- Planned but not yet implemented measures (not yet applicable at 30/06/2017)
- Type of implemented measures (not yet applicable at 30/06/2017)
- Type of obstacles emerged (not yet applicable at 30/06/2017).

3 RELEVANCE

DID THE OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERVENTIONS FUNDED BY THE FUND CORRESPOND TO THE ACTUAL NEEDS?

In 2015 approved version, NP objectives are adequately consistent with the needs identified by the programmer. The same survey carried out in June 2017 confirms, through beneficiaries' perception, a high degree of conformity between call contents and third-country nationals needs; the perception on financed project compliance with target group needs is similarly positive (albeit at a lower degree).

Moving from the Programme to projects, the positive opinion is confirmed and stronger. **The analysis carried out on the interventions funded at 30.6.2017 shows a good relevance between the relevant design framework and both the requirements set out in the NP, and the needs emerging progressively** in the first implementation period (2015-mid-2017); this shows, moreover, the resilience of the Programme with respect to the dynamics of migratory phenomena, which are the reason for the intervention.

3.1 DID THE OBJECTIVES SET BY THE MEMBER STATE IN THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME RESPOND TO THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS?

In its original version, the articulated Programme objective system (SO and NO) is adequately consistent with the needs identified during its drafting, by intercepting the critical elements emerging from reading the context in which the Programme itself was conceived.

The medium-term requirements that should be met by the Programme are: strengthening the reception system for asylum seekers in all its phases and components; improving the quality and speed of asylum procedures; promoting autonomy outside of the reception system as a result of interventions designed to integrate migrants (in various sizes); activating return paths.

For the purpose of verifying the relevance between these needs and the objectives set by the Programme, resort was made to the logical framework tool based on a reconstruction of Programme needs both pre-existing and identified referencing the four "medium-term requirements" provided for in the NP introduction (strengthening all stages and components of asylum seekers reception system; improving procedure quality and speed; promoting autonomy processes when leaving accommodation facilities, merging with integration interventions; activating return paths), and relevant "specific results".

Using a series of indicators mentioned in the NP acting as context descriptors, the evaluator identified some priorities and key areas of intervention.

Lastly, the identified needs (and their priorities and key areas of intervention) were connected to the "operational" objectives set out in the Programme.

Therefore, the analysis shows a substantial cohesion between the choice of the actions proposed by Reg. EU 516/2014 (here as "operational" objectives) and the prioritization of the interventions related to the identified needs.

This logical framework was submitted to a panel of people external to the evaluator (composed of experts with skills in social research methods, and "vertical" experts on the topics covered by the Programme), requiring them to assign a score (on a scale of 0 to 10) to each operational objective. The scores were assigned based on three criteria; each expert could also add a comment to the criteria:

- (i) selected target's ability to intervene on context dynamics represented by the descriptors in the NP;
- (ii) selected target's ability to intercept one or more priorities identified within the medium-term needs;

- (iii) appropriateness of the financial resources allocated for NO by the Programme in relation to mentioned priorities (taking into account the overall financial size of the Plan).

The assigned scores allowed to create a relevance index associated to individual selected objectives, to Specific Objectives and, lastly, to the whole Programme. This practice confirmed the suitability of the system developed during the planning stage, with an average rate above 6.0 for the whole NP, on a scale from 0 to 10. Specifically, the score of the second criterion (relevant to the link between objectives and priorities) was leading in this index, with an average of the 3 SOs equal to 7.0, thus confirming the internal coherence of the project planning.

On the other hand, the score of the first criterion (relevant to the link between objectives and context with an average around 6.0) was neutral; this opinion is probably partly affected by the lack of a more complete ex ante evaluation of the NP.

Lastly, the opinion on the adequacy of financial resources – with an average below the passing mark (5.4) – is more negative. The comments expressed by the panel experts show that this opinion is particularly focused on SO2 and SO3, and in both cases linked to the quantity and heterogeneity of potentially involved matters, with respect to which resources seem insufficient.

3.2 WHICH MEASURES DID THE MEMBER STATE PUT IN PLACE TO ADDRESS CHANGING NEEDS?

Up to June 2017, the NP implementation dynamic has mainly focused on responding to the needs identified during the programming process, also to continue what had been done during the previous SOLID programming. This response was differentiated due to the changing compliance of these needs with to most relevant context dynamics.

As regards Asylum (SO1), almost all the projects funded by June 2017 were approved and generally started in March 2016, actually responding to the needs identified as priorities between the end of 2015 and the beginning of 2017, thus better outlining the picture defined at the planning stage. The essential features of this need dynamics between 2015 and mid-2017 can be found in SO context analysis, which is herein referred to: increasing migratory pressure, significant growth in UAM arrivals, growth in the number of applications for international protection, and, in the background, Italy's acceptance of the European resettlement plan.

The *need* to create and qualify – through the Programme – services and reception for Unaccompanied Minors and, more generally, for vulnerable people (above all trafficking and violence victims), strongly prevailed on to those emerging from the recalled need dynamics. This is entirely consistent with the trend in needs that characterized SO1 intervention areas during the initial implementation of the NP, but also with the coherence and complementarity of the Programme compared to the extra AMIF action on asylum and reception.

Under OS2, the refinement of the strategic system and the start of its implementation took place in 2016 and therefore this timing has in fact prevented the ability to address new and emerging needs, especially due to the increased flow of mobility generated by migratory phenomena to Italy (as confirmed also by beneficiaries and privileged witnesses): this is the case of a) asylum seekers who are not eligible for AMIF under SO2, specifically with respect to civic-linguistic integration; b) needs associated to a long stay in reception centres or to the physical location of the centres; c) the needs of women victims of trafficking/violence; the management of the inclusion of CTP/EDA students in education and training courses during the year; d) the need to start labour market integration tools and paths. These needs are supposed to be addressed by the NP without changing the existing strategic system, and would position in the scar traced by most recent Community provisions in the Action Plan on TCN integration that may also apply to the Italian context:

- the refinement of tools allowing to verify the training process and previous work experience, the validation of diplomas and qualifications and the subsequent identification of any training needs;

- the strengthening of entrepreneurship through special financial measures, and facilitating access to credit;
- support for participation in active labour policies (on this matter, the DA has started a trial with non-AMIF funds; this experience should be integrated under the NP: this is the INSIDE project, aimed at promoting 672 internships for social and occupational inclusion of international protection holders hosted in the SPRAR system);
- the attention to newly arrived refugees, due to the specific additional criticalities they have to overcome, for example, vulnerability to trauma, lack of documents and forced inactivity.

Finally, as for returns (SO3), no new systemic needs have been identified, but specific needs linked to some weaknesses in the activities promoted up to now by the NP have emerged.

The first is the need to pay specific attention to the return of people requiring medical assistance; this theme is addressed by the actions provided for by an AVR project financed by Italy during the first half of 2017 outside AMIF Programme.

A second need is a better communication and interaction among the institutional stakeholders involved in return procedures. On this point, the initiative for the activation and development of the AVR&R institutional network and stakeholders training already provided for by the NP, was finally launched (June 2017). This further confirms the consistency of the planning system with the reference context and, conversely, the urgent need to speed up the implementation of the measures already planned.

4 COHERENCE

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?

During the programming stage, the coherence with other Programmes funded by EU resources has been ensured through the interaction with National Authorities in charge of Programmes co-financed by EU Funds. During the implementing stage and in support of the coherence of the NP's strategy in the European framework and in relation to other Programmes funded in asylum and immigration fields, the RA has enhanced co-ordination tools in its organisational structure. These co-ordination tools among the different levels of government (National, Regional and local) and among the different intervention fields (e.g. reception, labour market, social inclusion, education and training, public health, community activism) have already been institutionalised by the Italian Government within the reform and structuring process of the reception system started with the agreement signed during the Joint Conference of the 10th July 2014.

The implementation of the AMIF is coherent with the Italian's Government effort to improve and enhance the National reception and integration system of Third Country Nationals, in compliance with the objectives and standards set at European level (pursued through the National Operational Plan to face the extraordinary flow of non-EU citizens, adopted during the Joint Conference; the Italian Road Map of the 28th September 2015; the Reception Plan 2016; the Stability Programme for Italy, DEF 2017).

4.1 WAS AN ASSESSMENT OF OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITH SIMILAR OBJECTIVES CARRIED OUT AND TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT DURING THE PROGRAMMING STAGE?

The definition of the Programme's strategy has not been supported by a specific ex ante evaluation report. However, during the preparation stage of the NP, the coherence with the other Programmes funded by EU resources has been ensured through the interaction with National Authorities in charge of Programmes co-financed by EU Funds. This interaction occurred within the framework of the National Coordination Board for unplanned migratory flows, besides a direct communication with the European Commission, in compliance with Art. 12 and Art. 13 of the Reg. (EU) no. 514/2014

The Coordination Board, established with DM of the 16/10/2014, is a further step towards the definition of a National common strategy on reception and integration issues, in coherence with what the European Agenda for the Integration (COM/2011/0455) set out and following on from the experience of interinstitutional cooperation which has characterised the management of the humanitarian state of emergency in North Africa. Among its permanent members there are representatives:

- of the Civil rights and Immigration Department (DLCI) of the Ministry of the Interior, where the responsibility of AMIF NP places itself;
- of the Department of Public Security (DPS) of the Ministry of the Interior, in charge of the NP ISF;
- of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, where the Delegated Authority of the AMIF NP and the Lead Authority of the European Social Fund place themselves.

as well as representatives of local Administrations, among which Regions and Autonomous Provinces in charge of ESF Regional Operational Programmes.

The Board has been identified as forum to share and exchange views in relation to the programming of EU funds.

The NP has been shared with the Coordination Board between November 2014 and March 2015, and the contributions of the different representatives have been accepted. Thus the agreement of the Programme

towards common objectives, intervention priorities and regulatory standards set by the European Commission for the development of a common policy in the asylum and immigration fields.

NP's objectives in the **reception/asylum area (SO1)** prove to be particularly coherent with the overall review commitment of the *policy* and regulatory framework started at European level by the Commission (directive 2013/33/EU and 2013/32/EU) and consequently, at National level by the Italian Government (legislative decree of the 18th August 2015 no.142). The purpose consists in ensuring the real transposal of the standards set by the European directives regulating the **common European asylum system**.

In the field of **integration/legal migration (SO2)**, Programme's objectives, which are in line with the objectives of the **European Agenda for the Integration of Third Country Nationals** [see COM (2011)455] and of the following **Action plan on the integration of Third Country Nationals** [see COM (2016)377], support the development of a consistent, coordinated and sustainable National system for social and labour market integration of Third Country Nationals.

Consistently with the objectives of the European Agenda on migration, the NP finally contributes to strengthening National Programmes and procedures for **Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (SO3)** in order to ensure the implementation of the **EU Return Action Plan** (see COM (2015)453). AMIF plays a key role in this field to ensure the observance of the commitments undertaken by Italy at European level (see Hearing of the Minister Minniti, 8th February 2017, Joint Commissions I° Chamber of Deputies and I° Senate).

4.2 WERE CO-ORDINATION MECHANISMS BETWEEN THE FUND AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITH SIMILAR OBJECTIVES ESTABLISHED FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD?

Within the agreement signed during the Joint Conference promoted by the Ministry of the Interior and by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy with Regions and Local Authorities in July 2014, co-ordination mechanisms have been established at National level in the fields concerned by the intervention strategy of AMIF NP. In particular, the agreement envisages the National Coordination Board's operational work as described in the previous paragraph and the adoption of a National Operational Plan to face the extraordinary flow of TCNs. The purpose is to lead to include the set interventions in ordinary management, overcoming the emergency approach.

The Joint Conference has specifically chosen the **National Coordination Board** as forum to share and exchange views in relation to AMIF's programming and the Board is expected to meet at least three times a year. The Coordination role of the Board has been further defined by the Decree of the Minister of the Interior of the 16th October 2014, which has confirmed the adoption of a specific approach focused on a steady and close interinstitutional collaboration among the different Public Administrations involved. In light of the positive contribution ensured by the Board during the preparatory stage (see §6.1 AMIF NP), the operational work of this co-ordination tool has been ensured during the implementing stage as well, through its integration in the organisational structure of the Responsible Authority (see Si.Ge.Co. AMIF version 27.03.2015). The Board is also in charge of the preparation of the yearly **Reception National Plan** (see Art.16 of the Legislative Decree no.142/2015). The control and management system also envisages the operational work of an **AMIF Technical Committee** to be attended by specific representatives, according to the issues to be discussed, as for example representatives of Central, Regional and local Administrations in charge of the management of interventions in immigration and asylum fields.

With reference to the establishment of co-ordination mechanisms between the two EU Funds operating in the field of immigration and EU internal security (AMIF and ISF), in September 2015 the Ministry of the Interior, Responsible Authority for both Funds, has adopted a **Roadmap**, as required as part of the measures fostered by the EU in the field of international protection in favour of Italy and Greece (see Council Decision

(EU) 2015/1523). This Roadmap sets the concomitant activation of AMIF and ISF financial resources, besides National resources, in order to foster measures aiming at the improvement of systems' capacity, quality and effectiveness in the asylum, first reception and return fields.

Finally, the organisational structure for the implementation of ISF established by the Ministry of the Interior sets out that the Responsible Authority has to be supported by the **Technical Committee for Joint Programming** and by the **Technical and Administrative Secretariat for EU Funds and NOPs**. The information flow and the collaboration with AMIF Responsible Authority is thereby ensured (see §6.6 ISF NP).

In a broader perspective, the coordination between the Ministry of the Interior and MIUR is also ensured by a joint Board that aims at periodically monitoring implementation activities based on the 11 November 2010 agreement (that has amongst its objectives the definition of an integrated plan for interventions on language training for foreigners). In January 2016, a seminar was organised (1st National Seminar of the AMIF 2014-2020 Literacy board) during which all Regional Administrations and Regional School Offices were informed on the guidelines for planning the Regional plans for TCN civic and language training. These guidelines have then been attached to the Call released in December 2015 for the projects to be funded under AMIF.

4.3 WERE THE ACTIONS IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE FUND COHERENT WITH AND NON-CONTRADICTIONARY TO OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITH SIMILAR OBJECTIVES?

The implementation of AMIF NP is fully coherent with the Italian reception, integration and return system of Third Country Nationals and with the objectives and *standards* set at European level.

Concerning SO1, the intervention logic focused on the enhancement of the quantity (in terms of accommodation capacity), quality (in terms of the *standard* of specialised services for vulnerable *targets*) and of the *governance* (strengthening of the monitoring system) of the protection system for asylum seekers and refugees, which is mainly financed by National resources (National Fund for asylum policies and services). The aspect of the coherence of interventions supported by AMIF NP under SO1 is particularly important, even with respect to International law (Geneva Convention of 1951, New York Protocol of 1967; United Nations Convention of 1989, European Convention of 1950) and EU instruments (Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU of 2000) in the field of the safeguard and protection of human fundamental rights (e.g. with respect to the condition of foreign unaccompanied minors).

Concerning reception and asylum issues, public calls under SO1NO1 are coherent with the interventions started at National level in order to face the constant increase of arrivals number (SO1NO1.c), to improve the qualification of the reception system in favour of foreign unaccompanied minors (SO1NO1.e) and, more generally, in favour of vulnerable migrants (SO1NO1.a/ SO1NO1.b). The objectives of the calls under SO1ON2 focus on the strengthening of intervention and *governance* capacity in reception and asylum fields, also cutting across other interventions of AMIF (internal coherence) and, more generally, of the Italian National System for protection and reception. Under SO1NO3, the NP supports the implementation of the Italian resettlement Programme through the enhancement of the National *governance*.

As for Third Country Nationals' integration (SO2), the implementing logic is characterised both in terms of continuity (enhancement of active competences and resources in the territory) and innovation (modernisation of intervention methodologies in favour of a multidimensional handling) by the enhancement of the chain of services for social and labour market integration. The objectives related to the integration of Third Country Nationals have been defined in consideration of the experiences and competences gained by the Public Administration and by the third sector in this field, thanks to the employment of EU Funds supporting cohesion policies (e.g. resources of the EQUAL Community Initiative or of the ESF), of National Funds (National Fund for Migration Policies) and of Regional Funds (in the field of legislative interventions of Regional competence). During the implementing stage, the RA and the DA have organised different Technical Committees (on language training and job orientation; on the implementing strategy of Regional Intervention Plans for integration) and meetings (on themes such as social and labour market inclusion and integration of

UAM and young foreigners) to plan interventions. The National Coordination Board for migratory flows has given strategic directions for the definition of calls' contents.

The implementing strategy of the NP is therefore based on a close integration between social and labour market policies, in order to develop handling paths aimed at an active inclusion. Within its implementation, SO2 integrates in the wider National *welfare* reform process. This one envisages the promotion of collaboration agreements with the Administrations in charge of services supporting social and labour market activation of persons at higher risk of exclusion and poverty in the territory (see Guidelines of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy for the preparation and implementation of handling projects in support of active inclusion). This has been the purpose of the call *Multi-Azione* (multiple action), for example, under which Regional Administrations have been required to develop Regional intervention plans for the integration of Third Country Nationals through a shared programming process with the rest of the territory.

NP's objectives in returns field (SO3) completely support the Government's strategy both in terms of programming and implementation, aimed at enhancing and making more effective both enforced returns and Assisted Voluntary Returns (Hearing of the Minister Minniti, 8th February 2017, Joint Commissions I° Chamber of Deputies and I° Senate). The implementing stage envisages the activation of the objectives related to assisted returns to be carried out (SO3ON2.g). The NP represents the main funding source to this end.

5 COMPLEMENTARITY

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?

Both the objectives set in the NP and the actions implemented are complementary to other interventions in the relevant sectors, thanks to the employment of National co-ordination instruments set by the Joint Conference of July 2014 and to specific programming (Partnership Agreement, Integrated programming documents) and operational instruments (Regional Plans).

Mechanisms set up to this day put complementarity into effects more often in terms of programmatic collaboration (through consultation, information exchange) and less frequently in terms of operational cooperation (jointed/complementary actions). The main factors hindering this cooperation consist in procedural issues and they are connected to the difficulties in harmonising management rules and the control of the different funds (e.g. the different eligibility conditions of expenditure). In reference to complementarity between AMIF and ESF, the integrated use of resources is also influenced by the necessary dialogue with the 21 Administrations responsible for ROPs. One step forward consists in the recent start of a project development by the DA (with the support of ANPAL), aiming at social and labour market integration of beneficiaries of international and humanitarian protection, co-financed by AMIF NP and by NOP Inclusion (ESF).

Internally to AMIF, the integrated use of the NP and emergency assistance has ensured continuity to UAM reception. In fact, while waiting for the approval of the NP, projects have been funded under emergency assistance and, following the NP's approval, some of these projects have been extended in order to give time for the selection procedures of new projects.

The carried out survey on the beneficiaries of the NP reveals that over half (63%) recognises a connection between interventions funded by AMIF and other instruments with similar objectives in terms of services offered, target group persons, implementing bodies, financial resources. This opinion is homogeneously shared among the beneficiaries of the three SOs that consider this connection particularly positive for the target group persons (40% of replies in this sense) and for the quality of the services offered (38% of replies in this sense).

On SO3, the implementation of the AMIF NP has been slowed down by the start of an AVR&R project funded by National Funds. This project was given priority as it was more time sensitive (having to be completed by 2017).

5.1 WAS AN ASSESSMENT OF OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITH COMPLEMENTARY OBJECTIVES CARRIED OUT AND TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT DURING THE PROGRAMMING STAGE?

During the programming stage of the NP, the connection between AMIF and National policies and instruments with regard to asylum and return (SO1 and SO3) has been fostered through the involvement of the co-ordination structure which had already been set up within the Agreement of the 10th July 2014 between Government, Regions and Local Authorities, that is The National Coordination Board for unplanned migratory flows. With reference to SO2, as specifically stated in the NP, the National implementing strategy of the European Agenda for the Integration of Third Country Nationals consists in the “implementation of an integrated programming according to a system and complementarity logic, by coordinating and integrating Regional, National and EU financial instruments available”.

During the consultation process started with the programming stage of the NP, the RA has enhanced central Administrations' contributions (Premiership, National Office Against Racial Discriminations, Ministry of

Labour and Social Policy, Ministry of Education, University and Research, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies) and local Administrations' ones (State-Regions Conference, National Association of Italian Municipalities), as well as contributions of International and National nongovernmental organisations. With regard to the strategic connection of the NP with other National instruments drawn from EU and National resources in asylum, integration and return fields, the RA has also been supported by the **National Coordination Board for unplanned migratory flows**, established within the Agreement of the Joint Conference of the 10th July 2014. The agreement has identified the National Coordination Board (located within the Ministry of the Interior) as representing the forum to share and exchange views in relation to the programming of EU funds and of AMIF in particular. The Board has notably worked as forum to discuss issues related to SO1 and SO3, with reference to the complementarity with the strategic and operational programming of National instruments supporting the reception system (e.g. National Fund for asylum policies and services, National Fund for the reception of foreign unaccompanied minors).

The RA and the DA have adopted a specific approach with reference to the development of the complementarity and co-ordination principle of the NP with other instruments of the EU supporting the objectives in employment, education and training fields, as well as the promotion of social inclusion and fight against poverty. The strong complementarity for SO2 is justified by the opportunity to activate a significant quantity of financial resources (in addition to the limited availability of the AMIF) through the employment of the available ESI funds in the Italian territory (18.5 billion Euros the total value of ESF resources at National level). Moreover, this strong complementarity's purpose is to promote a widespread and not occasional use in the territory of ESI funds resources by Regional Administrations operating as Management Authorities (MA) of the ROPs. Eventually, in accordance with the subsidiarity principle, this decision proves to be consistent with Regional and local Authorities competences in public health and social services, and in intervention fields concerning education and training, employment and social inclusion policies.

SO2's strategy is based on four cornerstones: National system actions for the qualification and standardisation of services; multilevel *governance* of interventions; integrated programming; strengthening of the action at local level (see AMIF NP § 3). In particular, during the preparation stage (see AMIF NP §6.6), some key aspects of the **integrated programming** have been defined **with respect to labour market and social inclusion policies**, and they are described as multi-sectorial: i.e. able to integrate policies, services and initiatives referring to different areas, but complementary; multilevel: able to involve all the institutional stakeholders in charge by coordinating strategies, programmes and interventions; multi-stakeholder: able to involve all the actors affected by activating complementary resources, experiences and competences; multi-fund: able to give higher effectiveness to the definition and to the achievement of the objectives. In this sense, during the programming stage, the connection between NP's objectives, those of EU financial instruments in support of cohesion policies (e.g. the ESF) and of National ones in support of immigrants' integration (e.g. the National Fund for Migration Policies) has been facilitated by the role undertaken by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy as Delegated Authority of the NP and, at the same time, as leading group Authority of the ESF in Italy and MA of NOPs Inclusion and SPAO.

5.2 WERE CO-ORDINATION MECHANISMS BETWEEN THE FUND AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITH SIMILAR OBJECTIVES ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE THEIR COMPLEMENTARITY FOR THE IMPLEMENTING PERIOD?

The co-ordination between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives is being developed, in particular for SO1 and SO3, within the wider process of *governance* institutionalisation for the development of only one National reception, which was absent in the Italian territory. As for intervention areas of SO2, the activated co-ordination mechanisms (Regional Plans) aim at enhancing the Regional and local dimension of integration strategies. This serves also the purpose to harmonise territorial differences and awareness with the aim of ensuring the development of a consistent and common National system in the whole territory.

Consistently with the D.M. no.9225 of the 17th October 2014, the Si.Ge.Co. of the NP (besides the Monitoring Committee as the place for sharing views within the partnership) envisages the integration into the organisational structure of the RA of two Bodies suitable for the development of the complementarity: the National Coordination Board and **AMIF Technical Committee**.

As stated in the Reception National Plan 2016 in reference to the National and local co-ordination system, "The National Coordination Board has represented in 2015 as well, the benchmark of the National reception system's *governance*, a connection opportunity for National and European project planning in the field, with particular regard to the new AMIF". The Technical Committee is established instead within the organisational structure of the NP with the purpose to support the RA "in ensuring the accordance, the complementarity and the synergy among AMIF's activities and interventions in the reference existing fields of the territory, in light of anything shared within the National Coordination Board" as well (see Si.Ge.Co. AMIF NP). According to the issue to be handled (asylum, integration, returns), AMIF Technical Committee gathers the representatives of central, Regional and local Administrations in charge of interventions management. As for the areas of competence of SO3, a Technical AVR Committee has been established in order to enhance a National multilevel *governance* to manage assisted returns (see AMIF Implementation Report 2016).

For the implementation of part of SO2, the DA has structured and started a specific path which has also involved Regional Administrations for the development of a synergetic system of interventions aiming at social integration and labour market inclusion of Third Country Nationals and based on the activation of Regional resources, of resources of the National Fund for Migration Policies (NFMP) and of those drawn from AMIF NP and from ESF.

The **Programme Agreements** signed with 17 Regions represent a first step toward the application of the guiding principles of the integrated programming fostered by the DA within the NP: active inclusion through the launch of social and labour market services (multi-sectorial programming); co-ordination of the competent institutional stakeholders at National and Regional level and within the same administrations involved (multilevel programming); activation and enhancement of territorial competences and resources (*multi-stakeholders* programming); disappearance of interventions splitting up by facilitating a concentration of the resources the person is entitled to (multi-fund programming). In the Programme Agreement, Regional Administrations have developed an **integrated plan of interventions** describing preparatory actions to the qualification of the system of territorial services in favour of immigrants. Even if their goal is the transfer to the Regions of 3M Euros drawn from the NFMP, the envisaged actions are preparatory to the setting up of an integrated system meant for a coordinated use of National and European resources in support of TCNs' integration. Integrated plans show a potential positive effect on organisational set-ups of the 17 Regional Administrations involved: all of them have considered the introduction of mechanisms (Steering committee, Interdepartmental/Inter-institutional Board) aimed at coordinating and monitoring in an integrated way sectorial policies targeted at migrants. The identification at Regional level of an only one knowledge and competences centre will allow a more immediate relationship among the different Regional managements in charge and between these ones and the National level. The envisaged re-organisation interventions also concern the strengthening of co-ordination mechanisms (Thematic round tables, Coordination Boards, Working tables, territorial networks) for the *governance* of local stakeholders (local Authorities and third sector). As for the plans, Regions have also planned the definition of co-ordination instruments (operational protocols, work patterns, guidelines for the implementation of services) supporting an effective and multilevel territorial *governance* of the services.

5.3 WERE MECHANISMS AIMED TO PREVENT OVERLAPPING OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS PUT IN PLACE?

The promotion of the real integration of TCNs is a particular field revealing clear opportunities of complementarity development, and therefore, a higher overlapping risk between AMIF and other financial instruments, in particular those linked to the ESF. To this end, since the initial stage of the NP, the DA has fostered the definition of tools intended for an integrated programming. The purpose also consists in reducing the risk of duplicating interventions for the target group persons.

The carried out survey on beneficiaries' perception of the interventions started confirms their acknowledgement of potential project planning and operational synergies offered by the other EU, National and Regional financial instruments. Even in light of these results, started procedures should be further enhanced – considering the expected increase of the integrated use of resources in the next months, as an effect of the promoted instruments and of the procedural speed up of the ESF ROPs/NOPs. This, in order to reduce the risk of a *gap* within the range of services or a duplication of services intended to the same person.

In a document of “**multi-year programming in the field of labour policies and integration 2014-2020**” the DA has identified 10 lines of AMIF - ESF integrated programming. In particular, 4 multi-fund actions have been envisaged: (i) the launch of an intervention on the system in order to qualify and facilitate the access to labour market services in favour of migrant citizens (35M Euros NOP SPAO); (ii) support to labour market inclusion of applicants/beneficiaries of international protection (50M Euros NOP SPAO + 60M Euros AMIF); (iii) preventive actions against black market labour (4M Euros NOP SPAO + AMIF 4M Euros), (iv) actions in favour of labour market inclusion for people in transition to adulthood (7M Euros NOP Inclusion + 7M Euros AMIF).

The programming strategy experiences a concentration of interventions of NOPs and of AMIF to promote pilot projects and interventions of social and labour market integration in favour of TCNs in particularly vulnerable conditions (asylum seekers/beneficiaries of international protection, UAM). In line with this choice, two pilot projects have been launched at National level, funded by the NFMP: *Inside* (4.5M Euros) and *Percorsi* (Paths, 4.8M Euros), whose outcomes will support the systematisation of the interventions drawn from AMIF and from the NOP SPAO.

Another instrument preventing the overlapping risk of AMIF-ESF financial resources is represented by **Regional intervention plans for the integration of TCNs** developed by Regional Administrations and co-planned with territorial Authorities within the call Multi-Azione (funded by AMIF). During the development of the plan, each Administration has identified complementary actions to the interventions supported by AMIF and to be financed or already financed by other resources (ESF, NFMP, National Fund for Social Policies, National Health Fund).

The analysis of Regional integrated intervention plans and of Regional intervention plans for TCNs' integration has allowed the reconstruction of a first mapping of the synergies declared by the Administrations between AMIF and the ROPs ESF. By adopting the 4 actions of the call Multi-Azione (Action 1 Qualification of education system, Action 2 Promotion of the access to integration services, Action 3 Qualified information services, Action 4 Promotion of active participation of migrants) as mapping criterion, two are the intervention areas which are potentially complementary to the ESF: the one concerning education and training and the one concerning social and labour market integration. The interventions envisaged in relation to complementary objectives and *targets* to those of the AMIF, mainly concern the Axis “Social inclusion”. The potential intervention fields identified by the Regions concern the objective consisting in “increasing employability and participation of more vulnerable persons”. In this field, programmes have set multidisciplinary handling paths in favour of unemployed immigrants, asylum seekers, beneficiaries of international protection and not even barely legal UAM. With reference to the qualification of the education system, second generation immigrants are among the possible target group persons of counter-actions against early school leaving and of actions facilitating the access to professional training. However, only the ROP ESF Umbria envisages second generation immigrants among its target group persons.

With reference to the Axis Employment, the ESF can support TCNs' access to active policy services within universalist measures in favour of unemployed persons. Only the programmes of the A.P. of Bolzano, of Apulia, of Sardinia and of Aosta Valley include the specific objective of “increasing immigrants' employability”.

6 EU ADDED VALUE

WAS ANY ADDED VALUE BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE EU SUPPORT?

The EU support provided by the Programme has brought about a significant added value, which has been acknowledged by the beneficiaries for the projects completed by 30/06/2017.

In order to assess EU added value, resort was made to the results of a survey among the beneficiaries of the projects completed by 30/06/2017 and the outcomes of individual interviews to some project beneficiaries, national stakeholders and SO representative at the Administration.

NP added value mainly concerned the so-called “volume effect” (availability of financial resources in addition to the ordinary one, or of brand new financial resources), and the “process effect” (potential replication on a local or national scale of intervention contents). The *role effect* (support to innovation, in the broad sense) and the *scope effect* – for which the Programme has allowed to reach types of recipients or areas otherwise unreachable – are instead less frequent.

However, NP added value should be considered with respect to the overall reception and integration system in Italy, where the resources used are mainly national (about 3 billion euros in 2017 for reception).

The interruption of the support provided by the Fund would lead to different outcomes for the three SOs: the interventions under SO1 could be more or less penalized based on their *emergency/reactive* configuration (which would probably find continuity on other resources) or *targeted system* (for which AMIF replacement would be more problematic); the interventions under SO2 would on the contrary be more penalized (given their little emergency nature); the interventions under SO3 would be only partially penalized (at least with reference to AVR).

Finally, the benefit at a Community level produced so far by the actions supported by AMIF NP cannot be quantified yet, but the implementation trend – in the transition from emergency support (leading during the first year of NP implementation) to progressive support for the selective creation of a reception and integration system – will certainly contribute to the management of migratory phenomena and reception by the EU.

6.1 WHAT ARE THE MAIN TYPES OF ADDED VALUE RESULTING FROM THE SUPPORT BY THE FUND (VOLUME, SCOPE, ROLE, PROCESS)?

According to beneficiaries’ perception, **the added value attributable to the Fund support, referring to the 27 projects completed as of 30/06/2017, is positive in its overall.**

Specifically, both the *volume effect* and the *process effect* seem crucial. Most of the answers to the questionnaire (20 out of 24) confirm the centrality of AMIF contribution to intervention implementation and the potential replicability of relevant contents.

Recorded in 17 answers, the *role effect* is also significant, confirming that funded interventions have a novelty profile compared to the tools or models of implemented interventions. Also the *scope effect* is good, detected in 15 cases where the intervention has totally or largely covered areas and/or recipient types otherwise unreachable. These projects are almost all addressed to Unaccompanied Minors, confirming SO1 crucial contribution to the structuring of a first and second reception system for foreign minors.

Therefore, the Programme brings an important added value, in terms of contribution to a better planning and systematic management of interventions (related to *innovation* and *process effects*) as well as in relation to the size of *volume* and *coverage*.

However, the Programme added value should be contextualised within the framework of the allocations for the interventions destined to migrants and asylum seekers reception in Italy, which accounts for a clear predominance of national resources, amounting to almost 3 billion euros in 2017 (this figure was indicated by the Prefect Pantalone during 25/5/2017 hearing of the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry on the reception system). Therefore, the interventions implemented with AMIF operate in complementarity with the ones supported by national resources, in the dual perspective of strengthening and qualifying ordinary actions financed with national funds.

The very wide spread of the *volume effect* reported by beneficiaries indicates that the Programme, with reference to concluded projects, allowed for financial resources to be available to implement interventions that otherwise would not have been made or would have been minimally implemented (meaning on lower volumes or service levels). The most evident examples of this effect are the *Proroghe MSNA* projects, which allowed to carry on for a few months of 2016 the implementation of the projects launched prior to Programme approval, as well as the projects aimed at “improving the ability to monitor and evaluate the reception system” (see proj. *Monitoring e Reception*), i.e. the provision of “Information services to migrants illegally arrived by sea” (see proj. *Assistance* and proj. *Access*).

Regarding the *process effect*, its presence across the various project groups is undoubtedly positive because it means that both the interventions directly addressed to migrants (*Assistance*, *Access* and the ones for Unaccompanied Minors) and the interventions definable as “system-oriented” (*Monitoring*, *Reception* and the ones under SO2) can influence – in their overall structure and in the implementation and organizational modalities – the implementation, not only through the Fund, of other interventions with similar purposes or structure.

The *role effect (innovation)* affected above all the projects for Unaccompanied Minors (to which the Programme greatly contributed in terms of definition and launching of services and continuous and structured intervention modes), and the ones under SO2 (which, despite their diversity, provided for tools – e.g. to support the development of language skills – characterised by a new concept and specific calibration on immigrant population).

Finally, the *scope effect (coverage)* is particularly evident for information projects and first disembarkation assistance (*Assistance*, *Access*, 3 of the 4 *Praesidium IX bis*), thanks to which it was possible to oversee the intense flows of arrivals, especially by sea; for the projects monitoring services and facilities (*Monitoring*, *Reception* and one of the *Praesidium IX bis* projects), which allowed to define monitoring tools and protocols in situ and their effective implementation; for the “system-oriented” projects belonging to the *Proroghe MSNA* block (i.e. the projects owned by UNHCR, *Save the Children*, IOM and ANCI), thanks to which it was possible to support the implementation of projects that actually initiated a reception system specifically designed for foreign minors.

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?

The financial additionality attributable to the Program is very significant, albeit with the numerical and typological limitations of completed interventions.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the implementation of the interventions promoted by the NP is strictly linked to the availability of AMIF resources. In this regard, three variables have been identified that, even individually, appear at the basis of the decision on the Programme intervention, and that (individually or together) identify the actions that would not have been implemented without the Fund support (even if the last one seems progressively less relevant for the consolidation of the Programme implementation):

- **the need to manage an emergency** with a view to consolidating and structuring the phenomenon management system, especially if it applies to a vulnerable target population (such as the striking case of the interventions for Unaccompanied Minors under SO1);

- **the novelty of the reference topic** with respect to the general context and the contingent situation of the Administration, such as for the actions to monitor services and the system as well as for the ones, under SO2, aimed at the production of operational supports or specific materials;
- **the configuration of the action as a continuation** (or not) of previous consolidated actions and, as such, considered as structural and urgent by the Administration with respect to the reference topic (this is the case, always under SO1, of the projects called *Praesidium*).

The above is supplemented by the analysis of the benefits the beneficiaries of concluded projects reported (through survey or interview) they have obtained from interventions implementation.

The development of specific skills or abilities by the stakeholders involved in the projects (both technical and relational) emerges as the more widespread and relevant benefit for SO1 interventions. In fact, it concerns the projects aimed at Unaccompanied Minors, as well as the ones for first reception and information, and the “system-oriented” projects; this benefit is key as, in principle, it can last longer than the conclusion of the individual project.

From a medium-term perspective, it also refers to the second widespread benefit, common to SO1 and SO2 projects, namely the increase in beneficiary’s capacity to intervene on the topic or the initiative target. It is followed, but mainly for SO1, by the strengthening of public or private cooperation networks at a local level. The benefit represented by the ability to respond to an otherwise unidentifiable need for intervention is also important, but only for OS1, while the increase in beneficiary visibility is mainly relevant for the two SO2 projects (both implemented directly by the RA).

This benefit mapping is consistent with the content of the actions to which the concluded projects belong. From the reading of the Final Assessments and from some interviews to beneficiaries, interesting analysis elements emerge: for example, for projects of “informative and legal support for migrants and vulnerable targets” (*Assistance* and *Access*) the main benefit for the two actuators is the strengthening and qualification of their role and institutional mandate in accordance with project contents. A similar outcome is attributable to the beneficiaries of the projects monitoring “the reception system” (*Monitoring and Reception*) as well as to those of *Praesidium IX* projects.

As for the projects of the *Proroghe MSNA* procedure, a distinction should be made between the ones that directly involved Unaccompanied Minors and the ones that carried out accompanying and support actions. With reference to the former, the most relevant benefit relates to future sustainability of the activities carried out which, at least potentially, remain in the beneficiary endowment and *capital*. As for the latter, the benefit is twofold: on the one hand, the consolidation and, as far as possible, qualification of one’s role in relation to reception topic; on the other hand, the development and testing of protocols, methods and tools functional to the practice of their support function to the reception system.

6.3 WHAT WOULD BE THE MOST LIKELY CONSEQUENCES OF AN INTERRUPTION OF THE SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE FUND?

The effects of an interruption of AMIF financial support would be mainly felt in the areas of intervention covered by SO2 and, in part, of SO1 when addressed to “system-oriented” interventions. For the actions with a stronger emergency nature (typical in part of SO1 and in the whole SO3), it is instead likely to expect a replacement of AMIF resources with other national resources.

The relationship, especially in financial terms, between the interventions provided for by the Programme and the entirety of the interventions carried out in a typical year to support asylum, reception and integration in Italy is useful to identify – at least in general terms – which actions “would be interrupted or implemented at lower volumes due to the interruption of Fund support” (as explicitly indicated by the reference indicator in the Inception Report).

On this basis, it is possible to state that the interruption of the support provided by the Fund would probably lead – at a national system level – to different results depending on:

- the nature of the actions (emergency or not);
- their complexity (for example in terms of stakeholders involved in the implementation);
- their duration over time (annual or multiannual);
- their thematic proximity to the areas that are also object of ordinary intervention.

As for outcomes, from a financial point of view, they can be of three types:

- complete/partial unconditional replacement with national resources;
- complete/partial replacement with national resources but conditioned (or downstream of intervention priorities);
- interruption of support.

Moving on a project level (projects completed or being implemented as of 06.30.2017), it is possible to illustrate the proposed case series.

For SO1, first of all a distinction should be made between mainly emergency interventions (i.e. as a “first impact” response to migratory flows) and structural interventions such as those, especially multiannual, aimed at creating the reception system for minors and those aimed at reinforcing the Ministry’s capacity to manage and monitor services.

Based on beneficiaries’ answers to the CAWI survey on intervention implementation without AMIF funds, it is reasonable to state that emergency interventions would have been carried out even without AMIF contribution (because the emergency must be addressed by definition), at least in the case of more structured beneficiaries, both from a dimensional and financial point of view (for example, UNHCR, IOM). Structural projects, such as projects supporting the first and second-level reception of minors, would instead be more affected by the Programme interruption (especially the ongoing ones, with a multiannual duration). The situation is different also for ongoing projects aimed at reinforcing the Ministry’s ability to govern the system (this is the case of *Sindaca*, *SISAMI*, *MIRECO*, *Dublin Unit*, *Office Upgrades*), for which the Fund interruption would probably not result in their interruption, but in a slowdown with qualitative levels and implementation *standards* lower than the ones possible thanks to AMIF.

As for SO2, a project such as *Promotion/Skill Development* (concluded, multi-actor, system-oriented, on a topic qualifying linguistic integration) would not have been/would not be implemented without the Fund, as well as probably, among ongoing interventions, those based on the *Multiazione* (Multi-action) call (which involves the Regions, a great number of recipients, have a multiannual duration and very ambitious objectives: these characteristics mean that the interruption of AMIF support could seriously hamper its implementation).

Finally, the actions under SO3 on returns can also be attributed to the emergency sphere. The genesis and ratio of these actions, even within the more general EU policies, are such that any interruption of AMIF support would lead to the use of national resources.

On the contrary, the Fund support is critical for the projects falling fall under more structured policy lines; reference is made e.g. to the implementation of AVR interventions: in fact, AVRs from Italy were suspended once SOLID Funds had expired and before the start of the projects financed by AMIF. This also applies to the recent launch of an AVR project financed by National Funds and entrusted to IOM by direct selection. In perspective, the Fund support is also very important for the adequate implementation of forced returns from Italy, as it is expected that, between 2015 and 2022, 45% of them will be financed by the Fund, although to date the resources planned for this purpose have not yet been used.

6.4 TO WHICH EXTENT HAVE ACTIONS SUPPORTED BY THE FUND RESULTED IN A BENEFIT AT THE UNION LEVEL?

At EU level, the actions supported by the Fund through the Programme have so far generated an appreciable benefit.

This is due to two fundamental reasons: the first is that the resources mobilized by the Programme on the 3 Specific Objectives, both total and those committed until June 2017 (respectively 584 and 259 million euro), are modest compared to the ordinary funding of national policies for asylum and reception. The second is that the number of interventions concluded as of June 2017 (and therefore of the interventions more likely to produce measurable benefits) is very limited (27 compared to 310 funded, substantially concentrated under SO1).

However, the implementation Programme *trend*, in the transition from an emergency support (dominant in the first year of the Programme implementation) to the progressive – albeit slow – support for the selective construction of a reception system or parts of it, suggests that it will probably bring a tangible benefit (however proportionate to its financial dimension) to the management of migratory phenomena and of reception by the Union.

The analysis of the results of the projects concluded as of June 2016 in relation to the actions provided for in Reg. 516/2014 reflects a good match, confirming (even if only as a proxy) the expected benefit of the Programme at a Union level.

For the absolute majority of the projects under SO1 concluded at 30/06/2017, there is a significant link between results and Regulation actions relevant to the provision of *material assistance and first aid; legal, judicial and social assistance; general support for vulnerable people* (minors in the first place). Interestingly, these dimensions are covered by the absolute majority of the funding related to concluded interventions concluded, and it is therefore likely to expect that in these areas the greatest benefits will be made also at EU level.

7 SUSTAINABILITY

ARE THE POSITIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE FUND LIKELY TO LAST WHEN ITS SUPPORT WILL BE OVER?

The analyses carried out on the projects completed as of 30/06/2017 show the results/benefits achieved are very likely to continue even after the support ends, taking into account the numerical and typological limitations of examined interventions that, however, allow to make some distinctions.

This is particularly true for the interventions directly addressed to migrants (mainly consisting of *Proroghe MSNA* projects, among the concluded ones). The results/benefits of these projects refer to changes in recipients' condition, whose entity and intensity can be partially proved (based on beneficiaries' answers to June 2017 survey). As for system-oriented projects (such as the interventions concluded under SO2), the situation is different: their results are compliant with project works produced to be used *after* the conclusion of the project (they can be, respectively, a documentary or an education support tool). In this case, they are likely to continue.

With regard to available evidence, based on the survey carried out by the evaluator, in almost 80% of cases the probability that "the results/benefits obtained through the project last at least one year after its completion" is high. Therefore, in assessing the beneficiaries, the picture of the *likely continuity* of the results/benefits is decidedly positive. In particular, the projects that were initiated expecting more "structural" results (see the initiatives promoted by UNHCR, ANCI, Save the Children, IOM under the *Proroghe MSNA*), confirm these expectations even after almost a year from their completion.

This assessment is supported by the analysis of projects *Final Assessment* documents, which refer to the implementation by the beneficiary of "measures aimed at ensuring the continuation of activities beyond the end of the project and independently of AMIF contribution". Projects carried out by beneficiaries having an important institutional role in the implementation of asylum/reception policies and involving "system-oriented", capacity building or network interventions are the ones more likely to continue their activities.

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 measures – or devices – adopted by the RA to guarantee the "sustainability of the results of the projects implemented with Fund support" after the conclusion of the intervention consist of requests addressed to project beneficiaries during project proposal, mid-term and, finally, in the final balance.

In detail, the measures referred to are the following:

- In the proposal: the provision, with respect to project presentation forms, of a section (B2.12) dedicated to the description of the elements having as objective to support activities/actions and the intervention of the individual project. These elements have subsequently been considered within the evaluation criteria set out in the calls.
- Mid-term: the implementation of systems to monitor project implementation (according to a logic and a system similar to that of the Final Assessment Report and therefore of a documentary-declarative nature to be borne by the beneficiary) aimed at verifying that, with specific reference to the Sustainability mentioned in the proposal, the intervention implementation is consistent with the likely continuation of activities or results as stated in the project (however, in the quarterly monitoring card there is no explicit reference to Sustainability, which is only indirectly approximable through the contents of sections Strengths/Success Factors and Eventual Difficulties);

- In the final balance: the provision, within the Final Assessment forms (in the Procedural Sheet), of a section dedicated to the declaration – by the beneficiary – of sustainability over time (after project closure) of the “activities carried out” within of the single project (where reference is made to activities/actions – to their “continuation” – and not to project results).

The decision to include Sustainability among the evaluation criteria of project proposals is positive. However, once the project is financed, it is accompanied by a system essentially concentrated (both in periodic monitoring surveys and through Final Assessments) on the sustainability conditions of the initiative or parts thereof and not on the results achieved. This approach risks distorting the possibility of detecting during and at the conclusion of the funded initiative the existence (and maintenance) of the preconditions of result sustainability requested by the Commission.

In this regard, it might be appropriate to review the formats for the beneficiaries (both at the monitoring stage and in Final Assessments), focusing more clearly the reference to sustainability in terms of maintenance of the project “results” (at a recipient, organizational and territorial level), distinguishing it from the maintenance of “activities” (actions, services) implemented through the project.

A focus on the sustainability conditions of concluded projects was however carried out by the evaluator during June 2015 survey, asking the beneficiaries if in their projects they envisaged instruments specifically aimed at maintaining the results. The answer was positive for almost two thirds of respondents (14 out of 24), and in these cases they referred mainly to agreements with local institutions and only minimally (4 cases) to the use of their own resources.

The interpretation of the data should necessarily take into account the typological limitation of concluded projects, the majority of which (17) respond to the same notice (*Proroghe MSNA*); among them, the four interventions expected to produce more “structural” results (see the initiatives promoted by UNHCR, ANCI, Save the Children, IOM) are noteworthy.

These interventions share the use of the aforementioned agreements, evidently and correctly considered by the beneficiaries as essential preconditions for the future sustainability of the results achieved; the same beneficiaries, in fact, have positive (infra) expectations about the maintenance of their results over time, expectations that appear concrete considering that at the time of the survey these projects had been concluded for more than 10 months.

7.2 WERE MECHANISMS PUT IN PLACE TO ENSURE A SUSTAINABILITY CHECK AT PROGRAMMING AND IMPLEMENTATION STAGE?

There is a series of mechanisms used by the RA to control sustainability “at the planning and implementation stages” based on the analysis of the documentation (design and implementation) progressively produced by the beneficiary; these are accompanied by qualitative verification mechanisms through focus groups with beneficiaries promoted by the RA. Finally, reference should be made to the broader control tools required by Regulation 514/2014, which are mainly focused on achievements and results and not so much on the funded actions sustainability.

The mechanisms relating to intervention planning stage are, on the whole, adequate with respect to their assessment object, which has as reference the analysis of project proposals in which sustainability is as a criterion for evaluating them (as also highlighted in the previous paragraph).

The control mechanisms activated during the implementation stage are also attributable to desk analysis both in progress and at intervention conclusion on what was declared by the beneficiary respectively during the periodic monitoring surveys and the Final Assessments. In fact, this type of control is rather weak, with no focus on sustainability (for example, in the forms there are no fields dedicated to this topic).

This weakness is overcome by the provision, in project implementation Vademecum, of focus groups with the beneficiaries aiming at “facilitating the consolidation of know-how both vertically (from the territory to the Responsible Authority with reference to strategic/planning choices) and horizontally (among beneficiaries operating on the same topics in different territories)”.

Although not yet used, this tool would be a valuable opportunity to discuss the contents of funded initiatives and to share the elements that may allow to continue project activities and results (infra par. 7.3); in RA provisions, this sharing involves a wide audience including beneficiaries, representatives of Central Departments, Prefecture representatives, CC.TT.II., other central Administrations, and representatives of the third sector.

As some of NP actions have not yet started, this tool should be activated as soon as possible in order to deepen elements useful for planning future interventions and to share and spread good practices and working methods adopted by beneficiaries. A further mechanism is the one concerning on-the-spot checks on a sample of funded projects (provided for by the implementation Vademecum of the projects selected according to Awarding body modalities - art. 7 of Reg. EU no. 1042/2014 – or Executing body implemented together with other Authorities – UU.TT.G or other Departments - art. 8 of Reg. EU no. 1042/2014, March 2017, para. 1.7); sample selected according to a detailed financial and operation risk analysis.

These checks are aimed at verifying various elements going from compliance with information and advertising rules to the quality of the services provided. Specifically, while not providing for an explicit reference to the sustainability of funded intervention effects, the checks aimed at granting the compliance with the requirements of the Call/Invitation, Project proposal, Convention (e.g. coherence of activities and outputs) are appreciated, as they can be considered as checks on condition maintenance so that the desired sustainability can be produced.

Therefore, with respect to the control system, the opinion is essentially positive, taking into account the fact that the RA has entrusted the independent evaluator with the evaluation of the sustainability of the actions promoted by AMIF; specifically, this evaluation was aimed at the projects completed as of 30/06/2017 (as indicated in the Community Guidelines), and whose results are reported in the following paragraph.

7.3 TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE OUTCOMES/BENEFITS OF THE ACTIONS SUSTAINED BY THE FUND EXPECTED TO CONTINUE THEREAFTER?

In evaluating the majority of beneficiaries who have concluded a project as of 30/06/2017, a probable continuity of results/benefits strongly emerges, while the possibility of continuing the funded initiative is weaker. This figure is also confirmed by the presence of a series of recurring factors in many initiatives increasing their level of potential sustainability.

For the evaluation of result sustainability, we have used (i) a survey addressed to the beneficiaries of the projects concluded at 30.06.2016 and (ii) the analysis of the available Final Assessments.

Almost 80% of survey responses (19 out of 24) were positive, indicating a climate of absolute trust among beneficiaries regarding the future sustainability of the interventions. Final Assessments show a declared level of sustainability of the activities/actions of concluded project that differs according to project type, its implementation history and the beneficiary's profile.

In fact, projects carried out by beneficiaries having an important institutional role in the implementation of asylum/reception policies and involving “system-oriented”, capacity building or network interventions are the ones more likely to continue their activities/actions. In any case, projects are almost equally divided between those declaring they have adopted “measures to ensure the continuation of the activities”, and those saying that no continuation will be possible (10 to 9). Moreover, the continuation of the activities requires – given its prevalent physicality and materiality – resources available to make it possible, while the maintenance of the results leaves much more room for optimistic and certain statements.

In this regard, considering the 19 concluded interventions for which both Final Assessments and survey answers are available, it emerges a picture – certainly conditioned by the fact that the interventions relate to just two blocks (SO2, but above all *Proroghe MSNA* procedures) – that can be considered generally positive, specifically due to the significant presence of interventions favourably positioned in terms of maintenance of both activities and results/benefits (8 cases out of 19).

As a result of the analyses carried out on concluded projects, the variables more likely to allow for project continuation have been identified:

- beneficiary's profile (i.e. their ability to tap into their own resources for the continuation of activities and/or whether they are institutional entities: this is the case, for example, of the interventions made by UNHCR, IOM and *Save The Children*);
- the soundness of the local or supra local network in which the beneficiary is inserted or that has been activated thanks to the project (i.e. in the *Praesidium IX Bis* project with CRI ownership, showing a highly potential sustainability of activities based on the activation of a specific network for family reunification);
- the presence in the intervention of contents that are physiologically oriented to perspective continuity (this is the case of information support projects and first aid for disembarkation, *Assistance* and *Access*, which have carried out training interventions, capacity building, networking between subjects, activation of coordination tables, or monitoring and evaluation projects, called *Monitoring* and *Reception*, which have developed and extensively tested methods and tools for the monitoring of services and facilities accompanied by targeted training for eventual users);
- the existence of specific agreements with third parties that can support or encourage the continuation of activities;
- the use of national funds (therefore not linked to the time constraints of a community planning cycle) for activity financing;
- the focus – for continuation – on specific services or products (therefore not on all the activities of the project as a whole).

Many of aforementioned variables can be found in the projects concluded under SO1 with different combinations, confirming again a sustainability whose preconditions appear sufficiently robust.

As for SO2, on the other hand, the two concluded projects (Promotion/Skill Development and Docufilm) show a clear potential continuity of their results that coincide with their respective achievements. This is due to the fact that “the definition of the experimentation protocol” (the main output of Promotion/Skill Development) or the documentaries realized through Docufilm are a necessary condition, respectively, for the creation and supply of training modules, started with AMIF support under NO2.2, and to the spreading of the knowledge on “migration world” seen “from within SPRAR”.

8 SIMPLIFICATION AND REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN

WERE THE FUND MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES SIMPLIFIED AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN REDUCED FOR ITS BENEFICIARIES?

The analyses allow to formulate a first positive opinion on the innovations introduced by AMIF, whose scope has been deepened through a survey among all the beneficiaries of the projects funded as of 31 May 2017. Although most of the introduced innovations go in the right direction of a procedure simplification, beneficiaries' perceptions are not entirely positive and show margins of improvement towards greater procedural easing.

In general, the analyses have shown that the obligations provided for by national and EU legislation both to the beneficiaries of public resources and to PA staff, despite the simplification measures adopted, are still perceived as a slowing factor for implementation (the survey among beneficiaries found that 70% of them hope for a greater reduction in timing and administrative/procedural tasks). In particular, the obligations required by the monitoring system (reported in the survey to the beneficiaries in 38% of cases) and the expenses related to the expense reporting and to the requests for deposits (reported in 41% of cases) are particularly demanding.

However, beneficiaries' need for a simplification also emerged on the occasion of the dialogue with the evaluator (who individually contacted the beneficiaries whenever – based on the analysis of the indicators proposed in the projects – appropriate to propose their revision). Specifically, about ten beneficiaries contacted have indicated the need to simplify the terminology used for the indicators.

In this perspective, the initiatives of the RA, who has initiated a dialogue with all the beneficiaries aimed at rationalizing the indicators used in the projects and also organizing a calendar of meetings (held in the first half of 2017) aimed at those involved in project implementation, in the presence of the Evaluator, whose object is the monitoring procedures and the use of the information system (being updated). This is undoubtedly a positive opportunity for an effective exchange between the Administration and beneficiaries, with a view to simplification.

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?

Compared to previous SOLID funds programme with AMIF, some important changes have been introduced:

a) Merging of the 3 SOLID funds into one single fund.

AMIF gathers in a single programme the objectives pursued by EIF, ERF and RF Funds. By doing so, the procedures related to the three different objectives are joined together and homogenized in a single reference organization structure with plausible positive effects for potential beneficiaries. In terms of content, the beneficiaries' opinion on the transition to a single Fund is positive: AMIF compared to SOLID funds is perceived as a medium with a broader and more flexible content compared to previous experiences. In terms of procedures, the survey shows that more than half of the beneficiaries do not perceive a significant simplification of the procedures compared to the previous programme, and only 10% report a simplification in the presentation of project documentation.

b) Switch to multiannual programming with greater flexibility in project implementation timing.

One of the major changes introduced with AMIF is the transition from annual to multiannual planning. The ability to carry out projects covering a wide time span allows for a more flexible activity implementation, to calibrate and modify ongoing work and to achieve more ambitious objectives. In beneficiaries' perception, this was the most appreciated novelty reflecting the need to have a greater breadth both at the design stage and the executive one.

c) Elimination of the Certification Authority role, and introduction of the auditor and legal expert figures.

Past functions of the Certification Authority have been absorbed by the RA in terms of maintaining accounting data, sending payment applications, verifying expenditure data accuracy. In accordance with the provisions of Implementation Regulation (EU) no. 840/2015, the RA performs desk and financial administration-accounting audits on the spot in order to verify the correctness, accuracy and completeness of payment requests and supporting documentation submitted by the beneficiary. The beneficiary will have to produce the administrative, accounting and financial documentation necessary to demonstrate actual expenditure, and will submit them to external auditors (Independent Auditor and Legal Expert) in charge of verifying their eligibility for a refund. This way, expenditure audits are carried out by individual auditors without involving a Certification Authority, simplifying the required steps. On this novelty element, beneficiaries' opinion is essentially neutral with a few isolated cases that see a weighting of their action due to difficulties related to the selection procedures of external experts.

d) Simplification of financial circuits and expenditure reporting.

Unlike SOLID programming, the financial circuit for expenditure reimbursement has been removed, as the RA, through the special accounting where Community and national funds merge, directly pays the amount due to the beneficiary, without the need for the IGRUE-Bank of Italy steps. As for the method of payment of the interim deposit, the AMIF Programme allows to report any amount of expenditure, without the need to exceed the amount of the deposit paid, allowing for a beneficiary's financial management more compliant with project needs. Nevertheless, beneficiaries point out the persistence of an excessive burden. This perception might be motivated by the initial progress of the Programme and by the presence of many projects being just started, concentrated, from a financial point of view, on any requests for the deposit (which the beneficiaries often give up because of the difficulties in obtaining the necessary sureties).

In conclusion, the non-adoption of simplified cost options (SCO) should be noted, despite the fact that interviews with Administration staff have shown a favourable position for their use. In this regard, interventions providing for training actions that could easily use standard unit costs or lump sums, are pointed out to the RA as possible first areas of SCO application, both in the area of Asylum (SO1) and Migration and Integration (SO2). In the context of Return (SO3), it is recommended the opening of comparison tables with other MSs in order to jointly verify the options concretely applicable to the issue.

SECTION V: PROJECT EXAMPLES

DESCRIPTION OF THREE “SUCCESS STORIES”, AMONG ALL THE PROJECTS FUNDED

Example 1

ALFURAS project (Implementing body: *Consorzio Agri.Ca. Soc.*)

ALFURAS project, funded under the *Proroghe MSNA* call and implemented in Agrigento (Sicily), was implemented by a partnership of third sector entities. With an experimental call in 2014, the lead consortium approved, as an emergency measure, a reception services project for Unaccompanied Minors, subsequently extended from the end of 2015 to August 2016 through ALFURAS project. In 2014, the area of the province of Agrigento was characterized by a very high number of arrivals and, after the North-Africa emergency in the same year, arrivals of unaccompanied minors became prevalent.

Activities: the project guaranteed the availability of 50 locations where minors were followed by a team comprising a legal worker, a social worker, a psychologist, a doctor, 4 professional educators, an interpreter, two mediators as well as auxiliaries and vigilantes.

Since his arrival, the minor participated in: initial reception interviews aimed at collecting information and informing the minor about aspects related to his presence in Italy and the path to follow; health screening with possible in-depth analysis (within the first week); interview with the lawyer on the administrative path that would involve the minor; any further investigation on age; talks with the psychologist; educational and training activities. The Evaluator had the opportunity to visit the centre in October 2017 and on this occasion, in addition to project representatives and other privileged witnesses, 7 minor hosted in the centre between March and August 2016 were also met, and today in second-level reception facilities; a focus group was organized with them, during which they reported to fully appreciate the project.

The main **results** are: a) the implementation of a structured process to ascertain the age of minors (which led, in February 2017, to an experimental protocol promoted by the Prefecture and by the Provincial Health Authority); b) the speeding up of the procedure for submitting the application for international protection/asylum of the minor (in the legislative framework preceding the one currently in force); c) the gradual decrease in the average residence time of the minor in the centre following the creation, thanks to the project, of effective and stable relations with the institutional network and not at a local and supra-local level (with the involvement, among others, of Save the Children, InterSOS, UNICEF, UNHCR, Prefecture, Provincial Health Authority); e) the development of specific skills by project partnership stakeholders thanks to the participation in training carried out by international NGOs under the *Proroghe MSNA* call.

The lessons learned from the implementation of the project are: a) the inclusion of the project in the AMIF NP meant financial resources, regularity of payments, constant communication and support from the Ministry and the Prefecture of Agrigento; b) the quality of the territorial network (with health authorities, Courts, second-level reception centres) is critical for the quality of the intervention on minors taken in charge; c) the possibility of collaborating and receiving training from international organizations is an opportunity for professional growth for those working in the reception system; d) the highest added value for minors derives both from the presence of qualified personnel for the legal, administrative, health, psychological and mediation functions, and from practices aimed at improving service and relationship quality within education teams and with minors.

Additional lessons were learned from the problems encountered during project implementation. First of all, the lack of local cultural mediators in services for migrants has been criticized, resulting in the project's need to use its own, for example in the Court, by supporting their travel time and costs. On this topic, training actions (including among guests with adequate linguistic skills) and accreditation of certified mediators should be increased and encouraged. Another difficulty was the lack of second-level reception facilities, which meant that the centre had to equip itself to implement specific measures aimed at continuing the minor path of growth and integration. Finally, a third difficulty was the voluntary removal of minors from the

centre, a fact that concerned nationalities (Eritreans, Somalis and Tunisians) who have a precise migratory project and a network of contacts that allows for a clandestine path. For this reason, in three cases, relocation projects have been activated for Eritrean minors.

Example 2

ASSISTANCE project (Implementing body: IOM – International Organization for Migration)

The Assistance Az.1 project, active in the period 01.07.2015-31/12/2016, was implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM). IOM is the agency entrusted to deal with the phenomenon of migration worldwide, even in emergency situations. In Italy, it has managed and manages many programs of direct assistance to migrants.

The Assistance Az.1 project, funded under SO1 of the Programme, was a continuation of the activities carried out by the IOM since 2006 within the many editions of the Praesidium project, to which several partners have cooperated (UNHCR, Croce Italian Red and, since 2008, Save the Children) to support activities for the disembarkation of migrants arrived by sea and in the following reception locations.

The project operational **context** is that of a period in which unplanned flows to the EU had intensified: in fact, in 2015 103,000 people arrived in Italy, compared to 66,000 in 2014, and in 2016 the number has grown to over 176,000, often requesting international protection from Libya, West African countries and the Horn of Africa.

The project has carried out various **activities**. Firstly, information on the trafficking and labour exploitation issues for people disembarked by sea. This activity was carried out in Sicily, Puglia and, less incisively, in Calabria. The IOM team, composed of legal practitioners and cultural mediators speaking Arabic and Nigerian, provided for information material in various languages and held interviews with migrants directly at the landing site. Secondly, there was the activity of identifying vulnerable individuals and reporting them to State Police for the purpose of placing migrants in safeguarded contexts. Thirdly, the IOM staff collaborated on the reconstruction of the lists of missing people during numerous shipwrecks and carried out training activities for crews and Hotspots and reception facilities staff. Finally, a collaboration was made with the Ministry of the Interior for the drafting of the “Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) applicable to Italian Hotspots”.

As for **results**, considering the year 2016, the project allowed to reach and provide legal information and immediate support to approximately 98% of people arriving by sea in Italy (about 176,000 people). That year recorded a sharp increase in vulnerable people arrivals: specifically, 11,000 Nigerian women, about 80% of whom were potential trafficking victims. The project identified 6,599 of them: thanks to the project, the “disembarkation” contact was decisive for them not to enter or to exit exploitation situations. The legal information provided to minors on procedures and bureaucratic obligations connected to their condition was also particularly important. Finally, the training activity produced an increase in system stakeholders’ ability. As evidence of project success and of the consistency and importance of proposed actions, the activities provided for in the *Assistance* project are currently continuing with the *Aditus* project, again financed by AMIF.

The **lessons learned** from project implementation are: a) the expertise of an organization like IOM is a critical added value for projects dealing with sensitive issues in emergency situations; b) the supervision of complex emergencies can not ignore the synergy between all stakeholders with respect to the topic and the concerned target population (IOM, in this case, and stakeholders such as UNCHR, Save the Children, Italian Red Cross, third-sector bodies, Police and Prefectures, Local Authorities, National Anti-Trafficking Network); c) the collaboration between subjects led by an authoritative body produces, if adequately aimed at a specific topic (in this case: trafficking), knowledge and intervention capacity that can be the subject of training and communication throughout the national territory (as is currently happening with the *Aditus* project); d) the management according to logic and design criteria of an intervention that has instead a logic of emergency response (which was *Assistance*) presents non-trivial difficulties, even with respect to monitoring the results: it is therefore necessary that the project structure be flexible to adapt both to sudden changes in the

reference scenario and the emerging need areas, and to changes in the regulatory scenarios at both national and European Union level.

Example 3

Project “Promozione, sviluppo e attestazione delle competenze alfabetiche e linguistico-comunicative” (Promotion, development and certification of literacy, language and communication skills) (Implementing body: Consorzio CLIQ)

The project “*Promozione, sviluppo e attestazione delle competenze alfabetiche e linguistico-comunicative*” (Promotion, development and certification of literacy, language and communication skills) (hereafter skills), funded under the Programme SO2, was carried out during 2016 by CLIQ, a Consortium that gathers all Italian language certification bodies, such as L2 (Società Dante Alighieri, Università per Stranieri di Perugia, Università Roma 3). The Consortium, created in 2013 through an agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the four entities, aims to promote the culture of Italian language certification as L2, but above all to create a quality system for language skill certification that is in line with the “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages”.

The project **context** is that of linguistic training for non-Italian speaking adults. At the national level, since 2014/2015, CPIAs (*Centri Provinciali per l’Istruzione degli Adulti*, Provincial Centres for Adult Education) have replaced Permanent Territorial Centres (CTP) and are in charge of providing Italian courses for foreigners. The widening of the need area by reference target has already led some CPIAs to start Pre-A1 and B1 courses, but MIUR reference syllabuses did not related to these levels. More generally, the law on long-term residence permits sets A2 level as a minimum requirement, but at least B1 level is required to enter the world of work. The same applies to Pre-A1 level, as it is impossible to provide even basic courses (A1 level) of Italian language to people who are totally or functionally illiterate.

The **activities** carried out under the project consisted in the preparation of two syllabuses (“Syllabus for the design of experimental paths of literacy and learning of the Italian language at Pre-A1 level” and “Syllabus for the design of experimental paths of literacy and learning of the Italian language at level B1”) and “Guidelines for the design of regional plans for civic-linguistic education of third-country nationals”. The working group, made up of experts from Consortium members, worked both on site and remotely; joint work tables have also been set up between the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Education, University and Research. The final products were introduced at the Ministry of the Interior during the State/Regions Conference in March 2017.

Given the nature of the project, its final products are identified with the **results** of *Skills*. However, since they are tools functional to the implementation of Italian language training activities such as L2, their use is currently entrusted to the CPIAs in the context of a new funding line dedicated to this under AMIF (SO2/NO2, Regional Plans for civic-language training of third-country nationals), and designed in compliance with the Guidelines produced by *Skills*. Ongoing experiences worth to be mentioned are, by way of example, the ones of Puglia and Ferrara CPIA, where some training courses have already started based on the two syllabuses and the Guidelines. The representatives of these institutions do not report problematic situations and confirm they appreciate the instruments concerned.

The **lessons learned** from project implementation are: a) the implementation of the project by a pre-existing stakeholder being, also and above all, the only representative of the topic at a national level, has allowed a rapid and timely project operation; b) the simple and linear structure of the project has allowed it to be carried out within a limited period of time, without changes and adjustments to what was defined at the initial stage; c) a project that produces *tools* as final outputs (in this case linguistic tools) should lead, as it happened, to the activation of additional projects, linked to the original one and financing and supporting the use of advanced tools; d) the use of the tools produced by a project such as *Competences* should be structurally monitored (as is also provided for in a specific project presented by the CLIQ consortium, always funded by AMIF and to be activated in the coming months), in order to clearly bring out the strengths and eventual improvements of the tools and their ordinary use.

DESCRIPTION OF ONE 'FAILURE', AMONG ALL THE PROJECTS FUNDED

Example

Project HOME (Lead partner: Municipality of Salerno)

The HOME project, belonging to the *Proroghe MSNA* call, focuses on the first-level reception of unaccompanied foreign minors in Salerno, and is headed by the Municipality and the partnership of three associations. The project aimed to grant 50 first-level reception venues in the period February-August 2016, as well as legal assistance, psycho-social support, screening and health care, regularization programs, and age assessment services. In mid-2016, the centres of one project partner did not comply with the minimum operation standards, therefore the Ministry of the Interior excluded the partner from the project: the other partners have anyway completed the activities. It should be noted that the project was the final part of a previous project financed by an experimental AMIF call in 2014 as an emergency measure: the original project, the initial conclusion of which was set for December 2015, was extended until August 2016, and this extension is the HOME project.

Project implementation **context**, the city of Salerno (in Campania), is historically open to reception, with the presences of historical groups of migrants, such as the Philippine, Senegalese and Maghreb communities, some also represented by specific associations. During the project running, several thousand migrants arrived in Salerno from landing sites, and many were unaccompanied minors. The situation of the first-level reception system for minors in Salerno was very heterogeneous and qualitatively inconsistent, and the HOME project was used by the Municipality to qualify part of the services offered in town.

In terms of **activities**, based on the availability of seats in project facilities, stakeholders – following the indications of the Ministry of the Interior's Mission Structure – went to the landing site to welcome minors, then moved them to project centres and delivered the expected services (the most frequent landing sites were Ragusa, Palermo, Pozzallo, Taranto, Bari). HOME reception facilities were six in total (divided into small units) but two of them were, as already anticipated, closed due to the irregularities found by the Ministry (minors hosted in the closed centres were redistributed at other partners' facilities).

As for **results**, one of the project objectives was limiting the phenomenon of minor departure from facilities: during the months of project operation, no one escaped. On the other hand, the objective of reducing waiting time for the issue of residence permits and other minors' documents, has not been reached, even if they have a better understanding of the administrative process and the steps necessary to have their rights recognised. At an organizational level, the clear sharing of tasks between the partners – especially with respect to external parties (ASL, Police Headquarter, Prefecture) – was effective and able to consolidate the partnership. It has also been able to compensate, for the benefit of the minor, the difficulty of quickly obtaining the appointment of voluntary guardians. The results include the activation of some internships and education courses, as well as stakeholders' participation in training courses mainly activated by IOM.

The **lessons learned** from project implementation are obviously much conditioned by the fact that, during project implementation, the facilities of one of the partners were found unsuitable. From this point of view, the attention to be paid when selecting partners is certainly a lesson learned. Other lessons are as follows: a) the transfer of minors from first-level to second-level reception is often prevented by the limited availability of seats in SPRAR: if this transfer, when it occurs, takes place in centres far from the reception area and follows exclusively the criterion of seats availability (for example, nullifying stakeholders indications about interests or specific attentions towards the minor), it negatively affects the minor's integration path; b) the burden of bureaucratic requirements necessary to "regularize" the child's position is very significant, and the success of this path is put at risk by the heterogeneity and lack of coordination of the different procedures for which the various stakeholders are responsible (Police Headquarter, Prefecture, Municipality, ASL, Revenue Agency).

SECTION VI: METHODOLOGY

The evaluation themes mentioned in art. 57 of Reg. 514/2014 and the evaluation criteria described in art. 55 of Reg. 514/2014 are essential references for the Report's methodological setup. Another crucial landmark is the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework established under art. 55 of Reg. 514/2014 are essential references for the Report's methodological setup.

The evaluator's analyses were carried out according to a theory-based methodological approach with the aim of verifying the relationships between the (social, economic, regulatory) context in which the Programme is taking place, the mechanisms activated by the Programme (through its implementation and therefore through the funded activities), and the results achieved or at least reachable thanks to the Programme.

Consistently with this approach, a great work of acquisition and systematization of secondary and primary information was carried out.

As for the acquisition of secondary data, reference was made to: (i) procedural, physical and financial implementation data of AMIF NP; (ii) documentation relating to AMIF NP implementation (notices, conventions, manuals, etc.); (iii) monitoring sheets of each funded intervention; (iv) Final Assessment forms; administrative data produced by national authorities (specifically, Interior Ministries, MIUR, MLPS, MAE, MEF); (vi) data from public databases on reference context dynamics (Istat, Eurostat, etc.).

This information has been used in a transversal way and revised for the purpose of formulating the answers to each Evaluation Question.

By way of example, the implementation and monitoring data at a project level (including Final Assessments for completed projects), have allowed to build an effectiveness index of individual funded interventions which has allowed for an overall reclassification, also useful for analysing the performance of individual Actions/Objectives under which they were funded.

Similarly, always based on secondary information (project sheets, monitoring data, results achieved), a success index was built to identify the exemplary projects illustrated in this report.

The analysis of quantitative data was supplemented by the examination of primary qualitative information – collected through semi-structured interviews (mainly carried out at the interviewee's premises and, when not possible, by telephone) – aimed at:

- Representatives of the RA and of the DA, since they manage both the implementation strategy of the SOs and the "keys" to its interpretation (Responsible Authority, Representative of the Payments Unit, Representative of the Unit for Administrative and Accounting on-site desk and financial Audit, Representative of the Legal Business, Selection and Contracts Unit, Implementation Manager of SO1, Implementation Manager of SO2, Implementation Managers (previous and current) of SO3, Representative of the project *Potenziamento Unità Dublino* - Enhancement of the Dublin Unit-, Representative of the project *SISAMI*, Representative of the project *Potenziamento uffici DLCI – Ufficio Resettlement* - strengthening of DLCI Offices – Resettlement Office -, Delegated Authority, operational representatives of the Directorate General for Immigration and Integration Policies of the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy);
- a set of representatives of the beneficiaries, in order to better examine elements of interest revealed by the monitoring documents. They were selected on the basis of the progress of the projects, the significance of the project's contents, and the quantitative evidence resulting from the monitoring data.
- National stakeholders, chosen for their relevance for the Programme and for their experience in the themes addressed by each NO;
- beneficiaries of the projects selected as cases of success and failure, together with privileged witnesses on the outcomes of the selected initiatives.

During June 2017, AMIF beneficiaries answered a CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interview) questionnaire aimed at collecting their point of view on different areas related to AMIF NP and funded projects implementation.

Also, 11 experts were consulted on the Programme capacity to address the needs of asylum, integration and repatriation areas. This consultation took place during October 2017 through the a questionnaire with closed answers.

Unless otherwise stated, the secondary data reported in this document was obtained from the Ministry of the Interior.

SECTION VII: MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1

The objectives of the NP (according to the version approved in 2015) show a good level of correspondence to the needs identified by the programming authority. The Programme's relevance first emerged from the consultation of a panel of external experts, independent from the evaluator (the panel included experts with knowledge on social research methods and experts with "vertical" knowledge on the Programme's themes). Through the grades assigned by each expert, the NP's average relevance index ranked above 6.0 on a scale of 0 to 10. Also the beneficiaries' perception, collected through a survey carried out by the evaluator, suggests a positive assessment of the Programme's relevance. In particular the beneficiaries perceive a high match between the contents of the calls and TCN needs.

The positive judgement on the Programme's relevance is strengthened at project level. The analysis on interventions funded at 30/06/2017 shows that the projects are able to give a good response both to the needs identified in the NP and to the needs that have emerged in the first implementing period (2015 – June 2017). This confirms the standing of the Programme in relation to the changes in migratory trends, which are the reason for the intervention.

Conclusion 2

The NP has been important for the start and solid construction of a UAM-specific reception system (that did not exist in Italy before 2014) in answer to arrival trends.

On adult reception, theme funded by national resources, the NP has focused on the implementation of qualified services on (i) health and (ii) promoting migrants' independence. The evaluator approves this direction as it positively defines the NP's contribution to the reception system. However, this direction, following the strategic choice of not implementing the action on Asylum applicants under the Dublin Regulation (giving priority to the UAM reception system and first integration), will hinder achieving the target set in the NP on the creation of places in new or improved infrastructure (5,000 places). Apart from this indicator, SO1's progress is in line with the possibility of achieving the targets set in the NP considering the time still available for the actions' implementation.

Conclusion 3

With regards to the actions of the NP aimed at enabling TCN integration processes, language training initiatives are being implemented while no labour integration projects have yet started. In fact, all language training plans have been approved and are under way: they have already involved 15,000 immigrants and will allow to reach approximately 44,000 TCNs by 31/03/2018.

Although the NP aims to introduce 60,000 persons in active policy activities and to support self-employment for 2,500 persons (and although EU directives confirm the importance of introducing TCNs in the labour market at an early stage) no projects aimed at encouraging the involvement of unemployed foreigners in active labour market policy programs are currently being carried out.

Delays in starting these projects are mainly due to:

- The effects of Italy's re-organization of skills on active policies and the consequent need to redefine synergies and complementarities between AMIF and ESF;

- The programming approach adopted by the DA, which uses national resources to fund a first experimentation of projects in favour of vulnerable target group persons. AMIF resources will then be used for the systematization of these interventions.

On this theme there have been some relevant developments since 30/06/2017. In the first place, an intervention has been funded for involving beneficiaries of international protection in civil service in order to encourage their involvement in the Country's public and social life. Furthermore, measures aimed at supporting social and labour integration are being re-planned through actions for the inclusion of beneficiaries for international protection and by strengthening the building capacity of employment centres.

Conclusion 4

On integration, in many cases projects aimed at strengthening capacity and promoting the exchange of best practices work on strengthening integration services that at regional level are weak and, in 10 cases, on promoting conditions for the provision of not available services.

Furthermore, for interventions on the exchange of best practices, there is a weak response of some territories to the opportunities offered by the NP (Liguria, Trentino Alto Adige, Marche, Umbria, Abruzzi, Basilicata and Sardinia) and the concentration of projects in Lazio, Piedmont, Lombardy and Tuscany. This risks causing differences in the opportunities for TCNs to access new services.

Conclusion 5

SO3 does not register any relevant results since there is a low level of implementation: the volume of financial commitments is low (equal to 17% of total budget on return) and few projects have been funded (8 projects, 7 of which implemented).

Furthermore, the projects that are currently being carried out, aimed at AVR&R, do not register satisfactory results as the number of returns are a lot less than expected. The overall picture is worrisome: the completion of these interventions is set at March 2018, and the deadline for AVR&Rs completion is set at 31/12/2017 in order to leave time for accompanying activities and the monitoring of reintegration paths. It is therefore unlikely that the projects will fill the gap accumulated so far and reach results close to the expected ones. This is mainly due to the delay in the implementation of projects on preparatory activities for AVR&R. The absence of such projects leads to difficulties for AVR&R projects in intercepting potential target group persons.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

In reference to conclusion 2, following the strategic change chosen by the RA (that brings to concentrating attention on the offer of reception services rather than the increase of reception places in infrastructure), the target set for indicator SO1R2 (reception places in new or improved infrastructure) is not in line with the current programming choices. The RA should consider reviewing the set target of indicator SO1R2 in the NP so as to adjust it to current choices.

Recommendation 2

In reference to conclusion 3, the DA should:

- start the selection procedures for initiatives supporting labour integration for beneficiaries of international protection in the first semester of 2018. Timing is particularly important considering that for SO2 interventions at least 180 days pass between the release of the Call to tenders and the start of the projects and that the planning of these interventions has an experimental and innovative nature;
- follow the start and the coordination of TCN direct support initiatives and of the action aimed at strengthening Employment Centers in order to maximize effectiveness of actions under SO2, considering:

- the opportunity to experiment social and labour inclusion of beneficiaries of international protection using Employment Centres that aim at becoming territorial hubs for TCN social and labour integration as a result of the enhancement action foreseen in SO2NO3;
- the need to provide persons working in employment centres with the specific skills for a correct and effective management of the envisaged innovative interventions, in particular in light of the integration of AMIF and ESF resources that are being planned under SO2NO2.

Recommendation 3

In reference to conclusion 4, the RA should increase the awareness of beneficiaries of exchange projects on the need to define, within the projects, ways to transfer and replicate the achieved results. It is in fact crucial to define ways to transfer the identified good practices and innovations nationwide.

To this end, the evaluator suggests to ask the beneficiary, if not already expected in the projects' outputs, a specific document on the conditions that would allow to transfer and replicate the experimented good practices and innovation.

Recommendation 4

In reference to conclusion 5, the RA should, already in the short term, concentrate efforts on speeding up selection of new initiatives, both on NO1 (measures accompanying return procedures) and on NO2 (Returns).

In particular it seems necessary to strengthen preparatory actions for AVR&R. Specifically, a possible target group (that is also already foreseen by the AVR regulation) could be asylum seekers whose application has been denied (considering that there are a large number of such cases).

SECTION VIII: MID-TERM REVIEW

In September 2017, following two meetings between the RA, the DA and the persons in charge of each SO, the RA submitted to the EC the “Needs Assessment Questionnaire”. The document suggests some changes to the NP for 2018-2020.

SO1: on NO1, it suggests to strengthen some actions (a, b, c, e) by using the resources (44M euro) not used for action f). For other actions (d,g) it better defines the intervention areas. The RA confirms the choice to concentrate on reception services by introducing an additional action (c-bis). On NO2 the RA highlights the need to transfer resources from other actions under SO1 to strengthen the monitoring of reception centres.

SO2: this SO foresees the integration of additional resources, amounting to 50M euros, and the need to update the AMIF NP to allow the implementation of the interventions planned in the National Plan for Integration (adopted in September 2017). For NO2 the budget for action b) will be reduced (as it will be funded with ESF resources) thus leading to a reduction in the target value foreseen in the NP for indicator SO2R2. Furthermore the age class identified in the NP for measures aimed at supporting integration of UAMs will be enlarged to include persons up to 21 years of age. Savings generated on NO2 will be shifted to NO3 to ensure the continuation of the interventions and to broaden their scope. On NO3 it is necessary to strengthen the capacity building of local employment services.

SO3: this SO foresees the integration of additional resources, amounting to 35M euros, to fund enforced returns and training of the staff employed in escorting services (NO2). On NO1 resources originally foreseen for action f) – following the abolition of the Identification and Expulsion Centres (CIE) - will be allocated to other interventions under the same SO. On NO2, due to the few results on AVR, the possibility to reduce the budget for action g) is being considered. The RA is considering funding structures dedicated to first reception in countries of origin of returning migrants but has not yet quantified the needed economic resources.

SECTION IX: COMMON RESULTS AND IMPACT INDICATORS

For the comment on result and impact indicators, reference is made to Section IV Chapter 1 “Effectiveness”, in coherence with the indications of the European Commission in the guidance on the CMEF “*Guidance on the common monitoring and evaluation framework for AMIF and ISF*” (version revised in May 2017, page 27 and 28).

In this paragraph it is therefore appropriate to provide only some methodological indications for a correct interpretation of the tables described in this Section.

Both tables (Table 1 and Table 2) are divided in two parts. The first part specifies the values (calculated by the evaluator with the support of the technical assistance) covering the period 16/10/2016-30/06/2017, while the second part (automatically generated by SFC) indicates the values covering the period 01/01/2014-15/10/2016. Consequently, the values as at the 30/06/2017 are not total values reached at that date, but partial values concerning the reference period.

As for Table “1 - Indicators by specific objectives” showing 2017 values, it should be noted that:

- The calculation of result indicators has been made by subtracting the values given by SFC for the period 01/01/2014-15/10/2016 from the total value as at the 30th June 2017 (calculated by the evaluator based on the Monitoring Sheets, *Final Assessments* and other figures directly provided by the Technical Assistance);
- In case the *baseline value* of result indicators provided by SFC was empty, the value “0.00” has been entered. Nothing has been done, instead, in case of empty cells provided by SFC on the *baseline value* of impact indicators (whose sources come from the European Union, such as EASO and Eurostat);
- The cells of the following indicators are empty as data was not available to calculate the value of the indicator for 2017: SO1R3 (%), SO1I1, SO1I2, SO1I3, SO1I4, SO1I5, SO1I6, SO2I1, SO2I2, SO2I3, SO2I4, SO2I5, SO2I6, SO2I7, SO3R5 (b), SO3I1, SO3I2, SO3I3, SO4R1, SO4R2;
- The cell for indicator SO3R5 is empty as it was not possible to calculate the ratio (the denominator is not available, see point above);
- For indicator SO1R2 “The percentage of the total reception and accommodation capacity”, the denominator (total reception and accommodation capacity) at the base of the calculation is 81.909 (value provided by the Ministry of the Interior);
- For indicator SO1R4 a) “Number of places adapted for the accommodation of unaccompanied minors supported by the Fund”, since the cell in SFC that was supposed to report the value for 2016 is empty, the total value is reported in 2017;
- For indicator SO1R4 b) “Total number of places adapted for the accommodation of unaccompanied minors”, the given value refers to the number of minors in authorised structures as at the 31/12/2016 (Source: UAM in Italy. Monitoring Report as at the 31th December 2016 – Ministry of Labour and Social Policy);
- For indicator SO1R4 “Number of places adapted for the accommodation of unaccompanied minors supported by the Fund compared to the total number of places adapted for the accommodation of unaccompanied minors”, the value reported should be multiplied by 100.

As for Table “1 – Indicators by specific objectives” showing 2014-2016 values, it should be noted that:

- Empty cells have been left unchanged, since they are automatically generated by the SFC system.
- For indicator SO1R2, it should be noted that the value in the table is not correct for 2016, because the ratio between “the number of new or improved places of new infrastructures intended for reception and

accommodation”, that is 1.287, and the “total reception and accommodation capacity”, that is 81.909, turns out to be of 1.57 (the double, compared to the value indicated in the table).

As for Tables “2 - *Indicators on efficiency, added value and sustainability, as foreseen in Regulation (EU) No 514/2014*”, it should be noted that for indicator H2 a) “Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost”, the value in 2017 only considers Technical Assistance costs (information provided by the Ministry of the Interior). Finally, it should be noted that for this table SFC does not allow to input digits after the decimal point.

1 - INDICATORS BY SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	BASLINE VALUE	SOURCE OF DATA	2017
SO1	R	SO1R1	<i>Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che hanno ricevuto assistenza attraverso progetti in materia di accoglienza e sistemi di asilo sostenuti dal Fondo:</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C1)</i>	4.540
SO1	R	SO1R1	<i>i) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che beneficino di informazioni e assistenza durante l'intera procedura di asilo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C1.a)</i>	251.385
SO1	R	SO1R1	<i>ii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che beneficino di assistenza e rappresentanza legali</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C1.b)</i>	1.868
SO1	R	SO1R1	<i>iii) numero di persone vulnerabili e di minori non accompagnati che beneficino di assistenza specifica</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C1.c)</i>	2.302
SO1	R	SO1R2	<i>Capacità (numero di posti) delle nuove infrastrutture destinate all'accoglienza e all'alloggio create in risposta ai requisiti comuni delle condizioni di accoglienza previsti nell'acquis dell'Unione, e delle infrastrutture di accoglienza e alloggio esistenti migliorate in conformità dei medesimi requisiti a seguito dei progetti sostenuti dal Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C2.1)</i>	372
SO1	R	SO1R2	<i>La percentuale della capacità totale di accoglienza e alloggio</i>	<i>Percentuale</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C2.2)</i>	0,45%
SO1	R	SO1R3	<i>Numero di persone che hanno ricevuto una formazione su tematiche attinenti all'asilo con l'assistenza del Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C3.1)</i>	2.284
SO1	R	SO1R3	<i>Tale numero in percentuale del numero totale di personale formato su dette tematiche</i>	<i>Percentuale</i>	0,00	<i>RAE (indicatore SO1 C3.2)</i>	n.d.
SO1	R	SO1R4	<i>a) Numero di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati sostenuti dal Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>Relazioni sui progetti</i>	1659
SO1	R	SO1R4	<i>b) Numero totale di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>Stati membri</i>	13.194
SO1	R	SO1R4	<i>Numero di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati sostenuti dal Fondo rispetto al numero totale di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati.</i>	<i>Percentuale</i>	0,00	/	2,82
SO1	I	SO1I1	<i>Numero di casi pendenti in primo grado, meno di 6 mesi</i>	<i>Numero</i>		<i>EASO (indicatore EPS 2)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I1	<i>Numero di casi pendenti in primo grado, più di 6 mesi</i>	<i>Numero</i>		<i>EASO (indicatore EPS 2)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I2	<i>Percentuale di decisioni finali positive in fase di appello</i>	<i>Percentuale</i>	78,95	<i>Eurostat (migr_asydcfina)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I3	<i>Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza (stato alla fine del periodo di riferimento)</i>	<i>Numero</i>		<i>EASO (indicatore EPS 7)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I4	<i>a) Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza</i>	<i>Numero</i>		<i>EASO (indicatore EPS 7)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I4	<i>b) Numero di richiedenti asilo e di nuovi richiedenti asilo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	26.620,00	<i>Eurostat (migr_asyappctza)</i>	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I4	<i>Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza rispetto al numero di richiedenti asilo</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>		/	n.d.

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	BASLINE VALUE	SOURCE OF DATA	2017
SO1	I	SO1I5	a) Numero di posti alloggio adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati	Numero	0,00	Stati membri	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I5	b) Numero di richiedenti asilo considerati minori non accompagnati (Eurostat migr_asyunaa)	Numero	805,00	Eurostat (migr_asyunaa)	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I5	Numero di posti alloggio adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati, rispetto al numero di minori non accompagnati	Rapporto		/	n.d.
SO1	I	SO1I6	Convergenza dei tassi di riconoscimento in primo grado/in ultima istanza negli Stati membri per richiedenti asilo provenienti da uno stesso paese terzo	Punti percentuali		Eurostat (migr_asydcfina)	n.d.
SO2	R	SO2R1	Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che hanno partecipato a misure antecedenti alla partenza sostenute dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C1)	0
SO2	R	SO2R2	Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite dal Fondo attraverso misure di integrazione nel quadro di strategie nazionali, locali e regionali	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C2)	19.589
SO2	R	SO2R2	i) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso misure incentrate sull'istruzione e la formazione, comprese la formazione linguistica e le azioni preparatorie volte ad agevolare l'accesso al mercato del lavoro	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C2.a)	16.718
SO2	R	SO2R2	ii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento sostenute attraverso la consulenza e l'assistenza nei settori dell'alloggio	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C2.b)	16
SO2	R	SO2R2	iii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso cure mediche e psicologiche	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C2.c)	0
SO2	R	SO2R2	iv) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso misure connesse alla partecipazione democratica	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO2 C2.d)	33
SO2	I	SO2I1	Percentuale di cittadini di paesi terzi che hanno ottenuto lo status di soggiornante di lungo periodo rispetto al totale di cittadini di paesi terzi	Percentuale	56,40	Eurostat (migr_reslas)	n.d.
SO2	I	SO2I2	Tasso di occupazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	0,80	Eurostat (indagine sulle forze di lavoro) (lfsa_ergan) (lfsa_ergacob)	n.d.
SO2	I	SO2I3	Tasso di disoccupazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	6,30	Eurostat (indagine sulle forze di lavoro) (lfsa_urgan) (lfsa_urgacob)	n.d.
SO2	I	SO2I4	Tasso di attività: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	5,80	Eurostat (indagine sulle forze di lavoro) (lfsa_argan) (lfsa_argacob)	n.d.
SO2	I	SO2I5	Percentuale di giovani che abbandonano prematuramente gli studi o la formazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	22,60	Eurostat (indagine sulle forze di lavoro) (edat_lfse_02)	n.d.

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	BASLINE VALUE	SOURCE OF DATA	2017
SO2	I	SO2I6	Percentuale di persone di età fra 30 e 34 anni in possesso di un diploma di istruzione superiore: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	-16,10	Eurostat (edat_ifs_9911)	n.d.
SO2	I	SO2I7	Percentuale della popolazione a rischio di povertà sociale o esclusione sociale: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	21,40	Eurostat (indagine sulle forze di lavoro) (ilc_peps05)	n.d.
SO3	R	SO3R1	Numero di persone che hanno ricevuto una formazione su tematiche attinenti al rimpatrio con l'assistenza del Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C1)	0
SO3	R	SO3R2	Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C2)	539
SO3	R	SO3R3	a) persone rimpatriate volontariamente	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C3)	441
SO3	R	SO3R3	b) e persone allontanate	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C4)	0
SO3	R	SO3R3	Numero di rimpatriati il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE	441
SO3	R	SO3R4	Numero di operazioni monitorate di allontanamento cofinanziate dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C5)	7
SO3	R	SO3R5	a) Persone allontanate (e il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo)	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C4)	0
SO3	R	SO3R5	b) Numero di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio	Numero	5.860,00	Eurostat (migr_eirtn)	n.d.
SO3	R	SO3R5	Numero di allontanamenti con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio	Rapporto	0,00	/	n.a.
SO3	R	SO3R6	a) Numero di persone rimpatriate nel quadro delle operazioni di rimpatrio congiunte (volontario assistito o forzato) con il sostegno del Fondo	Numero	0,00	Relazioni sui progetti	0
SO3	R	SO3R6	b) Numero di rimpatriati il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE	441
SO3	R	SO3R6	Numero di persone rimpatriate nel quadro delle operazioni di rimpatrio congiunte con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri con il sostegno del Fondo	Rapporto	0,00	/	0
SO3	R	SO3R7	a) Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C2)	539
SO3	R	SO3R7	b) Persone rimpatriate volontariamente (e il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo)	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO3 C3)	441
SO3	R	SO3R7	Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri volontari con il sostegno del Fondo	Rapporto	0,00	/	1,22

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	BASLINE VALUE	SOURCE OF DATA	2017
SO3	R	SO3R8	a) Numero di posti nei centri di trattenimento creati/ristrutturati con il sostegno del Fondo	Numero	0,00	Relazioni sui progetti	0
SO3	R	SO3R8	b) Numero totale di posti nei centri di trattenimento	Numero	0,00	Stati membri	359
SO3	R	SO3R8	Numero di posti nei centri di trattenimento creati/ristrutturati con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di posti nei centri di trattenimento	Rapporto	0,00	/	0
SO3	I	SO3I1	a) Numero di cittadini di paesi terzi rimpatriati a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio (migr_eirtn)	Numero	5.860,00	Eurostat (migr_eirtn)	n.d.
SO3	I	SO3I1	b) Numero di cittadini di paesi terzi intimati (migr_eiord)	Numero	23.945,00	Eurostat (migr_eiord)	n.d.
SO3	I	SO3I1	Numero di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio rispetto al numero di cittadini di paesi terzi intimati	Rapporto		/	n.d.
SO3	I	SO3I2	Decisioni di rimpatrio adottate nei confronti di richiedenti asilo respinti	Numero		EASO (indicatore EPS 8a)	n.d.
SO3	I	SO3I3	Rimpatri effettivi di richiedenti asilo respinti	Numero		EASO (indicatore EPS 8b)	n.d.
SO4	R	SO4R1	Numero di richiedenti protezione internazionale e di beneficiari di tale protezione trasferiti da uno Stato membro a un altro con il sostegno del Fondo.	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO4 C1)	n.d.
SO4	R	SO4R2	Numero di progetti di cooperazione con altri Stati membri per migliorare la solidarietà e la ripartizione delle responsabilità fra gli Stati membri sostenuti dal Fondo.	Numero	0,00	RAE (indicatore SO4 C2)	n.d.

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
SO1	R	SO1R1	Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che hanno ricevuto assistenza attraverso progetti in materia di accoglienza e sistemi di asilo sostenuti dal Fondo:	Numero	1.788,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R1	i) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che beneficiano di informazioni e assistenza durante l'intera procedura di asilo	Numero	177.944,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R1	ii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che beneficiano di assistenza e rappresentanza legali	Numero	1.339,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R1	iii) numero di persone vulnerabili e di minori non accompagnati che beneficiano di assistenza specifica	Numero	1.365,00	0,00	0,00

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
SO1	R	SO1R2	Capacità (numero di posti) delle nuove infrastrutture destinate all'accoglienza e all'alloggio create in risposta ai requisiti comuni delle condizioni di accoglienza previsti nell'acquis dell'Unione, e delle infrastrutture di accoglienza e alloggio esistenti migliorate in conformità dei medesimi requisiti a seguito dei progetti sostenuti dal Fondo	Numero	1.287,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R2	La percentuale della capacità totale di accoglienza e alloggio	Percentuale	0,79	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R3	Numero di persone che hanno ricevuto una formazione su tematiche attinenti all'asilo con l'assistenza del Fondo	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R3	Tale numero in percentuale del numero totale di personale formato su dette tematiche	Percentuale	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	R	SO1R4	a) Numero di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati sostenuti dal Fondo	Numero			
SO1	R	SO1R4	b) Numero totale di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati	Numero			
SO1	R	SO1R4	Numero di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati sostenuti dal Fondo rispetto al numero totale di posti adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati.	Percentuale			
SO1	I	SO1I1	Numero di casi pendenti in primo grado, meno di 6 mesi	Numero	61.894,00	43.782,00	29.349,00
SO1	I	SO1I1	Numero di casi pendenti in primo grado, più di 6 mesi	Numero	34.097,00	17.880,00	9.905,00
SO1	I	SO1I2	Percentuale di decisioni finali positive in fase di appello	Percentuale	45,45	100,00	81,82
SO1	I	SO1I3	Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza (stato alla fine del periodo di riferimento)	Numero	161.395,00	82.169,00	
SO1	I	SO1I4	a) Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza	Numero	161.395,00	82.169,00	
SO1	I	SO1I4	b) Numero di richiedenti asilo e di nuovi richiedenti asilo	Numero	114.748,00	79.599,00	51.161,00
SO1	I	SO1I4	Numero di persone nel sistema di accoglienza rispetto al numero di richiedenti asilo	Rapporto	1,41	1,03	0,00
SO1	I	SO1I5	a) Numero di posti alloggio adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati	Numero			

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
SO1	I	SO1I5	<i>b) Numero di richiedenti asilo considerati minori non accompagnati (Eurostat migr_asyunaa)</i>	<i>Numero</i>	5.614,00	3.744,00	1.983,00
SO1	I	SO1I5	<i>Numero di posti alloggio adatti a ricevere minori non accompagnati, rispetto al numero di minori non accompagnati</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO1	I	SO1I6	<i>Convergenza dei tassi di riconoscimento in primo grado/in ultima istanza negli Stati membri per richiedenti asilo provenienti da uno stesso paese terzo</i>	<i>Punti percentuali</i>			
SO2	R	SO2R1	<i>Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento che hanno partecipato a misure antecedenti alla partenza sostenute dal Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	R	SO2R2	<i>Numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite dal Fondo attraverso misure di integrazione nel quadro di strategie nazionali, locali e regionali</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	R	SO2R2	<i>i) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso misure incentrate sull'istruzione e la formazione, comprese la formazione linguistica e le azioni preparatorie volte ad agevolare l'accesso al mercato del lavoro</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	R	SO2R2	<i>ii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento sostenute attraverso la consulenza e l'assistenza nei settori dell'alloggio</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	R	SO2R2	<i>iii) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso cure mediche e psicologiche</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	R	SO2R2	<i>iv) numero di persone appartenenti a gruppi di riferimento assistite attraverso misure connesse alla partecipazione democratica</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO2	I	SO2I1	<i>Percentuale di cittadini di paesi terzi che hanno ottenuto lo status di soggiornante di lungo periodo rispetto al totale di cittadini di paesi terzi</i>	<i>Percentuale</i>	60,80	60,93	58,18
SO2	I	SO2I2	<i>Tasso di occupazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante</i>	<i>Punti percentuali</i>	0,10	0,40	1,00
SO2	I	SO2I3	<i>Tasso di disoccupazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante</i>	<i>Punti percentuali</i>	4,70	5,30	5,20

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
SO2	I	SO2I4	Tasso di attività: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	3,90	4,70	5,30
SO2	I	SO2I5	Percentuale di giovani che abbandonano prematuramente gli studi o la formazione: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	22,70	23,10	24,00
SO2	I	SO2I6	Percentuale di persone di età fra 30 e 34 anni in possesso di un diploma di istruzione superiore: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali	-16,70	-15,50	-16,60
SO2	I	SO2I7	Percentuale della popolazione a rischio di povertà sociale o esclusione sociale: divario tra cittadini di paesi terzi e cittadini del paese ospitante	Punti percentuali		24,90	25,50
SO3	R	SO3R1	Numero di persone che hanno ricevuto una formazione su tematiche attinenti al rimpatrio con l'assistenza del Fondo	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R2	Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R3	a) persone rimpatriate volontariamente	Numero	4,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R3	b) e persone allontanate	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R3	Numero di rimpatriati il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo	Numero	4,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R4	Numero di operazioni monitorate di allontanamento cofinanziate dal Fondo	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R5	a) Persone allontanate (e il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo)	Numero	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R5	b) Numero di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio	Numero	5.497,00	4.803,00	4.204,00
SO3	R	SO3R5	Numero di allontanamenti con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio	Rapporto	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R6	a) Numero di persone rimpatriate nel quadro delle operazioni di rimpatrio congiunte (volontario assistito o forzato) con il sostegno del Fondo	Numero			
SO3	R	SO3R6	b) Numero di rimpatriati il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo	Numero	4,00	0,00	0,00

SO	TYPE	IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
SO3	R	SO3R6	<i>Numero di persone rimpatriate nel quadro delle operazioni di rimpatrio congiunte con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri con il sostegno del Fondo</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R7	<i>a) Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R7	<i>b) Persone rimpatriate volontariamente (e il cui rimpatrio è stato cofinanziato dal Fondo)</i>	<i>Numero</i>	4,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R7	<i>Numero di rimpatriati che hanno ricevuto assistenza al reinserimento prima o dopo il rimpatrio cofinanziata dal Fondo rispetto al numero totale di rimpatri volontari con il sostegno del Fondo</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO3	R	SO3R8	<i>a) Numero di posti nei centri di trattenimento creati/ristrutturati con il sostegno del Fondo</i>	<i>Numero</i>			
SO3	R	SO3R8	<i>b) Numero totale di posti nei centri di trattenimento</i>	<i>Numero</i>			
SO3	R	SO3R8	<i>Numero di posti nei centri di trattenimento creati/ristrutturati con il sostegno del Fondo rispetto al numero totale di posti nei centri di trattenimento</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>			
SO3	I	SO3I1	<i>a) Numero di cittadini di paesi terzi rimpatriati a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio (migr_eirtn)</i>	<i>Numero</i>	5.497,00	4.803,00	4.204,00
SO3	I	SO3I1	<i>b) Numero di cittadini di paesi terzi intimati (migr_eiord)</i>	<i>Numero</i>	31.311,00	26.887,00	20.029,00
SO3	I	SO3I1	<i>Numero di rimpatri a seguito di un'intimazione a lasciare il territorio rispetto al numero di cittadini di paesi terzi intimati</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,18	0,18	0,21
SO3	I	SO3I2	<i>Decisioni di rimpatrio adottate nei confronti di richiedenti asilo respinti</i>	<i>Numero</i>			
SO3	I	SO3I3	<i>Rimpatri effettivi di richiedenti asilo respinti</i>	<i>Numero</i>			
SO4	R	SO4R1	<i>Numero di richiedenti protezione internazionale e di beneficiari di tale protezione trasferiti da uno Stato membro a un altro con il sostegno del Fondo.</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00
SO4	R	SO4R2	<i>Numero di progetti di cooperazione con altri Stati membri per migliorare la solidarietà e la ripartizione delle responsabilità fra gli Stati membri sostenuti dal Fondo.</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	0,00	0,00

2 - INDICATORS ON EFFICIENCY, ADDED VALUE AND SUSTAINABILITY, AS FORESEEN IN REGULATION (EU) No 514/2014

IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	BASLINE VALUE	SOURCE OF DATA	2017
H1	<i>Numero di equivalenti a tempo pieno presso l'autorità responsabile, l'autorità delegata e l'autorità di audit addetti all'esecuzione del Fondo e remunerati dall'assistenza tecnica o dai bilanci nazionali rispetto a:</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>Stati membri</i>	42
H1	<i>a) il numero di progetti attuati</i>	<i>Numero</i>	0,00	<i>RAE</i>	272
H1	<i>b) il numero di fondi richiesti per il corrispondente esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	0,00	<i>Conti</i>	35.598.054,41
H2	<i>a) Assistenza tecnica più costi amministrativi (indiretti)</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	0,00	<i>Stati membri</i>	1.557.078,55
H2	<i>b) Importo dei fondi richiesti per l'esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	0,00	<i>Conti</i>	35.598.054,41
H2	<i>Costi di assistenza tecnica e amministrativi (indiretti) dei progetti rispetto all'importo dei finanziamenti richiesti per il corrispondente esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,00	<i>/</i>	0,044
H3	<i>Importo della spesa annuale presentata dallo Stato membro rispetto a</i>	<i>Importo in EUR</i>	0,00	<i>Conti</i>	35.598.054,41
H3	<i>Importo totale dei fondi destinati al programma nazionale.</i>	<i>Importo in EUR</i>	0,00	<i>Conti</i>	347.753.777,00
H3	<i>Tasso di assorbimento del Fondo</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,00	<i>/</i>	10,24%

IND ID	INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	MEAS UNIT	2016	2015	2014
H1	<i>Numero di equivalenti a tempo pieno presso l'autorità responsabile, l'autorità delegata e l'autorità di audit addetti all'esecuzione del Fondo e remunerati dall'assistenza tecnica o dai bilanci nazionali rispetto a:</i>	<i>Numero</i>	42	n.d.	
H1	<i>a) il numero di progetti attuati</i>	<i>Numero</i>	32	0	
H1	<i>b) il numero di fondi richiesti per il corrispondente esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	13.138.595,53	1.621.977,15	
H2	<i>a) Assistenza tecnica più costi amministrativi (indiretti)</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	1.222.904,63	0	
H2	<i>b) Importo dei fondi richiesti per l'esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Importo in milioni di EUR</i>	13.138.595,53	1.621.977,15	
H2	<i>Costi di assistenza tecnica e amministrativi (indiretti) dei progetti rispetto all'importo dei finanziamenti richiesti per il corrispondente esercizio finanziario</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	0,093	0	
H3	<i>Importo della spesa annuale presentata dallo Stato membro rispetto a</i>	<i>Importo in EUR</i>	13.138.595,53	1.621.977,15	
H3	<i>Importo totale dei fondi destinati al programma nazionale.</i>	<i>Importo in EUR</i>	347.753.777,00	347.753.777,00	
H3	<i>Tasso di assorbimento del Fondo</i>	<i>Rapporto</i>	3,78%	0,47%	

ANNEX: DATA

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

NATIONAL OBJECTIVE	A TOTAL PAID 01/01/2014- 15/10/2016	B TOTAL PAID 16/10/2016- 30/06/2017	TOTAL PAID (A+B) / SO PROGRAMMED (%)
OS1.ON1 Accoglienza/asilo	3.566.819,71	10.728.908,31	
OS1.ON2 Valutazione	119.123,64	1.275.908,94	
OS1.ON3 Reinsediamento	37.500,00	107.547,15	
TOTALE ON OS1	3.723.443,35	12.112.364,39	
TOTALE OS1	3.723.443,35	12.112.364,39	
OS2.ON2 Integrazione	881.432,76	6.727.808,83	
OS2.ON3 Capacità	1.647.305,31	2.715.748,32	
TOTALE ON OS2	2.528.738,07	9.443.557,15	
TOTALE OS2	2.528.738,07	9.443.557,15	
OS3.ON1 Misure di accompagnamento	-	199.792,21	
OS3.ON2 Misure di rimpatrio	1.622.986,63	- 150,00	
TOTALE ON OS3	1.622.986,63	199.642,21	
TOTALE OS3	1.622.986,63	199.642,21	
TOTALE ON OS4	n.a.	n.a.	
TOTALE OS4	n.a.	n.a.	
Impegni (priorità dell'Unione)	4.990.000,00	5.600.000,00	
Impegni (altro)	n.a.	n.a.	
Trasferimenti e ricollocazioni	672.500,00	3.025.500,00	
Ammissione dalla Turchia	n.a.	n.a.	
TOTALE Casi speciali	5.662.500,00	8.625.500,00	
Technical Assistance	1.222.904,63	1.557.078,55	
Totale	14.760.572,68	31.938.142,30	

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
OS1 - Asilo	0	0,00	19	3.723.443,35
OS2 - Integrazione/migrazione legale	0	0,00	9	2.528.738,07
OS3 - Rimpatrio	0	0,00	4	1.622.986,63
OS4 - Solidarietà	0	0,00	0	0,00
OS5 - Assistenza tecnica	0	0,00	0	0,00
Totale 1	0	0,00	32	7.875.168,05

	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
OS1 - Asilo	25	3.470.271,70	69	8.642.092,70
OS2 - Integrazione/migrazione legale	2	79.889,57	172	9.363.658,58
OS3 - Rimpatrio	0	0	4	199.642,21
OS4 - Solidarietà	0	0	0	0,00
OS5 - Assistenza tecnica	0	0	1	2.779.983,18
Totale 2	27	3.550.161,27	246	20.985.376,67
Totale 1+2	27	3.550.161,27	278	28.860.544,72

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
Autorità nazionali/federali	N. di progetti	2	3	0	0
Autorità nazionali/federali	Contributo UE	1.447.500,00	1.450.604,56	0,00	0,00
Organismi pubblici locali	N. di progetti	4	6	1	0
Organismi pubblici locali	Contributo UE	373.908,82	1.078.133,51	120.000,00	0,00
Organizzazioni governative non	N. di progetti	7	0	2	0
Organizzazioni governative non	Contributo UE	1.185.873,23	0,00	302.986,63	0,00
Organizzazioni pubbliche internazionali	N. di progetti	6	0	1	0
Organizzazioni pubbliche internazionali	Contributo UE	716.161,30	0,00	1.200.000,00	0,00
Croce rossa nazionale	N. di progetti	0	0	0	0
Croce rossa nazionale	Contributo UE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Comitato internazionale della Croce rossa	N. di progetti	0	0	0	0
Comitato internazionale della Croce rossa	Contributo UE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Federazione internazionale delle Società nazionali della Croce Rossa e della Mezzaluna Rossa.	N. di progetti	0	0	0	0
Federazione internazionale delle Società nazionali della Croce Rossa e della Mezzaluna Rossa.	Contributo UE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Imprese di diritto privato e pubblico	N. di progetti	0	0	0	0
Imprese di diritto privato e pubblico	Contributo UE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Organismi di istruzione/ricerca	N. di progetti	0	0	0	0
Organismi di istruzione/ricerca	Contributo UE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00

		PROJECT BENEFICIARIES 01/01/2014-15/10/2016			
		SO1: ASYLUM	SO1: ASYLUM	SO1: ASYLUM	SO1: ASYLUM
Autorità nazionali/federali	<i>N. di progetti</i>	7	24	2	0
Autorità nazionali/federali	<i>Contributo UE</i>	663.898,14	2.239.415,84	934.584,41	199.792,21
Organismi pubblici locali	<i>N. di progetti</i>	31	104	0	0
Organismi pubblici locali	<i>Contributo UE</i>	1.437.865,78	5.593.607,90	0,00	0
Organizzazioni governative non	<i>N. di progetti</i>	35	25	1	0
Organizzazioni governative non	<i>Contributo UE</i>	5.942.326,72	816.294,78	-150,01	0
Organizzazioni pubbliche internazionali	<i>N. di progetti</i>	4	0	1	0
Organizzazioni pubbliche internazionali	<i>Contributo UE</i>	2.017.239,08	0	0	0
Croce rossa nazionale	<i>N. di progetti</i>	3	0	0	0
Croce rossa nazionale	<i>Contributo UE</i>	243.101,36	0	0	0
Comitato internazionale della Croce rossa	<i>N. di progetti</i>	0	0	0	0
Comitato internazionale della Croce rossa	<i>Contributo UE</i>	0	0	0	0
Federazione internazionale delle Società nazionali della Croce Rossa e della Mezzaluna Rossa.	<i>N. di progetti</i>	0	0	0	0
Federazione internazionale delle Società nazionali della Croce Rossa e della Mezzaluna Rossa.	<i>Contributo UE</i>	0	0	0	0
Imprese di diritto privato e pubblico	<i>N. di progetti</i>	13	7	0	0
Imprese di diritto privato e pubblico	<i>Contributo UE</i>	1.807.933,33	67.019,54	0	0
Organismi di istruzione/ricerca	<i>N. di progetti</i>	1	14	0	0
Organismi di istruzione/ricerca	<i>Contributo UE</i>	0,00	727.210,10	0	0

Table 4: Special cases

SPECIAL CASES		2014-2015	2016-2017	2018-2020	TOTAL
Priorità dell'Unione per i reinsediamenti	Impegnato				
Priorità dell'Unione per i reinsediamenti	Effettivo	960.000,00	4.030.000,00		4.990.000,00
Altri reinsediamenti	Impegnato	5.000.000,00	14.890.000,00		19.890.000,00
Altri reinsediamenti	Effettivo				
Trasferimento e ricollocazione	Impegnato		17.508.000,00		17.508.000,00
Trasferimento e ricollocazione	Effettivo	9.500,00	663.000,00		672.500,00
Ammissione dalla Turchia	Impegnato				
Ammissione dalla Turchia	Effettivo				
Totale	Impegnato	5.000.000,00	32.398.000,00	0,00	37.398.000,00
Totale	Effettivo	969.500,00	4.693.000,00	0,00	5.662.500,00

DOCUMENTS - ATTACHMENTS

TITOLO DEL DOCUMENTO	TIPO DI DOCUMENTO	DATA DOCUMENTO	RIFERIMENTO LOCALE	RIFERIMENTO DELLA COMMISSIONE	FILE	DATA DI INVIO	INVIATO DA
----------------------	-------------------	----------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	------	---------------	------------

ATTACHMENT 1 – NOTE ON “ANNEX:DATA”

This document provides clarifications to the values reported in “Annex: Data”.

For Table 1 “Progress in financial implementation, by specific objectives (in Euro)” it should be noted that the column “Total paid / SO programmed” has been left blank as the value will be automatically generated by SFC. It should also be noted that “Total NO SO4”, TOTAL “SO4”, “Commitments (other) and “Admissions from Turkey” do not apply to the Italian AMIF NP.

On SFC there is a line missing from the table for SO3NO1. In this English version of the report this line has been included in the table and therefore the values provided in the table are correct. In the Italian Version of the Programme uploaded on SFC this attachment provides the details on the correct amounts.

For Table 2 ““Number of projects and EU contribution to finished and open projects, by specific objectives (in Euro)”, Technical Assistance is considered one projects that includes all technical assistance activities and therefore the financial contribution assigned corresponds to the entire budget.

For Table 3 ““Number of projects and EU contribution, by types of beneficiaries and by specific objectives (in Euro)” it should be noted that data for the period 16/10/2016-30/06/2017 have been calculated as the difference between cumulative data reported at 30 June 2017 and the data available in the second table which reports data for the period 01/01/2014-15/10/2016 (pre-filled in SFC).

For Table 4 “Special Cases” it should be noted that the data is that which is reported by SFC (the table cannot be edited by the system).

ATTACHMENT 2 – SUMMARY TABLE ON INTEGRATION SERVICES AVAILABLE IN ITALY BY REGION

SERVICE	N. OF SERVICES PER REGION [N. OF SERVICES]	AMIF PROJECT CODE	NP ACTION SO2NO3
Accommodation	Lombardia [106]	1543	J
	Basilicata [4]	272	
	Campania [21]	272	
	Calabria [44]	272	
	Puglia [10]	272	
	Sicilia [62]	272, 777 e 1533	
	Campania "assistenza abitativa", "social housing". [-]	641	
Education	Piemonte [292]	1393, 1531 e 1541	J
	Lombardia [916]	304 e 1540	
	Veneto [110]	529 e 1518	
	Emilia-Romagna [144]	1454	
	Toscana [10]	1366 e 1379	
	Abruzzo [5]	1503	
	Umbria [340]	1529	
	Lazio [584]	891 e 1366	
	Campania [82]	272	
	Basilicata [4]	272	
	Puglia [44]	272 e 1550	
	Calabria [140]	272, 467 e 1366	
	Sicilia [165]	272, 777 e 1492.	
	Italia [2064]	740	
	Piemonte [104] "mediaz. intercult.", [25] "formaz. professionale", [60] "mediaz. intercult.", [11] "informaz.", [22] "formaz. linguist"	348, 461	L
	Liguria [2] "informaz.", [15] "mediaz. intercult."	320	
	Veneto [11] "valori ed educazione civica", [8] "mediaz. linguist."	532	
	Emilia-Romagna [9] "mediazione interculturale"	165	
	Toscana [12] "mediaz. intercult.", "informazione", "accoglienza", "orientamento, protezione"	706	
	Marche [4] "mediaz. intercult.", "network di 122 atenei UE e Nord Africa e Medio Oriente", "informazione", "comunicazione", "associaz. immigrati", "osservat. politiche sociali"	396	
	Umbria, e Campania e Puglia [-] "supporto vittime discrim. razz.", sensibilizzazione", "associaz. stakeholders", "formaz. operatori"	85	
	Italia (città) [-] "sport", "polit. ambient., di genere, sociali, educat."	109	
	Piemonte "progetti servizi educativi" [-]	338	
	Toscana "progetti informazione donne" [-]	409	
	Lombardia [469]	1543	J
	Piemonte [35]	1541	
	Veneto [14] "orientamento al lavoro"	1518	
	Toscana [5] "mediazione interculturale"	1379	
	Marche [13]	313	
	Molise [20] "interventi"	1520	
	Campania [249]	272	
	Basilicata [63]	272	
	Puglia [243]	272 e 1550	
	Calabria [244]	272, 467 e 1366	
	Sicilia [326] "orientamento al lavoro"	272, 777 e 1492.	
	Piemonte [24] "orientamento al lavoro", [186] "patronati"	348	L
	Umbria, e Campania e Puglia [-]	85	
	Veneto [255]	532	
	Toscana e Calabria [-] "collegamento domanda/offerta lavoro domest. e di cura"	409	
	Lombardia [5] "consul. creazione impresa", [16] "form. profess.",	46	
Labour	Emilia-Romagna [256] "patronati", [1] "sportello dom./off.", [19] "orientamento", "progetti formaz., integraz. e sostegno familiare"	307	M
	Lazio [10] "consul. creazione impresa", [52] "formaz. profess.", [142] "patronati", [1] "sportello dom./off.", [56] "orientamento", "progetti di formaz.", "integraz. e sostegno familiare"	46 e 307	

	Molise [28] "patronati", "progetti di formaz., integraz., sost. fam."	307	
	Campania [2] "consul. creazione impresa", [11] "form. profess."	46	
Minors and second generations	Lombardia "integraz. cultur.", "protez. MSNA", "mediaz. intercul." [-]	1543	J
	Emilia-Romagna [68]	1543	
	Toscana [1] "mediazione interculturale"	1379	
	Lazio [550]	891	
	Campania [44]	272	
	Basilicata [14]	272	
	Puglia [27]	272	
	Calabria [67]	272 e 467	
	Sicilia [101]	272, 777 e 1532	
	Italia [1240] "integraz. culturale", [19] "mediaz. interculturale"	1330	
	Lombardia [211],	461	
	Umbria, e Campania e Puglia [-]	85	
	Veneto [52] "integrazione culturale"	532	
	Piemonte [-] "polit. inclus., prevenz. disagio giovan., dispers. scolast."	338	
	Italia [340] "mediazione intercul. per minori e seconde generaz."	743	M
Basic services	Piemonte [541] "mediazione e socio-sanitari-assistenziali", [25] "accoglienza", [24] "sportello immigraz.", [9] "punti assist."	336, 1531, 1544	J
	Lombardia [337]	1541	
	Veneto [21] "socio-sanitari-assistenziali"	1543	
	Toscana [148] "mediazione e socio-sanitari-assistenziali"	1518	
	Umbria [1] "protezione internazionale"	1545	
	Abruzzo [7] "socio-sanitari-assistenziali"	1529	
	Campania [74]	1503	
	Basilicata [16]	272	
	Puglia [118] "mediazione e socio-sanitari-assistenziali"	272	
	Calabria [104], Sicilia [101]	272 e 1547	
	Italia [353] "prima accoglienza", [137] "mediazione intercul.", [16] "mediaz. cultur." "scuola", [176] "mediaz. cult. sistema giud." [216] "mediazione culturale sistema sanitaria"	272, 467, 272, 777 e 1330	
	Emilia-Romagna [62]	879	
	Umbria [313]	852	
All (do not specify area)			
Basic services	Toscana e Calabria [-] "sostegno e assistenza legale"	409	M
	Italia [107] "protez. intern., mediaz. interc., prima accogli., assist. legale, socio-sanitari-assistenz.", [9] "sportelli informat. region."	632	
	Lombardia, Veneto, Lazio, Sicilia [-]	797	
	Puglia [122] "migrazioni ed intergrazione".	729	