

AMIF INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

CCI	2014HU65AMNP001
Title	HU National Programme AMIF
Version	2017.0
Time period covered	01/01/2014 - 30/06/2017

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

In view of the requirements of Article 56 (3) of Regulation (EU) No 514/2014, the RA acted as follows regarding the selection of the independent expert to prepare the AMIF Interim Evaluation Report.

Four potential tenderers were contacted, who had to meet the following conditions:

- the tenderer must hold a degree, have an excellent command of English (negotiation level), and proven experience in the evaluation of EU-funded projects
- the expected reference: proof of the preparation of at least one evaluation report on an EU-funded project or programme in the 5 years prior to the date of the call for tender. Information on the evaluation(s) prepared shall also be provided in the CV, with indication of the place and time of publication; a reference declaration detailing the subject, the contractor and his/her contact details (phone, e-mail) shall also be submitted. The declaration and the CV must also state whether the performance was in accordance with the relevant regulations and the contract.

All of the three tenders received met the aforementioned criteria and were evaluated based on the previously set evaluation criterion. The procedure was done exclusively by the persons assigned to this task, in accordance with the regulations in force. As a result, the contract was concluded with the lowest tenderer.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As it is described in the Interim Evaluation Report of AMIF (hereinafter: Report), there were several significant changes in Hungary in its asylum, migration and integration policies. All of these changes were induced by the migration crisis in 2015 that led to 1) frequent enactments of legislation in the field of asylum, 2) reorganization of the related institution system and 3) rise of the anti-migrant attitudes of the Hungarian population.

While focusing on the field of SO1 (Asylum), the external evaluations introduces that Hungary has built up a border fence and established a new asylum procedure connected to the border and the, so called, transit zones. Not only details of the new asylum system but criticism that arose towards several elements of the new system and infringement procedures against Hungary that were launched by the European Commission are described in the Report. As the Report emphasises, the AMIF financed projects could not fit perfectly to this new environment.

In the field of SO2 (Integration/legal migration), the Fund contributed relevantly to labour-market integration of immigrants which is an outstanding progress in the described environment. However, the increased anti-migrant attitudes of the Hungarian population should be also mentioned. These changes were felt mostly by people under international protection. The regular migrants could experience the effect of the communication campaigns but their rights and possibilities have not been eroded.

In return policy (SO3), due to the mentioned changes in the asylum system, borders have become more important as before. The Hungarian border has become frightening for potential asylum-seeker thus it was not necessary to return rejected ones among them. Furthermore, asylum-seekers in the transit zones can leave the transit zones and so the asylum procedure can cease without a legal act of the immigration authority and without readmission procedures. Thus, order to leave is not always necessary. Beyond these changes connected to the asylum system, the return procedure has not changed relevantly which means that the Fund could fulfil only a symbolic role in its development.

In solidarity (SO4), since Hungary does not wish to cooperate in the responsibility sharing system regarding relocation, there are no facts which could be evaluated. Hungary (and Slovakia) challenged the, so called, quota system but the Court of Justice of the European Union (hereinafter: CJEU) decided that the system is lawful and it shall be implemented by the Member States. However, there is no solidarity action carried out by Hungary in the period which is examined by the Report, except one project which aims to help integration of the few resettled refugees living in Hungary.

As the external evaluator emphasises, the general objectives of the Fund were achieved at reasonable cost in terms of deployed financial and human resources. The eligible costs were reasonable within the analysed period, primarily due to the strict financial evaluating rules of the applications. According to the information available, the same results and quality could not have been reached at a lower cost.

The products were procured and the services were provided at competitive prices, procurement procedures were carried out according to the national rules, and the salaries were also defined by the labour market in the projects. Both planning and implementation was appropriate from a financial perspective, it can be said that the value for money principle was implemented through the reference period. Taking the findings of the beneficiary survey into consideration, the external evaluator considers the costs justified given the outputs that have been achieved until now. In addition, the external evaluator considers AMIF as a program having low administrative costs (on the Fund level) and adequate costs (on the project level). Furthermore, effective measures were put in place to prevent, detect and report on cases of fraud and other irregularities

The objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund only partly corresponded to the actual needs. The migration crisis in 2015 has completely changed the environment and brought new needs. The National Programme, the Fund and its interventions were designed based on a forecast which could not follow this changing environment. Nevertheless, the Fund's interventions were able to correspond especially to the needs that have not been changed by the migration crisis or the political reaction to this crisis. Most of these unchanged needs were related to integration measures.

While discussing the issue of coherence, the external evaluator underlines that there were no other programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work (as AMIF) in Hungary. There is no information even of individual conflicts or parallel financing between the Fund and other programmes funded by EU resources. Furthermore, objectives set in the national program have unique goals and these stand independently from the objectives set in other planning documents (e.g OPs).

Complementarity issues were broadly considered in the highest-level migration strategy document. As a significant guarantee for ensuring complementarity is that the Ministry of Interior (hereinafter: MoI) is nominated as a voting member in the different formations of the policy making or monitoring bodies of the Structural Funds and also in the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanism Monitoring Committee. It must be mentioned that the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister also delegates one member to the Monitoring Committee of AMIF.

There are several added value that were brought by the EU support and should be introduced here, as cultural diversity, cooperation between various actors, stability of NGOs and Hungarian civil society, the support of the European Union itself (as beneficiaries were able to refer to the Fund as an EU promotion in their rhetoric).

It is still not clear whether the positive effects of the projects supported by the Fund will last (when its support will be over) as the projects are still running. However, one can conclude that some of the materials and long-lasting impact of the services that have been produced/provided within the framework of AMIF will probably have positive effects even after termination of the projects.

However, it should also be emphasised that projects aimed at influencing the attitudes of the host society by reinforcing the inclusive and tolerant attitudes towards migrants were probably not successful. In addition, the beneficiaries typically would not be able to maintain their services without the support of AMIF as 1) beneficiaries usually do not work on long term planning to facilitate diverse donor engagements, 2) it is difficult to engage micro-, and macro donors because supporting migrants

and TCNs is not a popular issue in Hungary, 3) only a very few further EU, national and international public funding provide insufficient funds for implementing activities focusing on the target group of AMIF.

The introduction of the innovative procedures introduced by the Fund brought simplification for the beneficiaries of the Fund only to a limited extent. Multiannual programming brought simplification mainly for the organisations whose projects were not affected by the changes in legalisation and the reorganization of the related institution system. RA was able to realize a fair, equitable and verifiable calculation of simplified cost options (SCOs) only in certain cases. The limited introduction of SCOs did not really reduce the administrative burden for the beneficiaries.

For the selection phase, the RA used the IT system developed by the Prime Minister's Office (EUPR). After the conclusion of Grant Agreements, the IT system of the RA itself has handled all procedures and relevant data. However, the inappropriate development of EUPR hindered the selection. As a result, contracting and the implementation of the projects did not start in time. In addition, the beneficiaries could not perform their interim reports on the project implementations via the IT system, in the beginning of the scrutinized period. Therefore, RA ensured the administration and registration of data via paper-based documentation.

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

The Hungarian asylum system faced an extraordinary pressure due to the dramatic increase in the number of asylum seekers between 2013 and 2015. The annual number of submitted asylum-applications was 18,895 in 2013, 42,775 in 2014 and 177,315 in 2015 (Eurostat; 2016). Irregular migration also meant a tremendous burden for Hungary that became the third country in the European Union regarding the number of apprehended irregular migrants at its external borders with 411,515 crossings during the year of 2015 (IOM, 2017).

In order to handle the crisis situation, the MS decided to erect a fence along its border with Serbia and (later on) with Croatia in order to ensure border security by preventing immigrants from entering illegally into the territory of Hungary. In addition, changes in legislation were realized in order to deter arriving asylum seekers. Among other decisions, Hungary

- introduced the border procedure in transit zones that were responsible for handling asylum applications and which came to be established at the Serbian and Croatian borders (Article 71/A of the Act CXL of 2015). The applications were likely to be rejected on the basis that applicants entered through Serbia which was designated as a safe third country (Act CXXVII of 2015, Government Decree 191/2015),
- considered the illegal crossing of the fence as a criminal act (Section 352/A, 352/C and 352/C of Act C of 2012 on the Criminal Code),
- ordered the military to assist the police in guarding the borders (Act CXLII of 2015 on the Law on Police and Military),
- ceased the refugee integration system and introduced other restrictive measures concerning integration and pre-integration (Szabó, 2016).

Due to the completion of the fence and to the changes in legislation, the number of illegal entries sharply decreased; the number of asylum applications was only 29,430 in 2016 (Eurostat; 2016). Between the first quarters of 2016 and 2017, the number of asylum applications decreased further by 85% (Eurostat, 2017a).

The European Commission, the Council of Europe, the UNHCR and NGOs expressed concerns regarding these and further changes in legislation (especially regarding the amended act LXXX of 2007 on Asylum and LXXXIX of 2007 on State Borders) and emphasised that these did not only have a detrimental impact on asylum seekers and refugees but were conflicting with EU and international

laws on many points.

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

The National Programme and the common indicators were prepared at the time when the number of asylum seekers was unexpectedly high. The projects under SO1 NO1 (Reception/Asylum) and SO3 NO2 (Return measures) started just in the period when the number of asylum seekers significantly dropped (for more details see Section 1). Thereby, these projects faced difficulties in implementation and achieving the planned indicators. During the scrutinized period between 2014 to 2017, Hungary enacted several legal amendments that transformed the asylum procedure significantly; only between July and September 2015, 19 acts and 19 government regulations at 473 points were amended (Tóth 2015). The frequent enactments of legislation and the reorganization of the related institution system hindered the implementation of projects in certain cases. For example, expansion of reception capacities could not be implemented.

The anti-migrant attitudes of the Hungarian population has been strengthened since 2014. According to TARKI (TÁRKI 2016), the level of xenophobia reached an all-time high in 2016 while only 1% of the population had positive attitude towards migrants. This trend was confirmed by the findings of other surveys as well (e.g. Pew Research Center 2017, Migrációkutató 2016, Republikon 2015). As a consequence, target groups and the members of the beneficiaries have experienced enmity, hostile sentiments and sometimes even threat. However, these tendencies have not hindered the implementation of the National Programme itself.

For the selection phase, the RA used the IT system developed by the Prime Minister's Office (EUPR). After the conclusion of Grant Agreements, the IT system of the RA itself has handled all procedures and relevant data. However, the newly development of EUPR hindered the selection. As a result, contracting and the implementation of the projects did not start in time.

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

The frequent changes in laws and the reorganization of the related institution system seriously undermined the execution of projects, especially under SO1 (Asylum). For example, the implementation of some projects could have begun already in 2015. However, when for instance the facility in Debrecen was closed, the Responsible Authority (RA) withdrew the call for proposals for reception activities (due to the reorganisation of the reception institutions for asylum seekers and to the changes introduced in Act LXXX of 2007 on asylum) and relaunched them in order to enable the potential applicants to react to the new circumstances.

The RA did not receive applications focusing on SO1 NO1 FP4 and SO1 NO2 FP2. (Hereinafter, abbreviations will be used in order to refer specific Funding Priorities (FPs). These abbreviations will contain information about the Specific / National Objectives of the FPs. For example, the fourth Funding Priority under Asylum (SO 1) and Reception/asylum (NO 1) will be described as SO1 NO1 FP4). SO1 NO1 FP3 was also not achieved as no related call for proposal were not launched by the RA. Moreover, the projects that started later than planned (just in the period when the number of asylum seekers significantly dropped) faced difficulties in implementation. As a result the achievement of the indicator SO1 R2 (capacity of new reception accommodation infrastructure set up in line with the minimum requirements for reception conditions set out in the EU acquis and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in line with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under this Fund) is only 0%. In addition, the indicators of SO1 R3 (Number of persons trained in asylum related topics with the assistance of the Fund) will probably not be met completely (currently, 15% of the planned number is fulfilled).

Here, it should be emphasised that the external evaluator followed the recommendations of the Guidance on the common monitoring and evaluation framework of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and calculated the indicators pro rata, taking the period between 01.01.2014 and 15.10.2022 into consideration. However, the projects started later than planned, just in the beginning of 2016. All in all, (among other factors) delay in implementation also explains why some of the indicators are currently underachieved.

Most of the national objectives of SO2 (Integration/legal migration) are covered by the total of 30 supported projects. Among the most important forms of support for the successful integration, namely housing support, support for Hungarian language trainings and facilitating the access to labour market are dominantly displayed, which means success achieved in this area. Intercultural dialogue and social inclusion of migrants to facilitate integration were also strongly supported. However, one of the measures under SO2 NO2 was not launched. In addition, regarding SO2 NO2 FP4 and SO2 NO3 FP1 no applications were received during the scrutinized period.

The changes, that have already been described in Section I and II, caused serious difficulties in implementing projects under SO3 (Return) as well. Although, calls for proposals have been launched,

but regarding SO3 NO3 (Practical cooperation and capacity building measures), which aims to improve IT systems, and to research and get to know other Member States' good practices in the field of return, no applications were received. Applications were also not submitted as the tasks of several measures have already been undertaken by various institutions (e.g. Frontex) and as the aims and scopes of the measures have already been made redundant by various social and political changes (e.g. new detention centre was not established, return carried out by land to Kosovo was not relevant anymore and the migration routes in Western Balkan was already mapped). As a result, most of the SO3 indicators are currently underachieved.

SECTION IV: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1	Effectiveness
---	---------------

1.1	Specific objective 1: Asylum - Strengthen and develop all aspects of the Common European Asylum System.
	The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to strengthening and developing all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, including its external dimension?
	<p>There are serious challenges related to Hungary in the field of Common European Asylum System (hereinafter: CEAS).</p> <p>It should be emphasised that although the external dimension of the CEAS (see: EASO, 2017) is mentioned several times in the National Migration Strategy (hereinafter: migration strategy), its practical requirements have not been incorporated into the Hungarian asylum policy.</p> <p>In addition, there are several ongoing infringement procedures against Hungary concerning this field (for the list which contains the infringement cases started in the field of migration and home affairs see: Migration and Home Affairs, 2017).</p> <p>Hungary follows the CEAS in a certain sense but at the same time, it tries to approach asylum-related issues in a new way. Based on this context, the NP's contribution is very significant since it has been stable and progressive in the field of asylum but its evaluation might be controversial at some points since it is not in full harmony with the special and new Hungarian approach.</p> <p>This evaluation is in line with the findings of the survey that was conducted by the external evaluator. The beneficiaries were asked how they would assess the changes in the field of asylum procedure. They had to rate it on a five-degree scale (1-negative, 5-positive). The average score was 2.67. Furthermore, they rather thought that the Fund was able to contribute to strengthening and developing the asylum procedure. Its average was 3.11 on the same scale (1-negative, 5-positive). It is important to emphasise that the opinions of the respondents significantly differ concerning the coherence between the Hungarian regulation and the aims of the Fund.</p>

1.1.1	What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the asylum procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?
-------	--

There were many changes in practice and even in the legal background. In order to make these changes visible, status of the asylum procedure on 1 January 2014 and 30 June 2017 will be compared at the following bullet points.

First, changes that can be evaluated as development without any doubt:

- The non-refoulement procedure that used to be regulated as an alien police procedure, has been incorporated to the asylum procedure [see Section 33 of Act LXXX of 2007 on Asylum, hereinafter: Asylum Act]. It can be evaluated as a development.
- The effect of the asylum procedure was clarified [Section 35 of Asylum Act] which helps determine the duration of the procedure. It can be evaluated as a development since this change can be useful for persons under asylum procedure.

Further changes, which were fiercely criticized by NGOs, also have a relevant influence on the asylum procedure (in emergency state):

- The preliminary assessment procedure has been merged into the main procedure. It was an important change [Section 47 of Asylum Act] as it helps simplifying the work of the asylum authority. However it is not guaranteed that the asylum procedure can be accomplished in the same quality. Therefore it is not possible to evaluate it as a development.
- An accelerated procedure has been formed [See Para. (7), Section 51 of Asylum Act]. Although, it certainly helps to accelerate the asylum system but critics also arose regarding this legal measurement. (For more details see: Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 2015a)
- A special border procedure that was also criticized by NGOs (See for example: ECRE, 2015. p. 16-20), has been formed too. [Section 71/A of Asylum Act].
- The next important change is an emergency state which is called “Crisis situation caused by mass immigration” that provides possibilities to degrade the standards of the asylum procedure [Section 80/H-80/J of Asylum Act]. The Crisis situation caused by mass immigration, that has been continuously maintained since 2015, has not helped to improve the procedure.

- There is one more crucial part of the asylum procedure which has become less favourable to asylum seekers; It is the system of legal remedies. The Hungarian Helsinki Committee summed up the critics regarding this issue (Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 2015a).

These were the most significant changes in the asylum procedure. A few of them can unequivocally be evaluated as an improvement or development.

The following projects can be mentioned concerning the strengthening and developing of the asylum procedures. These projects aimed to developing the quality of asylum procedure (SO1/NO1) and its evaluation (SO1/NO2):

1. HU/2016/PR/0022 - EASO Training Curriculum, training for refugee officers against burnout,
2. HU/2016/PR/0023 - Quality Assessment in the Field of Asylum,
3. HU/2016/PR/0024 - Improvement of COI services through subscription, seminars, conference.

All of them accomplished by the Immigration and Asylum Office (hereinafter: IAO). These improvements might be very important but beside the above described structural changes, these improvements are dwarfed. The number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems supported under this Fund has achieved 37% (source of data: indicator SO1 R1). Although, this rate is below the requirement (calculated pro rata). However, it should be emphasised that it has been achieved in spite of the changes of the asylum system that has resulted in a relevant decrease in the number of asylum seekers from 2016.

Furthermore, the mentioned projects can improve the skills of the IAO staff but it would be crucial to consider the fluctuation of the experts trained. The percentage of persons trained in asylum related topics with the assistance of the Fund is only 15% of the original plan defined in the NP (source of date: indicator SO1 R3). Although, it is very low but it can also be explained by the very high fluctuation rate at the IAO that is was 23% (source of data: IAO, 2017).

It must be mentioned that SO1 I1 and I2 indicators are not available for 2017 but the numbers from 2014-2016 period show that the asylum system was the most overloaded in 2015. These indicators are not able to show the effect of the AMIF projects since the asylum environment had completely changed as it was elaborated several times earlier.

1.1.2	What progress was made towards strengthening and developing the reception conditions, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?
	<p>As a comparison of the situation of reception centres, it is useful to compare the situation in 2014 and in 2017.</p> <p>As of April 2014, there was one reception centre and one asylum detention with three-three sites and two homes for unaccompanied children in Hungary.</p> <p>The sites of reception centres were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Debrecen (in the east of Hungary, near Romania) - it had a capacity for 773 asylum seekers; 2. Vámoszabadi (in the north-west, near the Slovakian and also the Austrian border), the newest reception centre that opened in August 2013, it has a capacity for 200 persons. 3. Bicske (close to Budapest) – with a capacity for 464. <p>The three sites of asylum detention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Békéscsaba (south-east of Hungary, near the Romanian border) 2. Debrecen (in the east of Hungary, near Romania) 3. Nyírbátor (north-east of Hungary, near the Ukrainian border) <p>(AIDA, 2014)</p> <p>The condition has been changed in the following way:</p> <p><i>“The site of the reception centre in Nagyfa was closed in August 2016, while Bicske, the closest site to Budapest, was ceased its operation in December 2016. Balassagyarmat, Kiskunhalas, Körmend and Vámoszabadi are still operating.”</i> (AIDA, 2016) The most important reception centres with the most experienced staff (Debrecen, Bicske) have been closed. It can be</p>

considered as a significant step-back.

There were two projects accomplished in the later closed reception facilities. (E.g.: HU/2016/PR/0017 - Wandering on the long road). The RA has informed the Commission about the relevant changes.

In June 2017 the reception centre has one site in Vámoszabadi and one in Kiskunhalas and one home for unaccompanied minors; and after the last institutional change the Community Shelter in Balassagyarmat now belongs to the reception centre. The asylum detention has two sites in Békéscsaba and in Nyírbátor.

It should be mentioned that further projects that provided additional services (e.g. social assistance, organization of community programs, interpreting services) improved the reception conditions. However, most steps toward strengthening and developing reception conditions do not seem to be effective since almost all asylum seekers have been placed in transit zones currently. (Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 2017)

All in all, none of the accomplished steps can be considered as a relevant step forward. This evaluation is underpinned by the following indicator numbers:

- The percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity was 0% which shows the mentioned disharmony between the National Program and the real result of the Hungarian asylum policy. (source of data: indicator SO1 R2)
- It is confirmed by the low percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics since it is 4%. (source of data: indicator SO1 R4)

The beneficiaries of the Fund were asked to evaluate the changes which have happened in the field of reception conditions. They evaluated it on a five-degree scale (1-negative, 5-positive) with 2.56 as an average. It is interesting that three beneficiaries evaluated it with 1, two of them with 2 and four of them with 4. It might indicate that beneficiaries saw different parts of the mentioned changes. However, they rather appreciated the Fund's contribution to strengthening and developing reception facilities. Its average was 3.

It must be mentioned that SO1 I3, I4 and I5 indicators are not available for 2017 but the numbers from 2014-2016 period show that the asylum system was the most overloaded in 2015. These indicators are not able to show the effect of the AMIF projects since the asylum environment had completely changed as it was elaborated several times earlier.

1.1.3	<p>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?</p>
	<p>The implementation of the legal framework of the qualification directive (hereinafter: QD) raised questions which led to an infringement procedure (No. 20140116). It must be mentioned that there are general challenges concerning the Hungarian implementation of the asylum acquis (European Commission, 2017a). The most important issue relating to the QD is the protection from refoulement (Art. 21) (See: Hungarian Helsinki Committee, 2015b). Harmonization steps (See: Eur-lex, 2017) have been taken toward the successful implementation by the MS but the contradiction between the implementation and the Hungarian asylum policy causes tension in the current asylum system. (See for example: EDAL, 2017)</p> <p>However, there are several projects which have helped the successful fulfilment of the QD. A lot of them headed toward labour market integration (Art. 26 of the QD, e.g.: HU/2016/PR/0009 – MentoHRring), maintaining family unity (Art. 23 of the QD, e.g.: HU/2016/PR/0019 - Pilot Project to Assist in Family Reunification to Hungary), access to social welfare (Art. 28 of the QD, eg.: HU/2016/PR/0005 – Skills on!), etc. They contributed to extending the rights guaranteed in the QD.</p> <p>Overall, Hungary has implemented the QD with certain doubts and the Fund helped enhancing its fulfilment as several projects provided best practices and significant services toward the recognized refugees and beneficiaries of subsidiary protection. Moreover, training projects implemented by the IAO (e.g.: HU/2016/PR/0022 - EASO Training Curriculum, training for asylum officers against burnout) helped maintaining and enhancing the quality of the procedures guaranteed by the QD (Art. 4 of the QD). Based on these conclusions, the Fund relevantly contributed to achieving a progress in the successful implementation of the QD. However, it was also not fully harmonized with the policy that Hungary pursued concerning this field in the examined period.</p> <p>It might be underpinned by the SO1 I6 indicator that shows convergence between MSs concerning to recognition rate of asylum-seekers from same countries of origin. Unfortunately, this data is not available from 2017 but the numbers from 2014-2016 years show that convergence had decreased after the 2015 crisis. However, it is only partly the result of the Hungarian asylum system. The environment and the asylum policy of other MSs have changed as well.</p>

1.1.4	<p>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</p>
-------	---

this progress?

The NP contains the following *funding priorities (SO1 NO2 F1-F3)*:

- 1. Developing of COI service – e.g. fact-finding missions, workshops, studies, information material*
- 2. Sharing best practices and experience among Member States related to asylum procedures, unaccompanied minors, vulnerable persons. – e.g. study tours, workshops, studies*
- 3. Implementation of research studies in the field of asylum in order to further develop the Hungarian asylum system and asylum procedures – e.g. on the efficiency of asylum procedures, on the accommodation conditions, on the alternatives to detention*

It is recorded above that the asylum procedure has been changed but it cannot be evaluated as an improvement without any doubt. The main problem is that there is no clear scale for measuring the improvements in this field, although two indicators (*the number of projects supported under this Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate asylum policies in Member States and the number of country of origin information products and fact-finding missions conducted with the assistance of the Fund*) can help to review some developments. The asylum procedure itself still remains difficult to measure.

The most important obstacle which has not been removed is that there is no MS guaranteed monitoring system which would help to evaluate the quality of asylum procedures.

However, it must be mentioned that three important projects have been implemented by the IAO which probably helps to improve the work of the asylum officers and the organizations itself. These must be enlisted here in order to underpin the findings and present the implementation of the National Objective 1 and 2 of this SO.

- *HU/2016/PR/0022 - EASO Training Curriculum, training for refugee officers against burnout* can help to increase the efficiency of asylum procedures and provide burnout prevention training to staff members (social workers, administrators) having a regular contact with clients, however it did not achieve the required numbers pro-rata.
- *HU/2016/PR/0023 - Quality Assessment in the Field of Asylum* is a very important endeavour to create a quality assessment system but its successfulness must be evaluated in the long run since the crucial question is whether the quality assessment would become the part of the national system or not. Currently, it is not possible to decide this question but the effort of the IAO must be appreciated.

- *HU/2016/PR/0024 - Improvement of COI services through subscription, seminars, conference* has helped to add new knowledge and information to the IAO and its staff. The colleagues participated its benefits are able to improve the quality of their work.
- *HU/2017/PR/0009 - University level asylum interpreter training* can improve the quality of the procedure by the work of trained translators. As such it can be considered as a secondary contribution factor.
- Other relevant project is the *MMIA-1.1.9/3-2016-00001 (SFC code is still not available) - Modernisation of the national asylum registration*. Unfortunately, it started only after 30 June 2017, thus it is not possible to evaluate its contribution to the monitoring system or the improvement of the asylum procedure.

Indicators show the following:

- The number of country of origin information products and fact-finding missions conducted with the assistance of the Fund has achieved 205% which is an impressive number (data source: indicator SO1 C4). However, this data does not give information about the knowledge and information internalisation.
- The number of projects supported under this Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate asylum policies in Member States has achieved 27% which means that it has a lack from the required number pro-rate. (data source: indicator SO1 C5)
- The number of persons trained in asylum-related topics with the assistance of the Fund has achieved 15% which means it has a relevant lack from the required number pro-rate (data source: indicator SO1 R3).

Overall, the projects enlisted indicate that the MS and IAO made progress towards improving the national system in this field. However, these processes might be accelerated and it would be also important to focus on the incorporation of new knowledge and information into the daily routine of the IAO staff.

1.1.5	What progress was made towards the establishment, development and implementation of national resettlement programmes and strategies, and other humanitarian admission programmes, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?
-------	---

	<p>The NP contains the following short funding priority (SO1 NO3 FP1): <i>Selection of persons for resettlement, e.g. travel cost, interpretation cost, subsistence cost. Expected result is: Effective selection missions, selected persons for resettlement in line with the pledging.</i></p> <p>It would indicate that Hungary is committed to receive resettled refugees. In fact, Hungary allowed the resettlement of 20 refugees in 2014, 20 in 2015 by Gov. Decree 86/2014 (III.18.). Resettlement was not undertaken by Hungary in 2016 and in 2017. It must be noted that the quota undertaken in 2014 and 2015 were not fully utilized. (Based on the information provided by the IAO, 6 and 16 Syrians have been resettled, respectively.) The SO1 C6 indicator shows that 22 resettled refugee were received in the whole examined period which is only 55 percent of the aim which was undertaken (40) (data source: indicator SO1 C6).</p> <p>Relevant projects under National Objective 3 in this SO are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HU/2016/PR/0002 - Selection Mission 2014/2015. It helped the selection of the people concerned in the resettlement processes. • HU/2017/PR/0001 – Evaluation of resettlement programs. It would be very useful to learn its results but unfortunately this project is still running. • HU/2016/RP/0001 - National resettlement program helps the integration of the resettled refugees. In this sense, the contribution of the Fund was almost full-fledged. However, this project is still running, thus its evaluation is not possible yet. <p>It can be considered that resettlement programs work only due to the Fund. It means that its contribution is more than significant in this field even if the aimed number has not been achieved. However, it must be mentioned that the scale of the resettlement program was almost negligible.</p>
--	---

1.2	Specific objective 2: Integration/legal migration - Support legal migration to the Member States in line with their economic and social needs such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and promote the effective integration of third-country nationals.
	The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to supporting legal migration to the Member States in accordance with their economic and social needs, such as labour market needs, while safeguarding the integrity of the immigration systems of Member States, and to promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals?
	The Fund approached the economic and social needs of migrants in accordance with the national migration strategy and the NP. This approach can be considered as a comprehensive and progressive way. Most of the projects dealing with the integration of immigrants aim labour

	<p>market integration. It might be important to help increase the number of TCNs with residence permits for gainful activity (in 2014: 13.010, in 2015: 12.650, in 2016: 14.500), however general economic tendencies could also help this increase (CSO, 2017a).</p> <p>Safeguarding the integrity of the immigration system was not as important as integration, especially labour market integration. The negative attitudes towards migrants could destroy the trust even in the immigration system since any potential applicant reside in Hungary (e.g. a residence permit holder who plans to apply for national settlement permit) could feel that the Hungarian authorities will be unwelcoming to him/her. Due to this factor, the maintenance of the immigration system and the co-operation with other Member States or other partners has not been in the focus of the Fund-financed projects, thus the Fund could not achieve progress in this sub-field. Another problematic sub-field is the monitoring and evaluation of integration policies since the number of projects supported to develop, monitor and evaluate integration policies in Member States is currently zero.</p> <p>Due to the above mentioned circumstances, the Fund-financed projects have not achieved a relevant progress in promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals. Although some of the projects could contribute to this goal, the mentioned attitude change made a significant positive promotion impossible.</p> <p>Overall, the Fund could significantly contribute to integration/legal migration processes but its potential contribution could not be fulfilled due to the political context that has been created in Hungary.</p> <p>It was reflected by the beneficiaries of the Fund when they were asked to evaluate the coherence between the regulation of legal migration in Hungary and the aims of the Fund in a five-degree scale. 34.5% of them evaluated it with 1 in a five-degree scale where 1 is the most negative evaluation. The average was 2.21).</p>
--	--

1.2.1	<p>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?</p>
	<p>There is no infringement procedure against Hungary concerning regular migration issues (however there are several ones concerning asylum issues as it was mentioned in Specific Objective 1). It must be reiterated here that the Hungarian government has formed a political and societal environment in which immigration is not desirable (as it is described in Section 2). Its consequence is that several implementation measures (e.g. the implementation of Directive 2014/36/EU) have had a positive impact on migration policy but they could not fulfil their full</p>

effects since the unfavourable environment has decreased their possibilities.

The number of residing foreigners has slightly increased in Hungary. There were 140.536 foreign citizens in Hungary on 1 January 2014 and 151.132 on the same day of 2017 (CSO, 2017b). It must be mentioned that this number includes EU nationals as well. The statistical data of the IAO can confirm this trend (IAO, 2016 and 2017). It shows that 76.713 non-EEC foreigners had any kind of resident permits (except persons under international or humanitarian protection) on 31 December 2014, this number was 88.200 on the same day of 2015 and 105.118 in 2016. Based on these numbers, the trend is obvious: Hungary has not become a country that is undesirable for immigrants.

It is difficult to define how the Fund contributed to these results. There have been several projects financed by the Fund which aimed the integration of third-country nationals into the labour market. These projects support migrants in multiple ways: with language courses, trainings, social work, consultation, trainee programs, etc. Unfortunately, it would require a comprehensive research among the TCNs concerned to point out what the exact results of these projects were but it is sure that they could contribute to the favourable processes. However, there is a strong assumption that Fund-financed projects can only support immigration in the long run but not in the short run since their projects are able to help migrants who are still in Hungary or who have already decided to migrate to Hungary but are not able to attract more TCNs to the MS. Obviously, the improving situation of new-comers can attract more immigrants in a few years. It might be an indirect effect of the Fund but this Report is not appropriate to measure it.

Another distortive factor which might help increase the number of TCNs with residence permits for the purpose of gainful activity is the Hungarian labour market situation. It has significantly improved from 2014. The data of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (hereinafter: CSO) show that 4.1 million people had jobs in 2014 and 4.351 million in 2016. This general trend might be able to partly explain the mentioned increase of TCNs with residence permits for the purpose of gainful activity. Furthermore, there are also labour shortages in several sectors in Hungary. (See Reuters, 2016) Based on these circumstances it cannot be exactly evaluated how the Fund contributed to the mentioned improvement since there were several favourable factors maintained by the general recovery of the national economy. (European Commission, 2017b) However, the progress in this field is obvious and must be recorded.

It must be mentioned that the following indicators are not able to reflect the achieved progress:

- The number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures (participants of family reunification) supported under this Fund is 30 which means that 15% of the goal has been fulfilled.
- The number of target group persons assisted by this Fund through integration measures

	<p>in the framework of national, local and regional strategies is 1352 which means that 14% of the goal has been fulfilled. It might show that the Fund-financed projects can help a certain part of the target group in their integration but the above mentioned improvement was partly achieved by general economic tendencies (data source: indicator SO2 R2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The share of third-country nationals (TCNs) having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs was 30.87% in 2015 and 25.54% in 2014. Unfortunately, data are not available from 2016 and 2017 thus conclusions cannot be drawn (data source: indicator SO2 I2). <p>The beneficiaries of the Fund were asked about their opinions and they answered that there were relevant step-backs in the field of supporting legal migration. (69% of them evaluated it with 1 in a five-degree scale where 1 is the most negative evaluation. The average was 1.62.) However, they appreciated the Fund's contribution. Its average was 3.62 in a similar scale.</p>
--	--

1.2.2	<p>What progress was made towards promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?</p>
	<p>In Hungary, the projects that were financed by the Fund promoted the effective integration of TCNs exclusively since in the several times described political and societal environment no other actor worked on any promotion in this field. The projects concerned are enlisted here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HU/2016/PR/0031 - Colours Festival 3.0 • HU/2016/PR/0033 - World Tour in the Colourful Village • HU/2016/PR/0034 - House of Cultures, culture-house of all • HU/2016/PR/0035 - ImmigroFest - Embracing City <p>These projects helped to popularize the topic of migration among the Hungarian citizens which was a concrete aim of SO2 NO2 (Programmes facilitating inter-cultural dialogue; supporting the development of an inclusive attitude e.g. conferences, documentary films, social events, publications)</p> <p>The government-financed campaign had a nation-wide effect while the Fund projects</p>

could only have local effects. Thereby, the projects that are mentioned above had a much lower effect.

The general political context can explain why Hungary does not wish to pay relevant attention to promoting the effective integration of TCNs. Thus, the Fund made the only positive motion toward the promotion which means that it was a relevant contribution.

The following indicators should underpin the conclusion:

- The number of target group persons assisted by this Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies was mentioned above too: 14% (data source: indicator SO2 R2).
- Employment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not available from 2017 but the numbers from 2014, 2015 and 2016 show a highly negative tendency which confirm our conclusions (data source: indicator SO2 I2).
- Unemployment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not handled in Hungary thus conclusion cannot be drawn from these data (data source: indicator SO2 I3).
- Activity rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not available from 2017 but the numbers from 2014, 2015 and 2016 show a negative tendency which confirm our conclusions (data source: indicator SO2 I4).
- The share of early leavers from education and training: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not handled in Hungary thus conclusion cannot be drawn from these data (data source: indicator SO2 I5).
- The share of 30 to 34-years-olds with tertiary educational attainment: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not handled in Hungary thus conclusion cannot be drawn from these data (data source: indicator SO2 I6).
- The share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals indicator is not handled in Hungary thus conclusion cannot be drawn from these data (data source: indicator SO2 I7).

The conclusion would be that the numbers show step-backs in this field. It is very important to note that available numbers are relative ones (SO2 I2 and I4). These are probably the results of

	<p>the improving general economic situation as it was described above (1.2.1.) and it is not able to show the effectiveness of the Fund.</p> <p>The beneficiaries of the Fund confirm that there were relevant step-backs in promoting the effective integration of third-country nationals. They evaluated it in a five-degree scale (1-negative, 5-positive) where 79.3% of the respondents responded with 1. Its average is 1.69 which number confirms our evaluation above. Nevertheless, they thought that the Fund could contribute to promoting the integration of TCNs. Its average is 3.72 in a similar scale.</p>
--	---

1.2.3	<p>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?</p>
	<p>There were no specific steps toward co-operation despite the fact that the NP contains the following Funding Priorities (SO2 NO3 FP1-FP4):</p> <p><i>1. statistical systems and IT systems of the authorities concerned 2. Development of a curriculum in compliance with the EU and national legislation; drafting and implementing methodology guidelines; development of professional procedures for the staff of relevant authorities dealing with return 3. Development of return procedures also by organising study tours and sharing best practices, exchanging of experience etc. 4. Research activities serving the development of return policies and practices – eg.: on the alternatives to detention.</i></p> <p>It must be mentioned that there has been an intensifying co-operation between the so-called Visegrád countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia) (hereinafter: V4). The V4 group has a specific approach to migration which is a bit divergent from the mainstream EU attitude. (V4, 2017). However, this co-operation has been existing in a rather political level than in a practical level so far.</p> <p>Beyond the V4 co-operation, Hungary does fulfil its obligations stem from the EU membership but does not undertake any additional role to form a specific co-operation. Therefore, it can be considered that there are no specific steps in this field.</p> <p>There was no specific project financed by the Fund which aimed the co-operation between the Member States, thus the Fund could not help the convergence. However, it can rather be explained by the cautious attitude of Hungary towards the migration since 2015 and not the lack of intention from the Fund. This conclusion is confirmed by the following indicators:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of local, regional and national policy frameworks/measures/tools in place for the integration of third country nationals and involving civil society, migrant communities as well as all other relevant stakeholders, as a result of the measures supported under this Fund which is 86. It means that the original goal was overachieved 12 times. It must be noted that local measures have also increased this number. There is no relevant international action among the components of this number, therefore it is deceptive to consider it as a good indicator of the co-operation among MSs (data source: indicator SO2 C3). <p>The number of cooperation projects with other Member States on integration of third country nationals supported under this Fund is zero, since there was no such project planned. It shows that this aim was not important in Hungary (data source: indicator SO2 C4).</p>
--	---

1.2.4	<p>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?</p>
	<p>Integration is one of the principles of the NP. The document defines not only its principles (e.g. integration) but even its more concrete Funding priorities (SO2 NO2 FP1-FP4) which are:</p> <p><i>1. Supporting the development and implementation of local integration action plans in line with the national integration strategy, e.g. local services in the fields of education, housing, social/health system, legal guidance</i></p> <p><i>2. Services directly helping the integration of TCNs– particularly beneficiaries of international protection –e.g.: measures to facilitate access to labour market, mentoring, operating job search clubs for TCNs</i></p> <p><i>3. Programmes facilitating inter-cultural dialogue; supporting the development of an inclusive attitude e.g. conferences, documentary films, social events, publications</i></p> <p><i>4. Organising information campaigns with the help of the media for the host society about immigration and TCN communities; also for TCN communities on the host country e.g. online, telecommunication and printed media tools</i></p> <p>The Fund and the projects that have been financed by the Fund follow the guideline which ensues from these objectives. Several projects deal with the Funding priorities mentioned. It is not necessary to name all of them but it might be useful to highlight a few in different topics ones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HU/2016/PR/0003 - C'mon, let's speak Hungarian! • HU/2016/PR/0005 - Skills On!

- HU/2016/PR/0008 - Hungarian. Language. Knowledge.
- HU/2016/PR/0009 - MentoHRing
- HU/2016/PR/0016 - Inclusive kindergartens and schools
- HU/2016/PR/0026 - Migrant entrepreneurs 3.0 – Migrant entrepreneur service centre for migrants

Most of these projects aimed the Funding priority 2. However, Funding priority 3 was also aimed (see it in 1.2.2) while the Funding priorities 1 and 4 seem less important in the implementation.

The list does not show a comprehensive picture about the diversity of the Fund-financed projects. However, the complexity of the mentioned projects is able to point out that labour market integration is particularly important for the Fund. In general, these projects could help to achieve the principles of the NP.

Based on the above, the integration of immigrants might be one of the most successful fields (the integration of people under humanitarian protection might be an exception as it is unfolded in SO 1.) and the Fund could significantly contribute to it since its projects have been in line with the NP.

There is a relevant indicator which underpins this conclusion: the number of local, regional and national policy frameworks/measures/tools in place for the integration of third country nationals and involving civil society, migrant communities as well as all other relevant stakeholders, as a result of the measures supported under this Fund was much higher than it was planned (see above in 1.2.3). It means that there were several measures and actions in this field (data source: indicator SO2 C3).

The other indicator which is relevant is the following:

- The number of projects supported under this Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate integration policies in Member States. Its result is zero (data source: indicator SO2 C5).

It must be noted that these sorts of projects would be important in the evaluation and precision of planning but capacity building is possible without them. Thus, taking this indicator into account is not necessary in this field.

1.3	Specific objective 3: Return - Enhance fair and effective return strategies in the Member States, which contribute to combating illegal immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit.
	The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to enhancing fair and effective return strategies in the Member States which contribute to combating illegal immigration, with an emphasis on sustainability of return and effective readmission in the countries of origin and transit?
	<p>Hungary shifted its migration policy towards a way which was not a typical EU MS response to the effect of the migration crisis in 2015. The present routine of return, at least the return of rejected asylum seekers, is based on the special border practice (See: 1.3.2.). Within this newly established system all rejected asylum seekers were handled so directly from the border. Furthermore, rejected asylum seekers typically leave the transit zones without any physical enforcement.</p> <p>The number of returned persons has slightly decreased due to establishment of transit zones and fences. There were 5,885 third country nationals ordered to leave in 2014, 11,750 in 2015 and 10,765 in 2016 (EUROSTAT, 2017b). Most probably the decrease has continued in 2017 too. The number of returned persons after an order to leave are the following: 4,345 in 2014, 5,975 in 2015 and 780 in 2016 (EUROSTAT, 2017c). This process jeopardizes the fulfilment of the aims undertaken as it is already visible in the relevant indicator numbers.</p> <p>The co-operation with other countries, Member States and (international) organizations has not been broadened relevantly. Before 2015 it was not necessary, and after 2015, Hungary chosen a special solution which didn't require international co-operation, except the organized Frontex joint operations. In the first half of 2015 the Hungarian government was uncertain to decide which strategy should be chosen – that could be the reason why relevant capacity building did not happen.</p> <p>The Fund could relevantly contribute to the measures accompanying the return process which is especially important to answer the new challenges of return. These measures and projects have helped to facilitate humane procedures the lack of which was ardently criticized in the border procedure. (See: 1.3.2.)</p> <p>Therefore the Fund could fulfil a kind of symbolic role related to the return procedure. However its contribution cannot be considered to be relevant, except for the above mentioned accompanying measures.</p>

1.3.1	What progress was made towards supporting the measures accompanying return procedures, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?
	<p>The humane and effective return and readmission policy is a focus area of the European Commission. (European Commission, 2017c). The NP Funding Priorities (SO3 NO1 FP1-FP5) of accompanying measures aim this goal as well:</p> <p><i>1. Providing services in detention centres and in the community shelter – e.g.: psychological, social assistance and legal aid, counselling, dissemination of information and pre-departure reintegration assistance 2. Establishment of a new multi-use detention facility that is flexible based on the needs of the target group and will provide short-term accommodation for returnees during the joint returns, and developing the existing facilities (e.g. renovation, modernisation, installation of security system and necessary equipment). Special needs of vulnerable persons will be catered for 3. Purchase of vehicle used for the transportation of persons subject to return policing procedures 4. Development of competences, language training of staff involved in return procedures and also of staff working in detention centres or in community shelter 5. Monitoring and evaluation of the removal activities</i></p> <p>It is desirable to check whether all of the goals named above as humane, effective and sustainable return has been fulfilled since these measures could support the return process.</p> <p>The following projects can be considered as accompanying measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • < > - Complex Reintegration Assistance for Assisted Voluntary Returnees <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HU/2016/PR/0015 - Hungarian Assisted Voluntary Return, Reintegration and Information Programme</p> <p>Other projects are also relevant and to be mentioned here since these aimed the NO1 of this SO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HU/2016/PR/0001 - Supportive Services for Third Country Nationals under Alien Policing Procedure. • HU/2016/PR/0006 - Proficiency and competency. • HU/2016/PR/0027 - Enhancing efficiency of proceedings related to migration detentions

- HU/2016/PR/0028 - Safe transportation of individuals subject of return procedure.
- One more project was planned but it was withdrawn due to the changing environment: HU/2016/PR/0036 - Psycho-social assistance in the Community Shelter Balassagyarmat III.

All the mentioned projects aimed at achieving the following aims which are recorded in the NP: “In order to facilitate smooth and humane return the training of officials of authorities concerned in the field of return is given special emphasis. HU intends to maintain staff with specific expertise by training and further training of them. HU intends to develop the authorities’ passenger transport capacities in order to ensure the transportation of irregular migrants to the detention centres and for removals.”

These projects helped to make a relevant progress in this field. Virtually, all institutions and venues were covered by them. Persons under return procedure and the personnel of the National Police Headquarters has received services and new equipments were also obtained. The quality of the return process could improve due to the trainings and direct services.

The Fund financed these projects which could develop the returning system thus it can be considered that the Fund contributed to achieving a progress. The contribution was exclusive since the Member State did not facilitate the improvement of the accompanying measures, although the original aims of the Fund were not fulfilled.

The following indicators help to evaluate the improvements:

- The number of returnees who received pre- or post-return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund is only 810 which means that only 18% of the original goal has been achieved. This number is probably low due to the special Hungarian approach to this field (data source: indicator SO3 R2).
- The number of monitored removal operations co-financed by the Fund is zero probably due also to the special Hungarian approach to this field (data source: indicator SO3 R4).
- The number of returnees who have received pre- or post-return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund is 1183 but the number of persons participating in the granted voluntary return program is only 178. It means that only 10% of the returned persons were reached (11,100 is the combined number in 2014, 2015 and 2016. See in the overall question) and the voluntary returnees proportion is around 1%. Therefore, it is certain that the Fund could not induce comprehensive processes in this field. However, it could create best practices in this field (data source: indicator SO3 R7).

	<p>The number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres is zero probably due also to the special Hungarian approach to this field (data source: indicator SO3 R8).</p>
--	--

1.3.2	<p>What progress was made towards effective implementation of return measures (voluntary and forced), and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?</p>
	<p><i>The NP also names the following goal in SO3 NO2 FPI: Implementation of assisted voluntary return programmes with cooperation between IOM and organisations involved in migration management e.g. assistance to acquire travel documents; purchase flight tickets; providing departure, transit and arrival assistance. This goal has only been partly fulfilled (as the indicators underpin it at the end of 1.3.1) but the Fund contributed significantly to its fulfilment.</i></p> <p>Within the framework of the Hungarian Assisted Voluntary Return, Reintegration and Information Programme (HU/2016/PR/0015) 870 returning persons have been undertaken since the beginning of the project. It would be a relevant number in Hungary but the achieved number of voluntarily returning persons is 177 as it was mentioned above. There were 11.100 third country nationals returned following an order to leave in 2014, 2015 and 2016 (EUROSTAT, 2017c). It means that 1.6 % of them were returned by the above named IOM project. (It must be noted that the implementation of this project started in July 2016.) This measure cannot be considered as a relevant since the IOM and the Member State worked previously together in similar projects. (It was also financed by the previous Fund.)</p> <p>In practice, it is a special return procedure which helped to increase the efficiency at the border. It is not visible since the return processes are carried out without an order to leave. In practice, persons concerned have left the transit zones without a legal act and have returned back to Serbia without readmission procedure. That is why the below referred SO3 I1 indicator is not able to reflect on the reality. However, this side effect of the asylum procedure was criticized by human rights organizations as it can be seen in the referred AIDA report. However it must be mentioned that the proportion of recognized persons has increased due to the transits zones. (IAO, 2016 and 2017) (Applicants can not disappear under the asylum procedure.) It means that less return is needed than without the transit zones would have been.</p> <p>The following indicators help to evaluate the improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund, persons who returned voluntarily was only 177 out of 2000. It means that only 9% of the original aim has been achieved. Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund, persons

	<p>who were removed was zero (data source: indicator SO3 R3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave cannot be examined since the data is missing from 2017 (data source: indicator SO3 R5). • Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of TCN ordered to leave: Unfortunately data are not available from 2017 but numbers from 2014, 2015 and 2016 show that 74 % of TCNs ordered to leave were returned following the orders (3440 out to 4659). This proportion decreased to 53.5 % in 2015 (5635 out to 10.528) and 17 % in 2016 (1862 out to 10.970). This numbers are not suitable to describe the effectiveness of the Fund since persons who were not detained left the country without indicating it to the IAO especially in 2015 and early 2016. (data source: indicator SO3 I1) • Return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants: Hungary has not handled these sort of data. Thus, conclusions cannot be drawn. (data source: indicator SO3 I2) • Effective returns of rejected asylum applicants: Hungary has not handled these sort of data. Thus, conclusions cannot be drawn (data source: indicator SO3 I3) <p>Overall, the implementation of the border procedure can be considered as an effective one but in some cases procedural guarantees might not be fulfilled. The Fund could contribute to the non-border procedures as it was described above but the border procedure became more important in the last 2 years. Unfortunately, returns due to the border procedure can not be perfectly examined since any asylum-seeker can return back to Serbia without an order to leave since they are called upon to leave the transit zone toward Serbia in their rejection decision on asylum thus there is no alien-police case connecting to these leaves.</p>
--	--

1.3.3	<p>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?</p>
	<p>There are four Funding Priorities in the NP connected to this filed (SO3 NO3 FP1-FP4):</p> <p><i>1. Developing migration databases, statistical systems and IT systems of the authorities concerned 2. Development of a curriculum in compliance with the EU and national legislation; drafting and implementing methodology guidelines; development of professional procedures for the staff of relevant authorities dealing with return 3.</i></p>

	<p><i>Development of return procedures also by organising study tours and sharing best practices, exchanging of experience etc. 4. Research activities serving the development of return policies and practices – eg.: on the alternatives to detention</i></p> <p>There is no relevant measure on a practical level in this field.</p> <p>There is no independent readmission agreement bound by Hungary with another third country since these have been taken by the EU itself in the last years (European Commission, 2017d).</p> <p>The Fund did not support any projects that aimed to achieve the goal mentioned in the question. This conclusion is underpinned by the following indicator: the number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund is zero (data source: indicator SO3 R6). In principle, the MS could organize joint charter flights financed by the Fund. However, as representatives of the Ministry of Interior emphasise, FRONTEX has increasingly undertaken the finance in this field.</p>
--	--

1.3.4	<p>What progress was made towards building capacity on return, and how did the Fund contribute to achieving this progress?</p>
	<p>The new border procedure can be considered as a relevant progress towards building capacity since the order of magnitude of return processes could significantly increase due to its speed. (See 1.3.2.). However, it must be reiterated that legal challenges can emerge concerning this kind of return procedure.</p> <p>It must be mentioned that the HU/2016/PR/0028 - Safe transportation of individuals subject of return procedure project helped <i>to obtain 6 specially designed police vehicles for forced transportation to be used exclusively for safely transporting TCN's subject of return procedure. The main activities include the purchase of 4 vehicles suitable for transporting 6 detained third-country nationals subject of return procedure, and 2 vehicles suitable for transporting 36 people.</i></p> <p>There is only one relevant progress in this field which is described by the following indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of persons trained on return related topics with the assistance of the Fund is 668. It means that 101% of the original goal was achieved (data source: indicator SO3 R1).

	<p>The other relevant indicator shows that there has been no progress in the monitoring and evaluation of return policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of projects supported under the Fund to develop, monitor and evaluate return policies in Member States is zero (data source: indicator SO3 C4) <p>Therefore, it can be stated that the Fund could contribute to progress in certain less important areas but Hungary could increase its return capacity independently from the Fund support due to its mentioned transit procedure. However, this return capacity is hardly measurable since we do not know how many people would have entered to Hungary without the current transit zone system (see in the first paragraph of the overall question of this SO).</p>
--	--

1.4	<p>Specific objective 4: Solidarity - Enhance the solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation.</p>
	<p>The overall question: How did the Fund contribute to enhancing solidarity and responsibility-sharing between the Member States, in particular towards those most affected by migration and asylum flows, including through practical cooperation?</p>
	<p>Hungary was one of the most affected countries by the migration and refugee crisis in 2015, therefore Hungary was interested in elaborating effective solutions to handle even an extreme high number of asylum claims and to provide proper service for asylum-seekers. However, Hungary's vision of the desirable solution has been different from the majority of EU MSs'.</p> <p>Taking this fact into consideration, it can be stated that Hungary did not enhance the cooperation in this field. Therefore, the Fund could not contribute to any improvement. However, it must be emphasized that it is the consequence of the divergent approaches and not the deficiency of the Fund.</p>

1.4.1	<p>How did the Fund contribute to the transfer of asylum applicants (relocation as per Council Decisions (EU) 2015/1253 and 2015/1601)?</p>
	<p>As Hungary does not execute the Relocation system (Hungarian Government, 2017), the Fund could not contribute to the transfer of applicants of international protection between Member States.</p>

--	--

1.4.2	How did the Fund contribute to the transfer between Member States of beneficiaries of international protection?
	As Hungary does cooperate neither in the obligatory Relocation system (Hungarian Government, 2017) nor in the volunteer one, the Fund could not contribute to the transfer of beneficiaries of international protection between Member States.

2	Efficiency
---	------------

2	The overall question: Were the general objectives of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost?
	As the projects started later than planned and almost none of them have been implemented until 30th of June 2017, it is difficult to answer the overall question. However, it is possible to point at some elements of the management procedures (see Section 2.1 and 2.2.) that ensured efficiency. Due to the strict financial evaluating rules of the applications the eligible costs were reasonable within the analysed period. According to the information available, the same results and quality could not have been reached at a lower cost. The products were procured and the services were provided at competitive prices, procurement procedures were carried out according to the national rules, and the salaries were also defined by the labour market in the projects. Both planning and implementation was appropriate from a financial perspective, it can be said that the value for money principle was implemented through the reference period. Lower costs could not be achieved especially in case of the public authorities as these organisations did not apply for the costs of the management (as they were covered by their annual budget). Taking the findings of the beneficiary survey into consideration, the external evaluator considers the costs justified given the outputs that have been achieved until now. In addition, the external evaluator considers AMIF as a program having relatively low administrative costs on Fund level and adequate cost on project level.

2.1	To what extent were the results of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost in terms of deployed financial and human resources?
	The guideline of the call for proposals specified (among many other issues) the requirements both of the applicants (organisational, economic and financial) and of the proposals themselves

(technical, professional and financial). In addition, it gave information about the evaluation criteria itself. In line with the general rules of evaluation a proposal only qualified for funding, if based on its evaluation, the proposal reached a given percentage of the maximum score available. The projects were assessed by an independent Evaluation Committee (hereafter: EC). The Evaluation Committee is composed of members and observers. The members must have relevant experience in the fields of Hungarian and European migration. The head of the Committee is from the RA designated by the Responsible Person. The process of the EC results in a list of proposals selected for funding to submit to the Responsible Person for approval. The applications are evaluated by the Evaluation Committee even financially and from a professional point of view. During the financial evaluation the experts of the Evaluation Committee analysed the cost-effectiveness of the expenditures (including the selection of contractors), the eligibility of the costs and the financial reliability and financial contribution of the organisations applying for funding. Moreover, the Evaluation Committee had a right to reduce the over-planned costs. EC requested 18% of the applicants to reduce their over-planned expenses and thereby the total grant amount of the AMIF projects were reduced by 14,8%. For the control of personal costs the Evaluation Committee took the Hungarian wage scale of the related professions into consideration.

The overestimated costs could be filtered out due to the regulation that obliged the beneficiaries to call for tenders if the costs of specific activities are above 1.000.000 HUF.

Public procurement procedures and procurements are implemented through a request of three price offers. Thereby, the procedure incorporates the obligation to check market prices. It should be mentioned that there are some exceptions to the requirement for the submission of at least three tenders due to a change in legalisation (Government Decree No. 459/2016 (XII.23.)). However, the impact of these changes still cannot be evaluated, as the modified Act on Public Procurement came into force in 1st April 2017 (just three months before the end of the scrutinized period).

At the Fund level, the costs of technical assistance reached only 2.68% of the total budget.

At project level, the project management costs had to remain below 8%. In addition, a 7% flat rate was also ensured for covering the indirect costs (that cannot be identified by the beneficiaries as being directly attributed to the project but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project) of the beneficiaries. The external evaluator considers AMIF as a program having adequate administrative costs at the project level .

Representatives of the beneficiaries could specify their level of agreement or disagreement on five-point scales (1 = “not at all”, 2 = „slightly”, 3 = „moderately”, 4 = „very”, 5 = “extremely”) while answering various questions. According to most of them, the financial resources were sufficient to implement the activities of the project on high standards (mean: 4.0). However, it should be also mentioned that some of the respondents pointed at the low level of personal costs that did not allow to hire high-quality subcontractors and employees. Almost none of the

	<p>respondents agreed with the statement: “it would be possible to reach the same results and quality at a lower cost” (mean: 1.6). Almost all of the beneficiaries emphasised that the activities of the project really supported the achievement of the aims that had previously been defined (mean: 4.7). Taking these findings into consideration, the costs can be seen as justified.</p> <p>Although, it would be possible to specify the costs per beneficiary of a service but comparing these costs (and thereby use the method of benchmarking) would be not possible due to the difficulties that are described in the chapter “Simplification and reduction of administrative burden”.</p>
--	--

2.2	<p>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?</p>
	<p>Project supervisors are responsible for the financial-economic supervision and control, and the examination of professional effectiveness of the projects. During their analysis they respect and take into consideration the Hungarian and international general rules of supervision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to examine the realisation of the projects from the aspect of conformity with the Hungarian and European Union legislation (Act on State Budget, Act on Accounting, Act on VAT, community competition law, community policies, etc.), and the agreement set up with the beneficiaries; • to check and analyse the project interim report submitted by the beneficiaries on the project implementation (narratives and financial claims); <p>The Beneficiaries are obliged to report on the progress of project implementation via the IT system in every two months and the final report after the end of the execution. 45 days after the arrival of their report, the Management Team declares whether the costs emerged at the Beneficiaries are eligible, recorded, related to the objectives of the subsidy and the implementation of the project. If it is necessary additional supporting documents can be requested and on-the-spot control could also be carried out;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the document and procedure of public procurement; • to certificate payment and recovery requests prior to making any payments/recoveries; • to check and analyse beneficiaries’ final reports, to establish the final eligible costs;

- to realise on-the-spot control of the projects (financial and operational);

Operational and financial on-the-spot checks are carried out in line with Commission Implementing Regulation on general principles of controls and in line with the Control Strategy of the RA; they are conducted based on the annual control plan of the RA (on the basis of risk assessment and meeting the criteria for representativeness, non-statistical sampling method) and ad hoc on-the-spot controls when necessary. In the course of the on-the-spot control they pay special attention to the supervision of the operational/professional implementation of the project, they check invoices and other conclusive accounting documents, supervise the observation of national and community rules, with special regard to the rules on the accountability of expenditures, public procurement, state subsidies, equality of opportunity, information and publicity, and to the prevention, detection and correction of irregularities.

The RA conducted altogether 6 operational on-the-spot controls between August and October 2016. The selection of the projects for control was conducted according to the Control Strategy of the RA, based on risk analysis and meeting the representativity criteria, as opposed to statistical sampling. The RA put the projects in order based on the evaluation of weighted risk factors, selected those who achieved the highest scores, altogether 20% of the projects, then examined whether they meet the representativity criteria. If the selected sample did not fulfil all the criteria of representativeness, the RA added the projects that scored highest on the criteria in question.

The majority of the problems were minor: formal errors; discrepancies between documents due to data inaccuracies; lack of clauses appropriately stating the document retention obligation or the obligation to tolerate control procedures in contracts between beneficiaries and third party contractual partners; disorganized or incomplete project documentation; 1-2 months of delays in project implementation; reports that do not reflect the actual progress. These errors have been corrected according to the proposals of the RA, or their correction is in progress. In one case, the RA revealed severe errors that put the achievement of project objectives errors at risk. RA ordered the correction of legal documents from both legal and technical aspects and declined the payment of unapproved project costs.

The RA, as a part of the administrative control check that the public procurement(s) or other procurement(s) answer the requirement of law. Checks connecting to the public procurement(s) are carried out by RA before the institution and also after accomplishment of the procedures. These controls are supplementary to each other and the system of controls is created in a way that it ensures the compliance with national and union rules and the filtering of non-eligible expenditures.

In case of suspicion of fraud the RA has an obligation to initiate criminal procedure ‘Government Decree No. 135/2015. (VI. 2.) on the use of the funds of Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and Internal Security Fund in the period of 2014-2020’ (Article 12). The RA designates a responsible staff member for handling irregularities. It should be also mentioned that RA repeatedly gives trainings to its staff and the Beneficiaries on the subject (for detecting and

	avoiding fraud) in line with its training plan.
--	---

3	Relevance
---	-----------

3	<p>The overall question: Did the objectives of the interventions funded by the Fund correspond to the actual needs?</p> <p>Partly. The interventions funded by the Fund would have been able to correspond to the planned needs but the migration crisis in 2015 has completely changed the environment. The National Programme, the Fund and its interventions were designed based on a forecast which could not follow this changing environment. Although, a new project was designed after 2015 (MMIA-1.1.10/3-2016-00001 (SFC code is still not available) - Development of services provided in transit zones) but even this new project was not able in itself to correspond to the actual situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Fund's interventions were able to correspond to the needs that have not been changed by the migration crisis or the political reaction to this crisis. Most of these unchanged needs were related to integration measures (e.g. integration needs of TCNs in schools and in the labour-market, etc.).</p> <p>The structure of measurements had been designed for a totally different migration context. The programming was carried out in 2013 and 2014, before any prognostications of the crisis. The new environment caused by global processes were not expected in the national strategy and later on Hungary decided to give a new response to the emerging new challenges. Hungary partly diverged from the National Programme in this new situation. Therefore, the National Programme and the Fund were able to respond to the actual needs only to a limited extent. It must be emphasized that it is not the consequence of an erroneous design or an incorrect implementation. It is the consequence of the new challenges and a new response to them.</p> <p>Overall, due to the changed situation the Fund established interventions only partly corresponded to the actual needs.</p>
---	---

3.1	Did the objectives set by the Member State in the National Programme respond to the identified needs?
-----	---

As it has been elaborated in the previous chapters, Hungarian asylum and return policies have changed significantly in 2015 due to the migration crisis (see: IOM, 2017). Return and solidarity policies have also changed slightly.

Due to the space limitation, it is possible to highlight only a few crucial objectives of the NP in order to demonstrate the differences between the NP and the identified needs. Sentences in italic are objectives taken from the NP which demonstrate the planned reaction to the identified needs. The sentences in regular font style demonstrate the actual responses to the actual needs.

In asylum:

- *In order to actively contribute to the EU becoming an “international protection zone” HU is committed to continue facilitating the protection, security and integration of TCNs in need of international protection, in compliance with EU and Hungarian legislation (NP 2016, p. 8).* – Hungary did not aim to adapt to the fluctuations in the asylum situation, and was not able to react rapidly to changes in the numbers and composition of applicants. It aimed to decrease the number of asylum-seekers which can be obviously evaluated as a different response.
- *HU intends to enhance legal guarantees of the TCNs in all phases of the asylum procedure, and to support the rights of applicants with continuous information (NP 2016, p. 8).* – As it is described in Specific Objective 1, there are no relevant steps in this field.
- *HU intends to raise the standard of efficient and fair asylum procedures. Further priorities are the development and quality improvement of the existing institutional system and services so that asylum seekers arriving in HU can be provided with adequate reception conditions (NP 2016, p. 8).* – It is described in Specific Objective 1, almost all new arrivals must stay in the transit zones which cannot be considered as adequate reception centres, and due to possible security costs it neither can be considered as cost-effective per capita.

In solidarity:

- *Taking part in international solidarity, HU wishes to provide assistance to countries under great asylum pressure by participating in Regional Protection Programmes (NP 2016, p. 22)* – As it is described in Specific Objective 4 and partly in 3 (in 1.3.3), the approach of Hungary and institutions of EU is different regarding solidarity.

In integration/legal migration:

- *As a further goal, HU wishes to become a more inclusive society and intends to reach that this inclusive attitude and openness makes it possible for newcomers not to have to give up their own culture, language and traditions but practice these in harmony with the legal order and values of HU and of the European Union (NP 2016, p. 11).* – As it is described in Specific Objective 2 (especially chapter 1.2.2), Hungary has weakened the image of an inclusive country. In fact, there have been several steps to weaken this image in a sense.
- *In order to receive financial assistance for integration purposes, the beneficiaries of international protection sign an Integration Contract, in the framework of which HU provides financial assistance from national budget and the refugees use the different services of the family support centres, which are maintained from national budget. With the support of AMIF, the quality of services will be improved (NP 2016, p. 12).* – This integration program has been ceased since 2016.
- *Officials in public administration as well as the staff of NGOs involved with TCNs are to receive migrant specific and intercultural trainings (NP 2016, p. 14).* – The Fund supported projects which helped to achieve this objective but overall, the process - which is described above - set a relevant obstacle in this field.

In return:

- *To facilitate smooth and humane return HU wishes to maintain staff with specific expertise by providing training (NP 2016, p. 15).* – The new return model described in Specific Objective 3 cannot be considered as a humane one since it does not lead to prioritising voluntary return as it is also demonstrated in Specific Objective 3.

The NP did not respond to real needs concerning several objectives. The identified needs might have been real and serious at the time of the elaboration of the NP but these needs have changed relevantly in 2015. Neither the NP was able to respond to the actual needs nor the implemented migration policies were able to create new and adequate solutions in accordance with the NP.

The beneficiaries were asked about their opinion on how timely the goals recorded in the NP are. They had to answer on a five-degree scale (1= they are not timely at all, 5= they are perfectly timely). The average of the responses was 3.68. The beneficiaries could answer also whether the activities carried out by AMIF projects could respond to the timely challenges in Hungary. 53,3% of them answered with “partly”.

3.2	Which measures did the Member State put in place to address changing needs?
	<p>Six project proposals, focusing on SO1 NO1 FP3, were withdrawn due to the fact that the reception system had been modified relevantly (See Specific Objective 1.1.2) and thus two important reception facilities were closed. Furthermore, building up a new closed facility and a new reception centre became unnecessary as a result of the transits zones system. These measures were put in place to address the change what was caused by the migration crisis in 2015 and its consequences.</p> <p>As it is also described in Section III, an intercultural dialogue and the social inclusion of migrants to facilitate integration were also strongly supported. However, the RA did not receive applications focusing on SO1 NO1 FP4 and SO1 NO2 FP2. SO1 NO1 FP3 was also not achieved as no related call for proposal were launched by the RA. It might be a result of the changing needs although the rescheduled measures did not help to find responses to the new challenges.</p> <p>Overall, it can be considered that the NP was not modified meanwhile the actual Hungarian policies have been changed – however certain concrete changes happened (e.g.: two facility investments were withdrawn). Its result was that the project structure was able to adapt to the new challenges and needs only to a limited extent. However, it must be mentioned that the new challenges were induced by the new governmental approach after 2015. Therefore, it is understandable why a new modified NP did not try to redress them.</p>

4	Coherence
---	-----------

4	The overall question: Were the objectives set in the national programme coherent with the ones set in other programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work? Was the coherence ensured also during the implementation of the Fund?
	<p>There were no other programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work in Hungary. Therefore, coherence is not a relevant issue related to the Fund and projects supported by the Fund. There is no information even of individual conflicts or parallel financing between the Fund and other programmes funded by EU resources.</p> <p>Furthermore, objectives set in the National Program have unique goals and these stand independently from the objectives set in other planning documents.</p> <p>The Partnership Agreement for Hungary, 2014-2020 concerning the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF), the European Social Fund (ESF), the</p>

	<p>European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) was examined. It has a general goal regarding the promotion of employment through economic development, education and social inclusion policies, with territorial disparities taken into account. (See the original Hungarian version here: Magyarország Partnerségi Megállapodása a 2014–2020-as fejlesztési időszakra, 2014 and an English summary here: Summary of the Partnership Agreement for Hungary, 2014-2020, 2014) It is possible that general social improvements achieved by the above mentioned funds are able to affect persons in the Fund’s target group (e.g. through better and more efficient institutions, through better labour-market, etc.) but there are one specific measure (vocational training) which could have been harmonised with the strategy of the Fund since these funds concentrate on general social developments.</p>
--	---

4.1	<p>Was an assessment of other interventions with similar objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage?</p>
	<p>Partly. MoI provided information that they coordinated with the Ministry of Human Capacities (since most unaccompanied minors live in an institution which is maintained by the latter. In addition, collation was necessary in order to clarify the way Article 9 (3) of Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament influences the implementation of specific projects). Moreover, MoI consulted with the European Commission about vocational trainings. However, these activities can only partly be considered as assessment of other interventions with similar objectives.</p>

4.2	<p>Were co-ordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established for the implementation period?</p>
	<p>Partly. There were no other interventions with similar objectives as it is described above. However, it must be mentioned that the UNHCR might ask certain NGOs to coordinate between Fund-financed projects and potential UNHCR donations. (e.g. NGOs donated by UNHCR can have Fund-financed projects at the same time. It is obvious that they had to coordinate between them somehow, otherwise it might have been a case of double finance.) However, these can be individual and internal assessments and not comprehensive and public ones. In addition, coordination was organized between UNHCR and MoI in order to avoid duplicate funding.</p>

4.3	Were the actions implemented through the Fund coherent with and non-contradictory to other interventions with similar objectives?
	As it is clarified at the Chapters 4.1 and 4.2, there were no other interventions with similar objectives as it is described above. Therefore, this question is considered as non-relevant.

5	Complementarity
---	-----------------

5	The overall question: Were the objectives set in the national programme and the corresponding implemented actions complementary to those set in the framework of other policies, in particular those pursued by the Member State?
	<p>Partly. Complementarity issues beyond that which have a direct connection to AMIF-related policies (return policy, integration policy, asylum policy, etc.) were not considered in the implementation. However, <i>The Migration Strategy and the seven-year strategic document related to Asylum and Migration Fund established by the European Union for the years 2014-20</i> takes other policies into consideration. It says (page 3.):</p> <p><i>Defining the activities related to migration needs a multidimensional approach. In the development, establishment of policies, strategies and in implementing them in the fields of labour market and employment, economy, demography, education (development of human resources), social policy, health, equal opportunities, security and law-enforcement the specific needs of migration should be taken into account. Managing migration flows require the collaboration of the Ministry of Interior (bearing primary responsibility) and other relevant ministries, moreover cooperation and contribution of local governments, civil and religious organisations, international organisations and scientific research institutions, and economic organisations is indispensable. Providing the necessary funding for realising the objectives defined in the strategy is a fundamental condition for its implementation. In addition to the funding allocated in the national budget, resources of the Asylum and Migration Fund will also be available in the next seven years. Besides the Asylum and Migration Fund, other EU resources – Internal Security Fund, Rights and Citizenship Programme, the financial support for external relations (geographic and thematic programmes) and the European Social Fund could contribute to the implementation of the activities specified in the Migration Strategy.</i></p> <p>All in all, complementarity issues are broadly considered in the highest-level migration strategy document (but details were not elaborated neither in the National Programme, nor in the implementation of the projects).</p>

As a significant guarantee for ensuring complementarity is that the Ministry of Interior is nominated as a voting member in OPs procedures and also in the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanism Monitoring Committee. It must be mentioned that the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister also delegates one member to the Monitoring Committee of AMIF.

5.1	Was an assessment of other interventions with complementary objectives carried out and taken into account during the programming stage?
	<p>Partly. Based on the answer of the MoI, an assessment of other interventions with complementary objectives had not been carried out as a comprehensive measure. However, the MoI reported the following in its implementation report (Version: 2015.I):</p> <p><i>The Ministry of Interior was represented in the working group preparing European Structural and Investment Fund Partnership Agreement and Operative Programmes, in the implementation phase the participation of the Ministry of Interior in the Monitoring Committee and in the Committee for Development Coordination is ensured. The Ministry of Interior also takes part in the elaboration of the Annual Development Plan and calls for proposals.</i></p> <p>It refers that cooperation concerning complementary objectives happened, although these cannot be evaluated as an assessment.</p> <p>It must be noted that the low number of TCNs (71.100 citizens of non-EU countries by 1 January 2016 which is only 0.7 percent of the population. See: EUROSTAT, 2017d) might be an explanation to the lack of assessment and effective cooperation in complementary objectives. However, in absolute number, 71.100 persons is equal to the population of the 12th biggest city in Hungary.</p> <p>It must also be mentioned that the National Programme AMIF (modified version) contains the following regarding complementarity:</p> <p><i>The Responsible Authority (RA) places emphasis on the complementarity with the national budget in order to avoid the overlap between the different funding instruments and to achieve the greatest added value.</i></p> <p><i>HU's Human Resources Development Operational Programme (HDOP) for 2014-2020 financed by the ESF covers all disadvantaged groups in general. In order to ensure the complementarity of the two Funds, the RA closely cooperates with the Ministry of the</i></p>

	<p><i>Human Resources during the preparation of the multiannual programme and the actual call for proposals especially in the field of social inclusion.</i></p> <p><i>Integration of Hungarian citizens from migrant backgrounds can be enhanced only from the allocations of the European Social Fund. The Ministry of Interior (MOI) is represented in the working group preparing ESIF Partnership Agreements and Operational Programmes, in the implementation phase the participation of MOI in the Monitoring Committee will be ensured. The MOI also takes part in the elaboration of the Action Plan and calls for proposals. Bearing in mind the EU external policies the RA intends to set in its call for proposals as a precondition for applicants to contact EU delegations in third countries regarding return activities and pre-departure information and assistance.</i></p> <p>Those measures are highly important but cannot be considered as an appropriate assessment.</p>
--	---

5.2	Were co-ordination mechanisms between the Fund and other interventions with similar objectives established to ensure their complementarity for the implementing period?
	See the environment above (5.1 and 5.2). There was no chance that overlapping would take place. During the programming stage, high-level consultations help to coordinate the cooperation between the Fund and national resources.

5.3	Were mechanisms aimed to prevent overlapping of financial instruments put in place?
	Based on the above expounded facts, there was no chance that overlapping would take place. Single projects were separated from the other activities of organizations receiving other financial instruments.

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

6	The overall question: Was any added value brought about by the EU support?
	<p>Yes, as it is described below in details. The most important added values are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural diversity, • cooperation between NGOs and between an NGO and a governmental organization, • support of the European Union, <p>stability of NGOs and Hungarian civil society.</p>

6.1	What are the main types of added value resulting from the support by the Fund (volume, scope, role, process)?
	<p>As it is mentioned in 6.4, the Fund represented a European Union conform value in Hungary since it has tried to support the integration of immigrant persons and persons under international protection. This attitude could support those organizations which have been working on a successful co-habitation between newcomers and the host society.</p> <p>NGOs that were supported by the Fund were able to refer to the Fund as an EU support in their rhetoric. It is a value itself to represent the European conformity in Hungary.</p> <p>The cooperation between NGOs and between an NGO and a governmental organization was facilitated by the structure of the Fund. (e.g.: Between NGOs: HU/2016/PR/0005 - Skills on! [Artemisszió Foundation and Menedék - Hungarian Association for Migrants] or HU/2016/PR/0001 – Between an NGO and a governmental organization: Supportive Services for Third Country Nationals under Alien Policing Procedure [National Police Headquarters and Menedék - Hungarian Association for Migrants]) It can be considered as an EU added value since it strengthened synergy between the organizations concerned.</p> <p>Governmental organizations would not have focused on cooperation with NGOs as they did in their projects without additional resources guaranteed by the Fund. Therefore, it can be considered that the Fund could add a general positive attitude to the phenomenon of migration through these cooperation projects as well.</p> <p>This immigration-friendly attitude is in line with the Article 21 and 22 of the Charter of</p>

	<p>Fundamental Rights of the European Union thus it is a value which is very important to be mentioned since it was confirmed by the Fund.</p> <p>It can also be mentioned that the Fund is a live link between the European Union and several organizations which can help to strengthen the support of the European Union. It is a value itself.</p>
--	--

6.2	<p>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?</p>
	<p>Probably not. The 2015-2016 policy change is elaborated in detail in the Effectiveness chapter. Based on the result of this change, it is certain that none of the actions required would have been carried out in Hungary except, probably, some actions related to return processes.</p>

6.3	<p>What would be the most likely consequences of an interruption of the support provided by the Fund?</p>
	<p>Based on the interviews conducted with the beneficiaries of the Fund, it can be evaluated that almost all projects supported by the Fund would cease immediately after an interruption of the support provided by the Fund. Beneficiaries were asked about what would happen if the resources from the Fund were not available anymore. 48.9 percent of the respondents said that their programs would not be sustainable and 44.4 percent said that only few elements of their program would be sustainable. It must be mentioned that only 2 respondents (among 45) said that their program would carry on from different resources. Most probably, some projects implemented by the National Police Headquarters might be exceptions since supporting and maintaining the main direction of the new Hungarian asylum and migration policy is a crucial issue for the Hungarian government.</p>

6.4	<p>To which extent have actions supported by the Fund resulted in a benefit at the Union level?</p>
	<p>The Fund has helped preserving integration-based and multicultural approaches in Hungary, by which, it has also helped preserving the values recorded in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. The Fund could help to retain a European Union accepted approach in</p>

	<p>Hungary concerning the asylum, integration and migration policies.</p> <p>A practical Union-level benefit might be that several beneficiaries of international protection and graduated third-country students left Hungary toward other EU countries. It means that those persons who received support from the Fund might enjoy the fruits of these services in other EU Member States. It can result in advantages in those Member States which are regarded as target countries. Unfortunately, there are no indicators which would be able to underpin this practical benefit but based on the interviews conducted, several beneficiaries of the Fund-guaranteed services reported to plan on leaving Hungary and move to another Member State (typically a Western European one).</p> <p>A question was asked from the beneficiaries of the Fund concerning EU added values. Their responses cover the above mentioned findings. Additionally, it was mentioned by several beneficiaries of the Fund that they could disseminate their new methods in another MSs which might have a result in these countries either directly or indirectly.</p>
--	---

7	Sustainability
---	----------------

7	<p>The overall question: Are the positive effects of the projects supported by the Fund likely to last when its support will be over?</p>
	<p>It is not possible to answer the question properly as most of the interventions are still running. However, one can conclude that some of the materials and long-lasting impact of the services that have been produced/provided within the framework of AMIF will probably have positive effect even after the termination of the projects. Further benefits of the actions sustained by the Fund expected to continue thereafter; as the informal networks that arose between experts, organisations and members of various target groups; positive changes in attitudes towards migrants; experiences that were gained due to the implementation of the projects; reunified families etc.</p> <p>However, it should also be emphasised that projects aimed at influencing the attitudes of the host society by reinforcing the inclusive and tolerant attitudes towards migrants were probably not successful due to the circumstances that are described at Section I and II. In addition, continuation of project activities and sustenance of project outcomes after the grant expires is typically not possible as 1) beneficiaries usually do not work on long term planning to facilitate diverse donor engagements, 2) it is difficult to engage micro-, and macro donors because supporting migrants and TCNs is not accepted (and even rejected) in the current social-political context in Hungary (for more details see Section I and II), 3) further EU or national public funding do not provide sufficient funds for implementing activities focusing on the target group of AMIF.</p>

--	--

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 RA included "sustainability" amongst the selection criteria of projects when calls for proposals were issued. If a beneficiary did not meet the criteria, its grant amount could be reduced. Thereby, RA encouraged the beneficiaries to plan since the beginning how the services initiated through AMIF would be still delivered and maintained after the termination of the project, in order to address needs that would continue to exist after the end of AMIF.

7.2	Were mechanisms put in place to ensure a sustainability check at programming and implementation stage?
	The legislation background ensures the sustainability at programming and implementation stage of the NP. It should be also mentioned that beneficiaries under maintenance obligation have to complete and submit annual maintenance report following the termination of their projects.

7.3	To what extent are the outcomes/benefits of the actions sustained by the Fund expected to continue thereafter?
	The materials (e.g. booklets, brochures, educational tools) that have been produced within the framework of AMIF will be available for the wider public in the future. The long-lasting impact of the services (e.g. therapies, development of competencies, certificates that facilitate integration into the labour market, Hungarian language courses etc.) will probably have a positive impact on the target group and thereby support their integration into Hungarian society even after the termination of the interventions. During the field work, some of the beneficiaries pointed at the informal networks that had arose due to the projects; migrants, members of the host society, experts and various organisations had evolved relationships and thereby supported the integration of the target group. Some organisations denoted the positive changes in attitudes towards migrants that have been realized not only within the target group of the project but sometimes even within their own organisations. Successful integration into the labour market should also be mentioned as an important benefit that will be sustained even after the termination of AMIF. Probably, the positive consequences of family reunifications and assisted voluntary return will also sustain. Some of the organisations pointed at the experiences themselves that were gained

	<p>due to the implementation of the project. These experiences will support and improve the on-going and future initiatives.</p> <p>Probably, the projects that aimed at influencing the attitudes of the host society by reinforcing the inclusive and tolerant attitudes towards migrants could be successful only to a very limited extent due to the circumstances that are described at Section I and II.</p> <p>However, it should also be underlined that the beneficiaries typically would not be able to maintain their services without the support of AMIF. Altogether, 97.5% of the respondents of the beneficiary survey expressed such an opinion (52.5% agreed: “it would be not possible to maintain the program at all”, 45.0% agreed: “it would be possible to maintain only very few elements of the program”).</p>
--	--

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

8	The overall question: Were the Fund management procedures simplified and the administrative burden reduced for its beneficiaries?
	<p>The introduction of the innovative procedures introduced by the Fund brought simplification for the beneficiaries of the Fund only to a limited extend. Multiannual programming brought simplification especially for the beneficiaries of the Fund whose projects were not affected by the changes in legalisation and the reorganization of the related institution system. Other organisations faced difficulties and had to realize change management at the project level in order to achieve the intended results and outcomes. It was possibly to realize a fair, equitable and verifiable calculation of simplified cost options (SCOs) only in certain cases. Introduction of eligibility rules did not really reduced the administrative burden for the beneficiaries.</p> <p>For the selection phase, the RA used the IT system developed by the Prime Minister’s Office (EUPR). After the conclusion of Grant Agreements, the IT system of the RA itself has handled all procedures and relevant data. However, the inappropriate development of EUPR hindered the selection. As a result, contracting and the implementation of the projects did not start in time. In addition, the beneficiaries could not perform their interim reports on the project implementations via the IT system, in the beginning of the scrutinized period. Therefore, RA ensured the administration and registration of data via paper-based documentation (where the contents comported with electronic documents).</p>

8.1	<p>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?</p>
	<p>The multiannual programming and the more comprehensive National Programmes primarily became apparent for the beneficiaries because of the opportunity to implement long-term projects. On the one hand, this innovative procedure would have ensured sustainability, stability and predictability. These advantages explain why 76% of the projects have been longer than 12 months (average lengths: 17,9 months, minimum/maximum duration: 6/34 months). However, multiannual programming brought simplification mainly for the beneficiaries of the Fund whose projects were not affected by the changes in legalisation and the reorganization of the related institution system, i.e. projects under the national objectives SO2 (Integration/legal migration). These organisations usually did not have to realize change management at the project level in order to achieve the intended results and outcomes.</p> <p>The use of flat rate financing, standard scales of unit costs and lump sums reduce the likelihood of error and the administrative burden on project promoters. However, the RA faced some difficulties while defining simplified cost options (SCOs) as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of persons belonging to the target groups of AMIF is quite small, • at the same time the target group itself is very diverse; it consist not only the members of the direct (refugees, TCNs) but the indirect (e.g. social workers, judges, public servants, employers etc.) target group as well, • at the same time, one specific beneficiary typically provides services for one specific group (e.g. solely for social workers or solely for refugees), • in addition, the activities of the various projects are diverse. <p>The Government Decree 135/2015 (VI.2.) on the use of the funds of Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (and Internal Security Fund) in the period of 2014-2020 contains the rules on eligibility in its Annex; which rules are harmonised and issued on the same legislation level with the ones in the Government Decree No. 272/2014 (XI.5.) on the use of the funds of Structural Funds. The eligibility rules for project costs in further details were defined in the call for proposals.</p> <p>It should be also mentioned that RA aimed at realizing simplified costs in certain cases but the Audit Authority did not approve them.</p>

For the selection phase, the RA used the IT system developed by the Prime Minister's Office (EUPR). After the conclusion of Grant Agreements, the IT system of the RA itself has handled all procedures and relevant data. However, the inappropriate development of EUPR hindered the selection. As a result, contracting and the implementation of the projects did not start in time. In addition, the beneficiaries could not perform their interim reports on the project implementations via the IT system. Therefore, RA ensured the administration and registration of data via paper-based documentation (where the contents comported with electronic documents).

Due to these reasons, the innovative procedures introduced by the Fund brought simplification for the beneficiaries of the Fund only to a limited extent. According the respondents of the beneficiary survey, it was only moderately easy to fulfil the administrative requirements of the program (the mean on a five-point scale was 2.97, where 1 = "it was not easy at all", 5 = "it was extremely easy"). The new IT system typically supported the beneficiaries only to a moderate level (the mean on a five-point scale was 2.83, where 1 = "it did not support at all", 5 = "it supported extremely"). Altogether, 87.5% of the respondents had previous experience with the Fund, as they used to implement projects under the European Integration Fund (EIF) and/or the European Refugee Fund (ERF). Comparing with EIF and ERF, fulfilling the administrative tasks within the framework of AMIF were neither easier nor more difficult (the mean on a five-point scale was 3.0, where 1 = "it became much more difficult", 5 = "it became much more easier"). Some of the beneficiaries underlined that producing the two-months reports (project interim reports) is particularly disproportionately burdensome. Other respondents criticized the low percentage of the costs of project management. According to these organisations, it is difficult to hire employees from the labour market where the wage rate is high(er). Finally, a clearly positive feedback should also be mentioned here; as the respondents underlined, the colleagues of RA strongly supported the work of the beneficiaries (the mean on a five-point scale was 4.18, where 1 = "they did not support as at all", 5 = "they extremely supported us").

SECTION V: PROJECT EXAMPLES

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

<p>Example 1</p> <p>Name of the project: ‘Mighelp job competence training & Migrant Career Centre’ (HU/2016/PR/0014)</p> <p><i>Beneficiary: Migrants' Help Association of Hungary. Type of beneficiary: NGO</i></p> <p>Duration of the project: 1st January 2016 – 31st October 2017 (Antecedents: ‘Job and integration – IT courses for migrants’ funded by European Integration Fund between 1st November 2013 and 31st August 2014)</p> <p>Total budget: 13 374 000 HUF</p> <p>The aim of the project is the implementation of three different trainings (that do not provide vocational training qualification): ECDL, nursery worker and driver courses. The activities consist of the development and certification of an intercultural, innovative and interactive training module as well. In addition, the beneficiary provides a complete self-designed innovative module, by providing intensive mentoring, career counselling and placing 10 of the 53 participants in jobs and/or internships.</p> <p>A field visit was organised by the external consultant within the framework of the monitoring and evaluation of AMIF. Altogether, three representatives of the beneficiary took part in the interviews. As the interviewees emphasised, they were able to implement the project primarily due to their previous experiences gained within the framework of the “Job and integration” project (funded by the European Integration Fund between 2013 and 2014). During these years, colleagues of the beneficiary learned the effective ways of supporting the target group whose members took part in an ECDL training course.</p> <p>However, the representatives of the Migrants' Help Association of Hungary recognized that successful integration in the labour market requires not only an ECDL certificate but further skills and certificates – especially a driving licence. During the preparation and implementation of the category B driving licence training, the organisers faced several challenges:</p>
--

Example 1

- participants often did not have sufficient Hungarian language skills,
- the driver instructors usually did not have sufficient English language skills,
- participants did not know most of the traffic signs.

As a consequence, most of the members of the target group did not pass the exams and took their driver's test again and again. Thereby, evolving a good mentoring relationship was crucial in order to achieve a (more) positive outcome. Representatives of the beneficiary maintained a continuous contact with the participants for the sake of supporting, encouraging and even pushing them. As the interviewees underlined, they used various argumentations in the interest of sustaining motivation. For example, they made it clear that “if somebody was selected somebody else was not selected” and “participants represent not only themselves but the whole migrant community”. In addition, they clarified that “if somebody leaves before the end of this program, he/she will never attend our program once again in the future.”

As the head of the beneficiary put it, without the continuous encouragement and motivation, the project would have been a fail. Mentoring was necessary in case of the ECDL training as well. As the program coordinator shared it with the external consultant: “when an Iranian mentor started to help one of our students in his own language, he passed all of the exams, even the difficult ones. Just because of the support from the mentor. It has been proved that with a little bit of help you can push people and they will succeed.”

The interviewees identified further essential elements of a successful project:

- well-based needs-assessment (in order to identify the real needs of the target group),
- well-defined criteria for selecting people (who really need the services that are provided by the project),
- cooperation with training companies/trainers/instructors who actually want to help migrants and refugees and “not only because of the money”.

As the interviewees declared, the attitudes of the host society have changed towards the migrants and refugees for the past years. Nonetheless, they have not faced any serious difficulties or met serious attacks or harms (except a threat, addressed to the representative of the organisation). According to the interviewees, the trainings proved to be successful and the indicators will be fulfilled.

Example 1

According to the last project interim report that covers the period between 1st June 2016 and 31st July 2017, 39 (out of the planned 53) participants have already taken part in the trainings and 1 (out of the planned 10) participants gained experience of employment.

Example 2

Name of the project: ‘Housing support for people under international protection’ (HU/2016/PR/0012)

Beneficiary: Budapest Methodological Centre of Social Policy and Its Institutions (BMSZKI). Type of beneficiary: Local public bodies

Duration of the project: 1st June 2016 – 30rd June 2018

Total budget: 82 501 550 HUF

The beneficiary first gained experience about the target group during the migration crisis in 2015. At that time, the management of the organisation decided to play an active role, as BMSZKI was a homeless service provider while migrants were out there on the streets without shelter. Within a few months, several thousand migrants visited one of the temporary accommodations of the beneficiary. Taking the experiences and the lessons that had been learned into consideration, the beneficiary decided to submit a proposal for AMIF in 2015.

The project aims to ensure third-country nationals a protected period in respect of accommodation so as to facilitate independent living. The main activities are providing housing assistance for 60 members of the target group, as well as providing individual and group mental health assistance, with social workers and psychologists involved, and after-care if necessary. The activities contribute to ensuring participants accommodation after the completion of the project. The direct target group of the project is beneficiaries of international protection.

The project is fully in line with the realization of the objectives stated in the National Programme AMIF (SO2/NO2 / 2nd Funding priority), since it facilitates the target group’s integration into Hungarian society by promoting housing which is one of the basic conditions of integration.

Example 2

A field visit was organised by the external consultant within the framework of the monitoring and evaluation of AMIF. Altogether, two representatives of the beneficiary took part in the interview. As the interviewees underlined, the project faced several difficulties during the implementation. The delay in announcing the results of AMIF led to some difficulties in the preparation of the project. In addition, the person who compiled the proposal underestimated the amount of work that was needed to complete the project. Moreover, members of the target group were not really interested in some of the program elements, especially in the mental health assistance. As the interviewees described, “these services are not so important as they (members of the target group) primarily try to survive and do their best in order to be integrated. They are working, they are tired and they have no time to join such activities.” In certain cases, the negative attitudes towards migrants should also be mentioned. Especially, members of the healthcare teams (e.g. doctors, nurses) were focusing on difficulties rather than solutions and sometimes refused to support migrant patients.

However, most of these difficulties were solved by the beneficiary. The financial issues of the project were optimized primarily by rearranging some budget lines and involving volunteers. The beneficiary put emphasis in providing services that are interesting and important for the target group; for example, entrepreneurship training and credit counselling are also available nowadays. Representatives of the beneficiary successfully informed their informal social network and even some partner organisations (mainly the SOS Children’s Villages) in order to find housing solutions for the target group. Thereby, they managed to get in contact with “migrant-friendly” landlords who often rent their apartments for an affordable price.

According to the interviewees, some members of their target group will not earn enough money after the termination of the one-year-long housing project and will be not able to rent flats themselves. However, there are some promising results – partly due to the general labour shortages in Hungary. As the representative of the beneficiary underlined, “we are in contact with for-profit companies that used to be uninterested in employing migrants several years ago. Nowadays, they are keen to find employees – even migrants. It is not a problem if they do not speak Hungarian properly and they do not have work experience at all.” In addition, the project itself will be successful since “if somebody can live a calm life for eight, ten or twelve months! He/she will be able to pull him/herself together and even recover from a post-traumatic-stress-disorder. And he/she will be able to save money. We consider it as success.”

According to the last project interim report that covers the period between 1st June 2016 and 31st July 2017, 65 (out of the planned 60) participants have already taken part in housing assistance and 87 (out of the planned 60) in individual and group mental health assistance.

Example 3

Example 3

Name of the project: ‘Pilot Project to Assist in Family Reunification to Hungary’ (HU/2016/PR/0019)

Beneficiary: International Organization for Migration (IOM). Type of beneficiary: International public organisation

Duration of the project: 1st August 2016 – 30rd June 2018

Total budget: 38 979 071 HUF

The aim of the project: providing information, administrative and logistical support in connection with family reunification for beneficiaries of international protection and the relatives thereof in Hungary, as well as facilitating integration. IOM offers assistance to its clients in three main areas:

1. provision of information: the project provides up-to-date information in various languages on the rules and requirements of the family reunification procedure. IOM provides web-based information, continuous pre-departure and post-arrival counselling through e-mail and phone and in person.
2. administrative and logistical assistance: the project offers family tracing, addressing urgent needs, acquiring and translating necessary documents for the submission of the application, requesting DNA tests, obtaining the necessary travel documents, setting appointments with the relevant embassy/consulate, assisting with the submission of various applications and providing logistical and financial assistance to family members.
3. post-arrival orientation and counselling: the project provides support for the families after arrival in Hungary in assessing the situation and needs of the families and referring them to the relevant NGOs providing services. After arrival, family members will receive information on their obligations and services that are available to them.

IOM concludes agreements with clients who use the services of the project. The beneficiary aims at launching 50 family reunification processes, which include travelling from the country of origin or residence to the consulate in addition travel assistance and support before, during and after the trip to Hungary.

The direct target group is TCNs who apply for family reunification in accordance with Council

Example 3

Directive 2003/86/EC, particularly the beneficiaries of international protection and their family members.

A field visit was organised by the external consultant within the framework of the monitoring and evaluation of AMIF. Altogether, two representatives of the beneficiary took part in the interview. As the interviewees underlined, only a few family reunifications were launched by various actors in Hungary before the project, mainly by international organisations and NGOs. However, these ad-hoc initiatives were not able to support a high number of families and resulted only in limited success. Sometimes, the beneficiary was also involved in such programs as due to their office-network of IOM all around the world, they were able to ensure logistical support for families who were stuck in the country of origin and needed help. However, these initiatives were sometimes unsuccessful because “if the families did not have enough money to cover the costs, for example to buy airplane tickets and translate the necessary documents, the reunification was not realized.” Thereby, the support of AMIF was crucial as it allowed IOM to expand its services by financial assistance as well.

Nonetheless, the project is suffering because of lack of resources as the financial resources that are assigned to the related national objective (SO2 / NO1) are limited. In addition, some of the activities (e.g. providing accommodation for the families waiting for reunification abroad, costs of travel documents, costs of traveling, translation of official documents, costs of DNA test) were extremely expensive – even above the previous expectations. Thereby, fundraising became one of the most crucial tasks of the organisation; the beneficiary is searching for other potential sources of funding, especially from various EU agencies, IOM offices and embassies.

Amendments in legislation also made the project difficult to implement. Primarily, these changes should be mentioned:

- cessation of the refugee integration system (that would have supported the integration of the families after arrival)
- since 1st July 2016, family members who wish to join a person benefitting from international protection in Hungary are required to submit their claims not within 6 but 3 months after recognition.
- Hungary reduced the time that is allowed for beneficiaries of international protection to stay in reception centres from two months to one.

As the representative of the organisation emphasised, despite these difficulties the project will be successful. The indicators that have been achieved until now confirm this statement. According to the last project interim report, 30 (out of the planned 50) participants were supported by interpreters and

Example 3

translation and 16 (out of the planned 25) by social assistance.

Description of one ‘failure’, among all the projects funded

Example
<p data-bbox="159 380 957 425">Name of the project: ‘Work for you!’ (HU/2016/PR/0011)</p> <p data-bbox="159 481 1404 526"><i>Beneficiary: Málta Care Non-profit Ltd. Type of beneficiary: Private and public law companies</i></p> <p data-bbox="159 582 949 627">Duration of the project: 1st January 2016 – 31st March 2018</p> <p data-bbox="159 683 598 728">Total budget: 49 351 900 Ft HUF</p> <p data-bbox="159 884 1492 1187">A field visit was organised by the external consultant within the framework of the monitoring and evaluation of AMIF. As the representative of Málta Care Non-profit Ltd. <u>underlined</u> during the field work, members of the organisation had not had previous experience in the field of migration in Hungary before 2015 as they had primarily focused on the labour-market integration of disadvantaged social groups. Experience had been gained about the target group during the crisis in 2015 when various (e.g. medical and food) services had been provided for migrants by the beneficiary. Taking the experiences and the lessons that had been learned into consideration, the beneficiary had decided to submit a proposal for AMIF in 2015.</p> <p data-bbox="159 1243 1500 1433">The project aims to develop complex labour market services for third country nationals legally residing in Hungary. The main activities are providing interpreting services fitted to the needs of the target group; providing job placement services for 100 people and a training about the program for 20 employers; developing and maintaining a specialized training programme (50 hours) to enhance employment of the target group; providing job placement services.</p> <p data-bbox="159 1489 1460 1646">The direct target group of the project is individuals specified by Article 9 (1) of Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council. The project is fully in line with the realization of the objectives stated in the National Programme AMIF (SO2 / NO2, 2nd Funding priority), for labour market training programs essentially increase the chances of employability.</p> <p data-bbox="159 1702 1492 1926">It is important to point at the successes of the project. The beneficiary managed to build up good relationships with employers and to effectively support members of the target group in order to gain labour market experience. One of the participants of the project even started to work as a public sector employee at one of the universities in Budapest. The target group of the project seems to be satisfied with the services that have been provided by the beneficiary. However, the difficulties that arose during the implementation of the project should also be introduced. Originally, the beneficiary</p>

Example

intended to implement the project not only in Budapest but in Pécs (the city that is close to the Croatian border) as well. Before 2015, the number of asylum applications was extremely high and the illegal entries at the Croatian border were still not prevented by the Hungarian authorities. Thereby, the beneficiary expected high numbers of migrants arriving and staying after their recognition in Hungary and especially along the Croatian border. However, the number of asylum applications strongly decreased due to the reasons that have already been described in Section I and II. As a result, the project was not able to maintain its services in Pécs, because of the lack of need of (the small number of) the target group.

According to the opinion of the external evaluator, this error was caused by the lack of thorough preparation and planning. It was well-known for the observers and experts of the field already in 2015 that the vast majority of the migrants who crossed the southern border of Hungary continued their way to Western-European countries. In addition, the asylum applications of the migrants who would have liked to stay in Hungary were likely to be rejected. All in all, it was foreseeable that the number of the target group of the project, (as the application described them, the “third country nationals legally residing in Hungary”) would be small in the city of Pécs. It is important to emphasise that the Evaluation Committee assessed the justification of the referred location. Finally, the EC decided to support the project based on the information that was provided by the applicant

According to the external evaluator, the lack of thorough preparation and planning resulted even in problems with the training program of the ‘Work for you!’ project as the beneficiary was not able to assess the real needs of the target group. According to the last project interim report, 0 (out of the planned 50) participants took part in the training program. However, some positive outcomes should also be mentioned: 89 (out of the planned 100) participants are satisfied with the services that have been provided by the beneficiary and 15 (out of the planned 25) gained labour market experience.

SECTION VI: METHODOLOGY

The external consultant used various methodologies in order to answer the questions of the template. He conducted three expert-interviews with three representatives of the Responsible Authority. While formulating indicators, the consultant built upon the data that was provided by RA (and DG HOME) about the final recipients of projects financed by the Fund. In addition, document analysis was also realized as the external consultant gained access to the IT system of AMIF (BAMIR) that handle all procedures and relevant data (e.g. interim and final reports) and as further documents (e.g. implementation and financial reports, description of management and control systems etc.) were provided by RA.

Within the framework of a field work, six semi-structured interviews was prepared with beneficiaries who implemented projects under the measures 2.1.1, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.8 and 2.2.12. Two out of the six project-recipients are located not in Budapest but at the countryside. The questions of the interview-guideline focused on the 1. context and background of the project, 2. antecedents of the project, 3. difficulties and experiences of the implementation phase, 4. results and lessons that have been learned, 5. other various issues (that were important to discuss in order to answer especially Section IV). The interviews were tape-recorded, written and analysed by the external consultant.

In addition, an on-line beneficiary survey, that was created by Google Forms, was conducted. The questionnaire contained altogether three open-ended and twenty-four close-ended questions. Altogether, 45 project-representatives (out of the 55) filled in the form (response rate: 82%).

SECTION VII: MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Main conclusions

Conclusion 1

Continuation of project activities and sustenance of project outcomes after the grant expires is typically not possible as 1) beneficiaries usually do not work on long term planning to facilitate diverse donor engagements, 2) it is difficult to engage micro-, and macro donors because supporting migrants and TCNs is not accepted (and even rejected) in the current social-political context in Hungary, 3) only a very few further EU, national and international public funding provide insufficient funds for implementing activities focusing on the target group of AMIF. All in all, sustainability is not ensured.

Conclusion 2

Fulfilling the administrative tasks put administrative burden on the beneficiaries. As the respondents of the survey and the interviewees of the field work emphasised, it was especially time-consuming to provide the project interim report in every two months. The introduction of the innovative procedures (multiannual programming and the more comprehensive National Programmes allowing for flexibility, simplified cost options, eligibility rules) introduced by the Fund brought simplification for the beneficiaries only to a very limited extent. Inappropriate development of the IT system that supported the selection phase was inappropriate. As a result, contracting and the implementation of the projects did not start in time. In addition, the beneficiaries could not perform their interim reports on the project implementations via the IT system, in the beginning of the scrutinized period. (Therefore, RA ensured the administration and registration of data via paper-based documentation).

Conclusion 3

The Responsible Authority ensure the possibility for the applicants of the multiannual projects. The possibility for long(er) projects ensure that certain services have been provided for the target group on a continuous basis and it reduced the administrative burden of the beneficiaries. In addition, this innovative procedure ensured sustainability, stability and predictability. However, the evaluation of multiannual projects could be contradictory as implementing long(er) initiatives (especially under SO1 and SO3) made more difficult to react to the changes in legislation and the reorganization of the

Conclusion 3

related institution system, due to the necessity of the frequent change management.

Conclusion 4

Conclusion 5

Recommendations

Recommendations 1

AMIF primarily supports Hungary to manage its migration efficiently, to provide protection to persons seeking international protection in an efficient and humane way, to foster economic and knowledge-based legal migration to Hungary to a greater extent, to actively facilitate integration of third-country nationals (TCNs) living in HU and to ensure an efficient return system. Thereby, capacity building of NGOs could not be an objective within the frameworks of AMIF. However, this aim should be set in other interventions and programmes funded by EU resources and applying to similar areas of work. The external evaluator considers extremely important to support NGOs in the field in order to enable them to build their constituencies, enhance their stakeholders and thereby increase their support from additional sources with an aim of reaching self-sustainability.

In addition, continuation of AMIF and thereby ensuring the sustenance of project activities and outcomes is strongly recommended.

Recommendations 2

It might be justified to submit project interim reports by the beneficiaries not in every two months but less often (e.g. at the milestones of the projects). Introduction of multiannual programming is evaluated as a progress, it should be preserved for the future. Due to the characteristics of the beneficiaries and the target group (e.g. the number of persons belonging to the target groups of AMIF is too small and diverse, the beneficiaries typically provide services for specific groups etc.), introduction of SCOs is not justified. No further recommendations could be summarised regarding the IT system of AMIF (BAMIR) (as its development has been successfully finalized).

Recommendations 3

Taking the complex crisis situation into consideration that has been described by the Report, it is not possible to give recommendations (regarding Conclusion 2) that are able to improve the implementation for the remaining period.

Recommendations 4

Recommendations 5

SECTION VIII: MID-TERM REVIEW

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

It can be stated in general, developments are taking place related to most of the key policy issues intended to address.

However, regarding the review of the situation analysis, it is essential to review the changes in the migration situation since 2015: changes in the legal background in the field of migration and migration trends, the reorganized institutional system. The abovementioned circumstances have a significant impact on the previously planned quantified results: including the increase in the number of accommodation places, the number of asylum seekers provided with assistance, and the number of volunteer returnees.

Apart from the four areas listed below, the developments on the remaining priorities show no discrepancy from the programming:

- „Children in migration”: the basic supplies are funded from national sources, the support of supplementary activities is still planned in the frame of the National Programme – SO 1 NO 1;
- „Integration of third-country nationals”: there is no need for corrections of the National Programme’s objectives, all the activities covering the components of integration are identified in Union Policies – SO 2 NO 2;
- „Resettlement”: due to the decision of the Hungarian Government Hungary does not intend to implement resettlement programmes and according to this decision the Responsible Authority could not initiate the implementation of resettlement;
- „Return”: the National Programme currently includes most of the Commission's objectives – SO 3. However, the ensuring of detention capacity in Hungary is not reasonable anymore; therefore this activity is to be deleted from the NP.

Based on the above, the following SO and NO have to be modified:

SO1 Asylum: There is a need to increase the level of services provided in the transit zones, therefore it is appropriate to integrate the related objective into the National Programme.

The supported activities are specially:

- provision of interpreter services in Arabic, Kurdish, Dari, Pashto, Farsi, Urdu;
- providing psychologists, psychiatrists, and additional social assistants;
- purchase of medical devices for pediatric care, televisions and satellite receivers;
- supplementary food packages for adults and children;
- purchase of low-value materials and tools for sport and community activities.

SO1 NO1 Reception/asylum: according to the amendment of the asylum law, lodged asylum applications are processed in the transit zones. By operating the transit zones and reducing the number of asylum seekers, there is no need for additional accommodation places by construction new Reception Centre, which activity is to be deleted from the National Programme.

From four sites of Reception Centre only one operates with 300 accommodation places, where the beneficiaries of international protection can spend a month. On average, 50-60 people per month receive international protection, even this site is not operating with full capacities.

Asylum seekers who are sent back by other Member States under the Dublin procedure are accommodated in one of three sites of Asylum Detentions. (In 2016 29,432 people applied for asylum, and 2,470 people applied for asylum in the transit zones until 31 August 2017.)

As a result of previously described facts there is a need to review of common and programme specific indicators:

- target value has to be decreased (C1);
- other indicators has to be deleted (C2.1., C2.2, S1).

SO1 NO3 Resettlement: according the decision of Hungarian Government (Hungary will not planning the implementation of resettlement programmes) funding priority lost its relevance, the target value of C6 should be reduced to 22 people.

SO2 Integration/legal migration: according to the change of legal background – the integration contract can no longer be claimed –, and the number of beneficiaries of international protection increased, further sources are needed, although funding priorities of NP SO2 NO2 are adequate.

SO3 Return: as a result of governmental security measures, the number of illegal migrants arriving in Hungary has drastically decreased.

SO3 NO1 Accompanying measures: according to the decrease of target group the construction of new

detention centre is not relevant. In line with this fact the related indicator – S3.1. – has to be deleted.

SO3 NO2 Return Measures: according to the decrease of target group it is justified to reduce the target value of indicator C3.

SECTION IX: COMMON RESULT AND IMPACT INDICATORS

--

1 - Indicators by specific objectives

SO	Type	Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
SO1	R	SO1R1	Number of target group persons provided with assistance through projects in the field of reception and asylum systems supported under the Fund:	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C1)	0.00	0.00	16,757.00	16,757.00
SO1	R	SO1R1	i) number of target group persons benefiting from information and assistance throughout the asylum procedures	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C1.a)	0.00	0.00	0.00	16,757.00
SO1	R	SO1R1	ii) number of target group persons benefiting from legal assistance and representation	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C1.b)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	R	SO1R1	iii) number of vulnerable persons and unaccompanied minors benefiting from specific assistance	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C1.c)	0.00	0.00	292.00	302.00
SO1	R	SO1R2	Capacity (i.e. number of places) of new reception accommodation infrastructure set up in line with the common requirements for reception conditions as set out in the Union acquis and of existing reception accommodation infrastructure improved in accordance with the same requirements as a result of the projects supported under the Fund.	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C2.1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	R	SO1R2	The percentage in the total reception accommodation capacity	Percentage	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C2.2)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	R	SO1R3	Number of persons trained in asylum-related topics with the assistance of the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C3.1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.00
SO1	R	SO1R3	That number as a percentage of the total number of staff trained in those topics	Percentage	0.00	AIR (indicator SO1 C3.2)	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00
SO1	R	SO1R4	(a) Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund	Number	0.00	Project Reporting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	R	SO1R4	(b) Total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors	Number	0.00	Member States	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	R	SO1R4	Number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of places adapted for unaccompanied minors.	Percentage		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

SO	Type	Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
SO1	I	SO1I1	Stock of pending cases at first instance, less than 6 months	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 2)	12,333.00	31,297.00	9,375.00	
SO1	I	SO1I1	Stock of pending cases at first instance, more than 6 months	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 2)	39.00	1,009.00	965.00	
SO1	I	SO1I2	Share of final positive decisions at the appeal stage	Percentage	8.76	Eurostat (migr_asydcfina)	4.76	8.33	0.65	
SO1	I	SO1I3	Number of persons in the reception system (stock at end of the reporting period)	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 7)		262.00	198.00	
SO1	I	SO1I4	(a) Number of persons in the reception system	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 7)		262.00	198.00	
SO1	I	SO1I4	(b) Number of asylum and first time asylum applicants	Number	18,895.00	Eurostat (migr_asyappctza)	33,864.00	149,143.00	60,202.00	
SO1	I	SO1I4	Number of persons in the reception system as compared to the number of asylum applicants	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	
SO1	I	SO1I5	(a) Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors	Number	0.00	Member States	0.00	0.00	0.00	34.00
SO1	I	SO1I5	(b) Number of asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors (Eurostat migr_asyunaa)	Number	380.00	Eurostat (migr_asyunaa)	479.00	7,097.00	2,800.00	
SO1	I	SO1I5	Number of accommodation places adapted for unaccompanied minors (UAM) as compared to the number of unaccompanied minors	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO1	I	SO1I6	Convergence of first instance/final instance recognition rates by Member States for asylum applicants from a same third country	Percentage points	58.13	Eurostat (migr_asydcfina)	45.31	41.69	13.44	
SO2	R	SO2R1	Number of target group persons who participated in pre-departure measures supported by the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (Indicator SO2 C1)	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.00
SO2	R	SO2R2	Number of target group persons assisted by the Fund through integration measures in the framework of national, local and regional strategies	Number	0.00	AIR (Indicator SO2 C2)	0.00	0.00	318.00	1,352.00
SO2	R	SO2R2	i) number of target group persons assisted through measures focusing on education and training, including language training and preparatory actions to facilitate access to the labour market	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO2 C2.a)	0.00	0.00	0.00	789.00
SO2	R	SO2R2	ii) number of target group persons supported through the provision of	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO2	0.00	0.00	0.00	196.00

SO	Type	Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
			advice and assistance in the area of housing			C2.b)				
SO2	R	SO2R2	iii) number of target group persons assisted through the provision of health and psychological care	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO2 C2.c)	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.00
SO2	R	SO2R2	iv) number of target group persons assisted through measures related to democratic participation	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO2 C2.d)	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.00
SO2	I	SO2I1	Share of third-country nationals (TCNs) having received long-term residence status out of all TCNs	Percentage	34.18	Eurostat (migr_reslas)	25.54	30.87		
SO2	I	SO2I2	Employment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points	1.20	Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_ergan) (lfsa_ergacob)	5.90	2.50	-5.50	
SO2	I	SO2I3	Unemployment rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points		Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_urgan) (lfsa_urgacob)				
SO2	I	SO2I4	Activity rate: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points	1.00	Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (lfsa_argan) (lfsa_argacob)	3.60	0.30	-6.90	
SO2	I	SO2I5	Share of early leavers from education and training: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points		Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (edat_lfse_02)				
SO2	I	SO2I6	Share of 30 to 34-years-olds with tertiary educational attainment: gap between third country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points		Eurostat (edat_lfs_9911)				
SO2	I	SO2I7	Share of population at risk of social poverty or social exclusion: gap between third-country nationals and host-country nationals	Percentage points		Eurostat (Labour Force Survey) (ilc_peps05)				
SO3	R	SO3R1	Number of persons trained on return-related topics with the assistance of the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C1)	0.00	0.00	44.00	504.00
SO3	R	SO3R2	Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C2)	0.00	0.00	377.00	1,120.00
SO3	R	SO3R3	(a) persons who returned voluntarily	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C3)	0.00	0.00	53.00	178.00
SO3	R	SO3R3	(b) and persons who were removed	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C4)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

SO	Type	Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
SO3	R	SO3R3	Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund	Number		AIR	0.00	0.00	53.00	178.00
SO3	R	SO3R4	Number of monitored removal operations co-financed by the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C5)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R5	(a) Persons who were removed (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund)	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C4)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R5	(b) Total number of returns following an order to leave	Number	4,395.00	Eurostat (migr_eirtn)	3,440.00	5,635.00	1,862.00	
SO3	R	SO3R5	Numbers of removals supported by the Fund, as compared to the total number of returns following an order to leave	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R6	(a) Number of persons returned in the framework of joint return operations (assisted-voluntary and forced) supported by the Fund	Number	0.00	Project Reporting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R6	(b) Number of returnees whose return was co-financed by the Fund	Number		AIR	0.00	0.00	53.00	178.00
SO3	R	SO3R6	Number of persons returned in the framework of the joint return operations supported by the Fund as compared to the total number of returns supported by the Fund	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R7	(a) Number of returnees who received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C2)	0.00	0.00	377.00	1,120.00
SO3	R	SO3R7	(b) Persons who returned voluntarily (and whose return was co-financed by the Fund)	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO3 C3)	0.00	0.00	53.00	178.00
SO3	R	SO3R7	Number of returnees who have received pre or post return reintegration assistance co-financed by the Fund, as compared to the total number of voluntary returns supported by the Fund	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	7.11	6.29
SO3	R	SO3R8	(a) Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund	Number	0.00	Project Reporting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R8	(b) Total number of places in detention centres	Number	0.00	Member States	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SO3	R	SO3R8	Number of places in detention centres created/renovated with support from the Fund, as compared to the total number of places in detention centres	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

SO	Type	Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
SO3	I	SO3I1	(a) Number of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave (migr_eirtn)	Number	4,395.00	Eurostat (migr_eirtn)	3,440.00	5,635.00	1,862.00	
SO3	I	SO3I1	(b) Number of third-country nationals ordered to leave (migr_eiord)	Number	5,940.00	Eurostat (migr_eiord)	4,659.00	10,528.00	10,970.00	
SO3	I	SO3I1	Number of returns following an order to leave compared to the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave	Ratio		/	0.74	0.54	0.17	
SO3	I	SO3I2	Return decisions issued to rejected asylum applicants	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 8a)				
SO3	I	SO3I3	Effective returns of rejected asylum applicants	Number		EASO (EPS Indicator 8b)				
SO4	R	SO4R1	Number of applicants and beneficiaries of international protection transferred from one Member State to another with support of the Fund.	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO4 C1)				0.00
SO4	R	SO4R2	Number of cooperation projects with other Member States on enhancing solidarity and responsibility sharing between the Member States supported under the Fund.	Number	0.00	AIR (indicator SO4 C2)				0.00

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

Ind ID	Indicator description	Meas unit	Baseline value	Source of data	2014	2015	2016	2017
H1	Number of Full Time Equivalent in the Responsible Authority, the Delegated Authority and the Audit Authority working on the implementation of the Fund and paid by the technical assistance or national budgets as compared to:	Number	0.00	Member States	0.00	0.00		
H1	(a) the number of projects implemented	Number		AIR	0.00	0.00	36.00	13.00
H1	(b) the amount of the funds claimed for the financial year	Amount in EUR		Accounts		0.00	1,687,098.00	
H2	(a) Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost	Amount in EUR		Member States	0.00	0.00		
H2	(b) Amount of funds claimed for the financial year	Amount in EUR		Accounts		0.00	1,687,098.00	
H2	Technical assistance plus the administrative (indirect) cost of projects as compared to the amount of funds claimed for the financial year	Ratio		/	0.00	0.00	0.00	
H3	Amount of the annual expenditure submitted by the Member State	Amount in EUR		Accounts		0.00	1,687,098.00	
H3	Total amount of funds allocated to the national programme.	Amount in EUR		Accounts		24,113,477.00	31,877,477.00	
H3	Absorption rate of the Fund	Ratio		/		0.00	0.05	

ANNEX: DATA

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

National objective / Specific Action	A Total paid	B Total paid	Total paid (A+B/SO programmed) (%)
SO1.NO1 Reception/asylum	123,141.00		2.03%
SO1.NO2 Evaluation	26,269.42		11.62%
SO1.NO3 Resettlement	9,359.41		8.56%
TOTAL NO SO1	158,769.83		2.48%
SO1.SA1 Transit centres	0.00	0.00	
SO1.SA2 Access to asylum	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SA SO1	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SO1	158,769.83	0.00	2.48%
SO2.NO1 Legal migration	0.00		0.00%
SO2.NO2 Integration	918,522.83		11.96%
SO2.NO3 Capacity	49,478.10		3.24%
TOTAL NO SO2	968,000.93		10.21%
SO2.SA3 Joint initiatives	0.00	0.00	
SO2.SA4 Unaccompanied minors	0.00	0.00	
SO2.SA8 Legal migration	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SA SO2	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SO2	968,000.93	0.00	10.21%
SO3.NO1 Accompanying measures	340,326.74		6.71%
SO3.NO2 Return measures	0.00		0.00%

SO3.NO3 Cooperation	0.00	0.00	0.00%
TOTAL NO SO3	340,326.74	0.00	4.73%
SO3.SA5 Joint return	0.00	0.00	
SO3.SA6 Joint reintegration	0.00	0.00	
SO3.SA7 Joint family unity and unaccompanied minor reintegration	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SA SO3	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL SO3	340,326.74	0.00	4.73%
TOTAL NO SO4			
TOTAL SO4			
Pledges (Union priorities)	220,000.00		55.00%
Pledges (Others)			
Transfers & relocations			0.00%
Admission from Turkey			
TOTAL Special Cases	220,000.00		2.69%
Technical Assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00%
TOTAL	1,687,097.50	0.00	5.29%

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

	Number of projects and EU contribution			
	01/01/2014-15/10/2016			
	Total Nr of finished projects	Total EU contribution to finished projects	Total Nr of open projects	Total EU contribution to open projects
SO1 - Asylum	0	0.00	7	158,769.83
SO2 - Integration/legal migration	0	0.00	23	968,000.93
SO3 - Return	0	0.00	6	340,326.74
SO4 - Solidarity	0	0.00	0	0.00
SO5 - Technical assistance	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total 1	0	0.00	36	1,467,097.50

	Number of projects and EU contribution			
	16/10/2016-30/06/2017			
	Total Nr of finished projects	Total EU contribution to finished projects	Total Nr of open projects	Total EU contribution to open projects
SO1 - Asylum	0	0.00	0	0.00
SO2 - Integration/legal migration	0	0.00	0	0.00
SO3 - Return	0	0.00	0	0.00
SO4 - Solidarity	0	0.00	0	0.00
SO5 - Technical assistance	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total 2	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total 1+2	0	0.00	36	1,467,097.50

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

		Project beneficiaries 01/01/2014-15/10/2016			
		SO1: Asylum	SO2: Integration / Legal migration	SO3: Return	SO4: Solidarity
State/federal authorities	Nr of projects	6	0	5	0
State/federal authorities	EU contribution	147,678.63	0.00	340,326.74	0.00
Local public bodies	Nr of projects	1	1	0	0
Local public bodies	EU contribution	11,091.20	105,161.15	0.00	0.00
Non-governmental organisations	Nr of projects	0	14	0	0
Non-governmental organisations	EU contribution	0.00	374,496.58	0.00	0.00
International public organisations	Nr of projects	0	1	1	0
International public organisations	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
National Red Cross	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
National Red Cross	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
International Committee of the Red Cross	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
International Committee of the Red Cross	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Private and public law companies	Nr of projects	0	6	0	0
Private and public law companies	EU contribution	0.00	425,872.25	0.00	0.00
Education/research organisations	Nr of projects	0	1	0	0
Education/research organisations	EU contribution	0.00	62,470.95	0.00	0.00

		Project beneficiaries 16/10/2016-30/06/2017			
		SO1: Asylum	SO2: Integration / Legal migration	SO3: Return	SO4: Solidarity
State/federal authorities	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
State/federal authorities	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Local public bodies	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
Local public bodies	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-governmental organisations	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
Non-governmental organisations	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
International public organisations	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
International public organisations	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
National Red Cross	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
National Red Cross	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
International Committee of the Red Cross	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
International Committee of the Red Cross	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Private and public law companies	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
Private and public law companies	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Education/research organisations	Nr of projects	0	0	0	0
Education/research organisations	EU contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 4: Special cases

Special cases		2014-2015	2016-2017	2018-2020	Total
Resettlement Union Priorities	Pledged				
Resettlement Union Priorities	Actual		220,000.00		220,000.00
Resettlement Others	Pledged	400,000.00	0.00		400,000.00
Resettlement Others	Actual				
Transfer & relocation	Pledged	0.00	7,764,000.00		7,764,000.00
Transfer & relocation	Actual				
Admission from Turkey	Pledged				
Admission from Turkey	Actual				
Total	Pledged	400,000.00	7,764,000.00	0.00	8,164,000.00
Total	Actual	0.00	220,000.00	0.00	220,000.00

Documents

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

Latest validation results

Severity	Code	Message
Info		Evaluation report version has been validated.