

Public Consultation on the European Return Fund 2011-2013

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

INTRODUCTION

This consultation aims to collect opinions on the functioning of the European Return Fund (RF) 2011 – 2013 in your Country and more specifically the successes and the obstacles in the implementation of national programmes.

The results of the public consultation will be taken into consideration for the preparation of the ex post evaluation report on the RF actions for 2011-2013.

The evaluation is an important instrument to inform the European Parliament and the Council, the Member States, the research Community, the general public and other stakeholders about the achievements of the RF actions for 2011-2013. It will also contribute to the design of future funding instruments.

In order to collect public opinion on the functioning, achievements and impact of the RF 2011-2013 actions, this public consultation is mostly addressed to bodies and individuals who benefited from or implemented projects funded by the Fund.

The public consultation is published in English and its results will be made publicly available through dedicated page. The respondents are invited to reply in English to the possible extent, but replies in other languages will be accepted.

For more information on this consultation, please read the background document.

Files

[RF_Glossary.pdf](#)

[RF_Background_20Document.pdf](#)

IMPORTANT NOTICE ON THE PUBLICATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS

- * Contributions received from this survey will be published on the European Commission's website[1]. Do you agree on the publication of your contribution?

[1] For further information, please consult the privacy statement - <https://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/ri/registering.do?locale=en>

- Yes, my contribution may be published under my name (or the name of my organisation);
- Yes, my contribution may be published but should be kept anonymous (with no mention of the person/organisation);
- No, I do not want my contribution to be published. (NB. Your contribution will not be published, but it may be used internally within the Commission for statistical and analytical purposes).

Specific Privacy Statement

[RF_Privacy_20Statement_rev.pdf](#)

PART I - IDENTIFICATION OF STAKEHOLDER OR EXPERT

* You are responding as:

- An individual who was beneficiary of activities funded by the RF 2011-2013;
- An individual who is a third-country national legally present on the territory of the 27 EU Member States concerned (but who did not benefit from RF co-funded activities);
- An independent expert;
- On behalf of a business/private company;
- On behalf of a non-profit organisation;
- On behalf of a public authority;
- On behalf of an academic/research institution;
- On behalf of a pan-European interest group;
- Other.

Please specify your name and the name of the organisation you represent.

50 character(s) maximum

MIGUEL ANGEL GIL. DG MIGRATIONS

* Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?

- Yes
- No

If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register [here](#). Please notice that it is not compulsory to register to reply to this consultation. Citizens have a right to expect that European institutions interaction with citizens associations, NGOs, businesses, trade unions, think tanks, etc. is transparent and takes place in compliance with the law as well as in due respect of ethical principles, avoiding undue pressure, illegitimate or privileged access to information or to decision makers. The Transparency Register exists to provide citizens with direct and single access to information about who is engaged in activities aiming at influencing the EU decision-making process, which interests are being pursued and what level of resources are invested in these activities. Please help us enhancing transparency by registering.

Please indicate your Register ID-number

50 character(s) maximum

Please indicate your contact e-mail address

* Please indicate your Country of residence or establishment:

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other non-EU Country

Please be aware that the use of 'Country' in the following questions refers to your Country of residence/activity. When reference is made to your Country of origin it will be explicitly mentioned.

PART II – QUESTIONS

1. In your Country, do you consider that the implementation of the RF during 2011-2013 affected positively the work of the administrations dealing with return and the beneficiaries of EU return policy?

- Generally yes, to a great extent;
- Partially yes, but to limited extent;
- Generally no, the implementation had poor impact on the administrations;
- No, it was an obstacle to the implementation of the national policy on return;
- Other;
- Don't know.

2. The general objective of the RF is to support the efforts made by the Member States for actions assisting migrants to return to their Country of origin and with their reintegration process. Based on your experience, did your Country achieve this result?

- Mostly yes;
- Partially yes;
- No;
- Don't know.

3. Based on your experience, which of the following specific objectives were achieved in your Country? (Multiple answers possible)

- The introduction and improvement of European common rules for managing the return of irregular migrants;
- The improvement of the cooperation between the Member States in the field of the return of irregular migrants;
- The application of common standards on return in line with EU policy developments.

4. To achieve EU common approach to third-country nationals' return the European Commission set the following priorities for the implementation of the RF. In your experience, which one was the political priority of the government in your Country? (Multiple answers possible)

- The development of a strategic approach to return;
- The improvement of the cooperation among Member States;
- The implementation of specific innovative (inter)national tools in return;
- The application of common standards on return in line with EU policy developments.

5. As a general principle, Member States implement their annual programmes following the general and the specific objectives. Based on your experience, were the actions financed by the RF in your Country consistent with the above objectives?

- Yes;
- Generally yes, but to limited extent;
- Generally no, but with some exceptions;
- No;
- Don't know.

Please add any comments that you would like to share.

400 character(s) maximum

6. Based on your experience, which of the following activities were implemented in your Country?
(Multiple answers possible)

- The facilitation of voluntary returns of third-country nationals, in particular through assisted voluntary return programmes;
- The simplification and implementation of enforced returns of third-country nationals who do not or no longer fulfil the conditions for entry and stay;
- The improvement of the operational cooperation of Member States' authorities with authorities of third country authorities;
- The promotion of an effective and uniform application of common standards on return in line with policy developments in this field;
- The support for innovative tools;
- The promotion of training among the national authorities;
- The investments in the detention centres;
- Other;
- Don't know.

7. Operational cooperation between the Member States' and the third Countries' authorities is essential to facilitate the exchange of experience and improve the quality of EU return policy. Did your Country intensify its cooperation with the Member States and with third Countries?

- Yes;
- Mostly yes, but with some problems;
- Generally no, although good practices were exchanged in some cases;
- No;
- Don't know.

Please feel free to provide details on your experience.

400 character(s) maximum

Focus of the strategy was to promote and facilitate returns of migrants offering them a pack of both in kind and in cash benefits through social and international organizations dealing with them at national level, so cooperation with MMSS was not a priority. Concerning third countries, cooperation was not at the level of governments but between social organizations acting as counterparts.

8. Were the activities funded by RF implemented in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights as well as Community legislation in this field?

- Yes;
- Generally yes, but only some of the activities;
- No;
- Don't know.

9. In order to ensure the functioning of the return policy it is essential that the Member States adopt common principles and common measures. In your experience, did you notice any difference among the Member States in the way they apply the EU return policy standards?

- Yes, very large differences;
- Yes, but the differences are small;
- No differences;
- Don't know.

10. In your opinion, did the projects and the activities funded in your Country of residence address the needs of the potential beneficiaries?

- Yes;
- Generally yes, but with some problems;
- Generally no, although with some successes;
- No;
- Don't know.

If you answered 'yes' please describe briefly your reasons.

400 character(s) maximum

11. One of the expected results of the RF 2011-2013 is the improvement of the cooperation among Member States, the Member States and Third Countries and the national administrations at different levels (regional, local and urban). In your opinion, was this result achieved? (Multiple answers possible)

- Yes, through the exchange of experience, good practice and information;
- Partially yes, but the cooperation was improved primarily at the external level;
- Partially yes, but the cooperation was improved primarily at the internal level;
- Other;
- The cooperation was not improved.
- Don't know.

If you replied 'the cooperation was not improved', please briefly provide some details.

400 character(s) maximum

See answer to question n° 7

12. Projects funded under the RF are expected to produce positive effects. Would you say that improved services and procedures (achieved also through the RF) will continue without the EU financial support?

- Yes;
- Generally yes, although with some problems;
- Generally no, although with some initial successes;
- No;
- Don't know.

If you did not reply 'yes' please briefly describe your reasons.

400 character(s) maximum

Most of the services provided will disappear

13. Based on your experience, would you say that the contribution of the RF was crucial to implement the EU policies in the field of return in your Country?

- Yes, it made a huge difference;
- Yes, but to limited extent;
- Probably no;
- Don't know.

20. Do you have any publication (flyer, study, handbook etc..) concerning the RF 2011-2013 that you would like to share with us?

- Yes;
- No.

Contact

HOME-FUNDS-EVALUATIONS@ec.europa.eu
