



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 5.5.2011
COM(2011) 246 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT**

**Report on the interim evaluation of the specific Programme "Drug prevention and
information" (DPIP) 2007-2013**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Purpose and structure of this report	3
1.2.	Background	3
1.2.1.	Objectives and priorities	3
1.2.2.	Types of actions supported.....	4
1.2.3.	Participation	4
1.2.4.	Target groups	5
1.2.5.	Access to DPIIP.....	5
1.2.6.	Budget	5
2.	Implementation of the DPIIP.....	6
2.1.1.	Commission initiatives.....	6
2.1.2.	Grants	6
3.	Evaluation of the DPIIP.....	10
3.1.	Relevance of the DPI Programme.....	10
3.2.	Effectiveness of the DPI Programme	11
3.3.	Efficiency of the DPI Programme.....	12
3.4.	Sustainability of the DPI Programme	13
4.	Conclusions and recommendations.....	14
4.1.	Increased EU dimension and EU added value and impact	14
4.2.	Increased efficiency of management of DPIIP.....	14
4.3.	Improved dissemination and better use of results	15

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose and structure of this report

As required by Article 15 (3b) of Decision No **1150/2007/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ (hereinafter referred to as the *basic act*), this report presents the results obtained in the course of the implementation of the **Drug prevention and information programme** (hereinafter referred to as *DPIP or DPI Programme*) since its approval on 25 September 2007. Based on the findings of the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the DPIP's implementation, on its main achievements while taking into account the main challenges, the report provides recommendations concerning the remaining period of implementation.

For the purposes of the qualitative and quantitative analysis an external contractor assisted the Commission². The findings of the study carried out by the contractor were based on the analysis of the documents, interviews with stakeholders, case studies and on a survey amongst the beneficiaries of funding. The survey included both action and operating grant holders receiving a grant under the calls for proposals 2007 and 2008 and also those partners of the action grant holders who were parties to the grant agreements.

1.2. Background

1.2.1. Objectives and priorities

The DPIP Programme forms part of the EU's Drug Strategy 2005-2012 that aims to significantly reduce the social harm and health damage caused by the use of, and trade in illicit drugs. The DPIP contributes to the objective to ensure a high level of human health protection and to reducing drug-related health damage. The **general objectives** of DPIP are to prevent and reduce drug use, dependence and drug related harm, to contribute to the improvement of information on drug use and to support the implementation of the EU Drugs Strategy 2005-2012.

The general objectives are further defined by the following three **specific objectives**

- (a) to promote transnational actions to:
 - (a) set up multidisciplinary networks;
 - (b) ensure the expansion of the knowledge base, the exchange of information and the identification and dissemination of good practices, including through
 - (c) training, study visits and staff exchange;

¹ Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice

² The study was prepared by the European Evaluation Consortium. At the time of the assignment the conclusion of the grant agreements under the call for proposals for action grants 2009/2010 was still ongoing. Therefore, these beneficiaries were not included in the survey.

- (d) raise awareness of the health and social problems caused by drug use and to encourage an open dialogue with a view to promoting a better understanding of the phenomenon of drugs; and
 - (e) support measures aimed at preventing drug use, including by addressing reduction of drug-related harm and treatment methods taking into account the latest state of scientific knowledge;
- (b) to involve civil society in the implementation and development of the EU Drugs Strategy and EU Action plans; and
 - (c) to monitor, implement and evaluate the implementation of specific actions under the Drugs Action Plans 2005 to 2008 and 2009 to 2012.

1.2.2. *Types of actions supported*

With a view to pursuing the general and specific objectives set out above, DPIP supports the following types of action:

- (a) **Commission initiatives - specific actions taken by the Commission**, such as studies and research, opinion polls and surveys, formulation of indicators and common methodologies, collection, development and dissemination of data and statistics, seminars, conferences and experts' meetings, organisation of public campaigns and events, development and maintenance of websites, preparation and dissemination of information materials, support to and animation of networks of national experts, analytical, monitoring and evaluation activities;
- (b) **specific transnational projects of Community interest** presented by at least two Member States, or at least one Member State and one other state which may either be an acceding or a candidate country; or
- (c) **the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest** regarding the general objectives of the Programme under the conditions set out in the annual work programme.

While Community financing takes the form of **public procurement contracts** in case of the Commission initiatives, the other two types of actions are financed by providing **action and operating grants**.

1.2.3. *Participation*

The DPIP is open to all 27 EU Member States. Other countries are also allowed to participate under the following conditions:

- (d) the EFTA States which are party to the EEA Agreement, in accordance with the provisions of that Agreement;
- (e) the candidate countries and the western Balkan countries included in the stabilisation and association process in accordance with the conditions laid down in the association agreements or their additional protocols relating to

participation in Community programmes concluded or to be concluded with those countries;

- (f) Candidate countries not participating in the Programme may be associated with projects where this would contribute to their preparation for accession, as may other third countries or international organisations not participating in the Programme where this serves the aim of the projects.

Based on the above principles, two organisations from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and one from Croatia participated (as associated partners) in transnational projects financed under the 2007 annual work programme. Apart from this, during the first three years of its implementation neither any of the candidate countries nor any West Balkan country joined the DPIP.

1.2.4. Target groups

DPIP is targeted at all groups that directly or indirectly deal with the phenomenon of drugs. With regard to drugs, youth, women, vulnerable groups and people living in socially disadvantaged areas are groups at risk and shall be identified as target groups. Other target groups include teachers and educational staff, parents, social workers, local and national authorities, medical and paramedical staff, judicial staff, law enforcement and penitentiary authorities, non-governmental organisations, trade unions and religious communities.

1.2.5. Access to DPIP

Access to DPIP is open to public or private organisations and institutions, local authorities at the relevant level, university departments and research centres working in the area of information on and prevention of drug use including the reduction and treatment of drug-related harm. Bodies and organisations which are profit-oriented can participate only in conjunction with non-profit or state organisations.

1.2.6. Budget

Article 12 of the basic act foresaw an overall financial envelope of **EUR 21.350.000** for the implementation of the DPI Programme for the period of 2007 to 2013. The provision of the funding was foreseen in equal instalments of EUR 3.050.000 per year. This yearly budget includes appropriations to cover the administrative costs of the programme management amounting to EUR 50.000 per year. In addition to the funding made available in the budget of the EU, the EFTA/EEA states also contribute to the DPIP based on a memorandum of understanding.

In the period under review the majority of the funding (78%) was allocated to operating and action grants, while Commission initiatives represented less than a third (22%) of the allocations:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Action grants</u>	<u>Operating grants</u>	<u>EC</u>
2007	3.000.000	2.250.000	0	750.000
2008	3.071.700	2.221.700	500.000	350.000
2009	3.071.700	2.471.700	0	600.000
2010	3.075.600	1.717.600	400.000	958.000

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DPIIP

Due to the late adoption of the basic act on 25 September 2007 the actual implementation of the programme could only start in 2008. Although there was an annual work programme adopted for the budgetary year 2007, the appropriations were only used from 2008 onwards. This situation negatively influenced the annuality of the implementation and created a one-year implementation gap. The programme could however catch up by not publishing calls for proposals in 2009.

2.1.1. Commission initiatives

Since 2007 altogether 18 actions have been funded under the heading of Commission Initiatives. Each of these actions contributed significantly to the implementation of the EU Drugs Strategy and the EU Drugs Action Plans. The DPIIP plays an important role to support the involvement of civil society: DPIIP funding supported the European Action on Drugs (EAD) which provides European civil society with a platform to make a commitment as regards drugs use and risks related to drug abuse. The Commission has run an extensive information campaign on EAD, three large scale events were organised in Berlin, London and Warsaw; and an internet site was set up to ensure the operation of EAD. By organising and financing 3 plenary and several expert level meetings, the Commission supported the operation of the Civil Society Forum on Drugs.

Research plays an important role to underpin evidence-based drug policies and develop the necessary policy responses to reduce the adverse health and social impacts of drug use in our societies. Two important actions were financed to develop an EU strategy for drug related research in the EU. Both *The comparative analysis of the illicit drug research in the EU*, and the large conference aiming at identifying and bridging the research gap (financed under the 2007 and 2008 annual work programmes respectively) were considered important milestones and served as a basis for setting up of the current research framework in this drugs policy field at EU level.

Under the 2007 and 2010 annual work programmes two additional studies were financed on *The detailed analysis of the operation of the world market in illicit drugs* to address the significant gap in knowledge on how drugs markets actually work and on the development of an EU framework for minimum quality standards and benchmarks in drug demand reduction to support the work of the Commission to develop an EU consensus in this area as required by the EU Drugs Action Plan. The Commission also supported the establishment of an expert group in the area of the latter study.

2.1.2. Grants

Support for specific transnational projects of Community interest (action grants) and the activities of non-governmental organisations or other entities pursuing an aim of general European interest (operating grants)

With the funding foreseen under the grants headings of the annual work programmes 2007-2010 the DPIIP supported activities implemented mainly by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and universities. With few exceptions, local and regional authorities were only partners in the projects. National administration was involved as an associated partner in selected cases. Altogether **143** organisations from **27 countries** participated in the financed

activities³ as beneficiary of an operating grant, project coordinator, project partner or associated party. *Associated parties are not direct beneficiaries of the grants and are not party to the grant agreements, they contribute to and profit from the activities indirectly.*

Out of all the participating organisations **136 (95%)** are established in one of the MS of the EU, altogether **23 Member States** are represented. Until the present no organisations participated from IE, CY, LU and MT, however some of the activities might involve individuals from these countries (e.g. participation at dissemination event) Despite the possibility provided in the basic act and the yearly contribution provided to the programme, no organisations participated from the EFTA/EAA countries.

Despite the **very positive achievements in terms of the EU coverage** the DPIP is facing challenges in terms of the geographical balance. The majority (82) of the participating organisations (including associated partners) were established in 5 Member States (IT – 17%, UK – 10%, DE – 13%, ES 6%, BE 6%). This proportion is almost identical to the proportion of the countries of origin of direct grant beneficiaries. Out of the 112⁴ grant beneficiaries (operating grant holders, action grant coordinators and partners) 54 % came from 5 MS (IT – 18%, UK – 12%, DE – 11%, ES 6%, BE 6%).

Operating grants

Altogether **three calls for operating grants** were published. Applicants could apply for funding for the implementation of their annual activity programmes during 2008, 2010 and 2011(annual work programme 2011).

In response to the three calls altogether **39 applications** were received out of which **9 organisations** were selected. The assessment of

the applications submitted for the financial year 2011 was still ongoing at the time of the preparation of the report.

The financial conditions for operating grants remained unchanged throughout this period. The maximum amount of grant available was 100.000 EUR, the percentage of the EC contribution to the total eligible operating budget of the applicant could not exceed 80%.

	OPERATING GRANTS	2008	2010	2011
Number of applications received		16	19	4
Number of eligible applications		13	5	n.a.
Number of proposals selected		5	4	n.a.
Total amount of funding allocated	500.000 EUR	400.000 EUR	400.000 EUR.	
Total amount of grant sought	1.029.632 EUR	1.318.474,56 EUR	n.a.	
Total amount of grant awarded	409.429 EUR	219.788,38 EUR	n.a.	

³ 2007, 2008 and 2009/2010 calls for proposals included

⁴ Several organisations participated in more than one project or were beneficiaries of an operating grant during the first four years of the DPIP. These organisations were only taken into account once for the purpose of the calculation of the cumulated total number of grant beneficiaries.

Action grants

In order to get support for **transnational projects**, interested organisations could respond to **3 calls for proposals**. Due to the late adoption of the basic act, the first call for proposals based on the annual work programme 2007 was published in 2008. Similarly the call under the 2008 annual work programme was only published in

ACTION GRANTS	2007	2008	2009/2010
Number of applications received	39	59	66
Number of eligible applications	33	41	53
Number of proposals selected	9	6	10
Total amount of funding allocated	2 250 000 EUR	2 221 700 EUR	4 189 300 EUR
Total amount of grant sought	11 610 036,34 EUR	13 850 005,17 EUR	21 732 250,18 EUR
Total amount of grant awarded	2 181 947,85 EUR	2 116 748,04 EUR	3 889 295,44 EUR

2009. In order to allow the programme to cover this time gap, the third call was published in 2010 that combined the appropriations under the action grant heading foreseen for two years (2009 and 2010). As a result, while the available funding in case of the first two calls was almost identical (around 2,2 million EUR) the appropriations were nearly doubled in 2009/2010.

The increase in the number of applications shows a steady growth of interest in the DPIP. The Commission treated altogether **164 applications for action grants**. Out of the **eligible 127 proposals** the budget permitted the **funding of 25**. The total amount of grant awarded to proposals was **8,187 million EUR** representing an overall **75%** contribution to the total implementing costs of the actions.

	Total budget in EUR	Total amount of grant in EUR	EC contribution %
Total 2007	2.789.586,16	2.181.947,85	78%
Total 2008	3.034.116,27	2.116.748,04	70%
Total 2009/2010	5.114.243,88	3.889.295,44	76%
Total	10.937.946,31	8.187.991,33	75%

While in 2007 there was no upper limit in terms of attainable grant, a 500.000 EUR cap was introduced in the 2008 call and maintained in the 2009/2010 call as well. Applications where the requested funding did not reach a minimum of 75.000 EUR were not accepted.

	Total budget in EUR	Total amount of grant in EUR	EC contribution %	Length in Months
Average 2007	309.954,02	242.438,65	79	28,33
Average 2008	505.686,05	352.791,34	75	28,50
Average 2009/2010	511.424,39	388.929,54	77	23,60
Total average	442.353,83	328.053,18	77	26,81

Year	implementing beneficiaries	implementing organisations	Average number of EU MS concerned
2007	3,7	5,3	4
2008	6	7,8	5,6
2009/2010	5,8	6,4	5,1

The average amount of grant requested was 328.000 EUR, which is well above the minimum threshold. The lowest amount of grant awarded was 120.000 EUR while the majority was between 300.000 and the upper threshold. The majority of the project coordinators of the selected proposals were NGOs (48%) and universities or institutions run by universities (40%), only 12 % of the coordinators are coming from the governmental sector of local/regional level.

Total	5,2	6,5	4,9
-------	-----	-----	-----

The dimension of the projects showed a slight increase both in terms of number of partners and number of EU member states concerned. All the projects selected under the 2007 action grant call started in 2009.

3. EVALUATION OF THE DPIIP

The evaluation of the programme was clustered around the following four categories: (1) Relevance; (2) Effectiveness; (3) Efficiency and (4) Sustainability of the programme.

3.1. Relevance of the DPI Programme

Illicit drugs are a complex social problem, which require a long-term, integrated and multidisciplinary approach. The study on developments in the global illicit drugs market mentioned above⁵ found no evidence of any improvement over this period. In some countries the problem diminished but in others it worsened, in some cases sharply. Drug abuse still constitutes a major health problem in the EU, according to the annual reports of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Action⁶. **The relevance of the policy objectives of the DPIIP is very high since its adoption in 2007.** Its objectives, priority areas and activities are highly pertinent to the needs, problems and issues of the target groups.

Civil society involvement is a key objective of EU Drugs Action Plan. The Action Plan highlights the need to increase commitment across society to reduce drug use as one of the main issues. It states that an alliance between citizens and the institutions created by them and for them should be reinforced. **The DPIIP is particularly suitable to contribute to this objective.**

There is a clear link between the activities implemented; the measures contained in the annual work programmes as well as the broad programme objectives. All the activities implemented relate to one or more of the priority areas mentioned in the annual programmes.

The added value of the DPIIP is high. EU intervention adds benefits to the fight against drug use and drug prevention by promoting transnational learning and improving the visibility and credibility of activities implemented.

Due to the multifaceted and global nature of the drug phenomenon, several Community financial instruments support the initiatives of the EU in the illicit drugs field and complement funding under the DPIIP. The Prevention of and Fight Against Crime programme 2007-2013 (ISEC)⁷ provides support for projects in the field of illicit drug trafficking and which contribute to the implementation of the supply reduction policy of the EU Drugs Strategy and its Action Plans, including drugs markets, production, trafficking and drugs-related crime.

As drug abuse is a key public health and social concern throughout the EU and beyond, one of the priority areas of the Community Programme on Public Health⁸ is to take action on addiction-related determinants such as tobacco, alcohol, illegal drugs and pharmaceuticals

⁵ JLS/2007/C4/005 — Detailed analysis of the operation of the world market in illicit drugs and of policy measures to curtail it

⁶ EMCDDA Annual Report 2010

⁷ 125/2007/JHA

⁸ Basic act Decision No 1350/2007/EC of the European parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 establishing a second programme of Community action in the field of health (2008-13)

used improperly. This Programme also provides support for projects on reduction of health-related harm associated with drug dependence.

The 7th Research and Development Framework Programme supports large-scale drug related research. In 2009, under the Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities programme of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research (FP7), the Commission launched a call for research proposals targeting addictions, with a minimum EU contribution of €6.5 million. In order to support joint research activities between Member States, the Commission has made €2 million available for the establishment of a European Research Area Network (ERA-NET) in the field of drugs. The 2010 Security Programme under the FP7 includes a call for proposals on the unintended consequences of drugs policies and their impact on EU security. A call for proposals for large collaborative projects (€6 to €12 million) in the field of 'addictive disorders' was also published in 2010 under the FP7 Health Theme. The external dimension of drugs policy is supported by the relevant financial instruments.

Evidence suggests that overall there is complementarity between the different programmes and initiatives. However, this **fragmentation** also presents risks of overlap (between the DPIP and the Public Health Programme, for instance) or gaps. Moreover, it has made it difficult for both the Commission and for potential beneficiaries to maximise use of EU funding in this field. Although the basic act allows⁹ the possibility of sharing resources with other Community instruments in order to implement actions meeting the objectives of all the programmes, this was not used during the first 3 years of DPIP's implementation.

3.2. Effectiveness of the DPI Programme

At the stage of the evaluation only very few activities have been completed. Consequently only limited conclusions can be drawn on the effectiveness of the DPI Programme. However, the DPIP funded projects and activity programmes have already implemented a variety of activities and produced concrete outputs, this way the current analysis can already be built on solid evidence. The findings of the evaluation indicate that the projects funded are likely to contribute significantly to the objectives of the DPIP.

Although the DPIP performed well in terms of the number of participating countries there is still room for improvement in terms of creating real, long-lasting added value via the projects.

Although it is the only instrument specialised for the support of the policy field, and its general objectives are ambitious especially in terms of prevention and harm reduction activities, its overall financial resources are the most limited in comparison to the other programmes mentioned above. DPIP currently is not meeting funding needs. Although the maximum project duration was decreased from 3 years to 2 years, the financial envelope foreseen for the DPIP does not allow the financing of more than 10 projects a year. The size of the projects in terms of number of participating organisations is also limited by the available funding. In order to **reinforce the programme**, so that it can achieve long-lasting results at EU level, **there is a need to strengthen its financial resources**.

Even though there were no major obstacles experienced in the realisation of the activities, the project promoters experienced procedural and substantive challenges. Amongst the **procedural challenges** stakeholders identified the obstacles linked to the lack of flexibility in

⁹ In particular the General Programmes "Security and Safeguarding Liberties", "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows" and the 7th Research and Development Framework Programme

terms of reallocation of expenses within the projects and the slowness in the delivery of the funding as the most substantial. Although partnerships were considered to be beneficial for the programme's activities and projects, the coordination of a number of partner organisations from different countries with different backgrounds required considerable efforts. In some instances, delays were experienced due to problems arising with national legislation concerning the participation of experts and individuals in focus groups.

With regards to **substantive challenges**, the engagement of vulnerable groups appeared in some cases to be difficult. Also engaging the statutory sectors and recruiting participants for needs assessment was challenging. This furthermore made engaging them in the wider project impossible to achieve. Undertaking research in prisons was also not easy due to the limited access available. A more important problem is the difficulty at operational level in relation to the monitoring and assessing the impact of the results.

Based on the analysis of the proposed dissemination strategies the expected result is not fully satisfactory bearing in mind few of the projects have been completed. It can be concluded that in the majority of cases the outputs of the projects rarely reach anyone outside the project partners, although there are some good examples as well, where project results were/will be presented at large scale international professional events. The most common dissemination strategy is the setting up of a specialised internet site for the project or placing some information on an already existing website of the coordinator or partners. As there is no elaborate requirement set in terms of what kind of information should be provided about the programmes and the language of the information, the level of communication varies across individual projects. The visibility of the Community support is also varying. Nevertheless, all the supported organisations respect the minimum requirements.

Currently there is no centralised strategy in place concerning the communication of the results of the achievements of the projects or activities funded under the DPIIP.

3.3. Efficiency of the DPI Programme

The findings of the survey among the beneficiaries of the grants showed that there was an **overall satisfaction with the Commission's management of the DPIIP**.

The applicants welcomed the introduction of the **on-line application procedure** supported by the electronic grant management system PRIAMOS since 2008. The introduction of the electronic application submission decreased the administrative burden of the applicants and the costs of submitting an application. The survey also showed that in general beneficiaries considered the **guidance and support given by the Commission helpful at the application phase and throughout the implementation of the activities**.

Despite the overall positive assessment, certain **shortcomings** were identified.

Though the Commission was generally clear with its guidance, problems arose as it took a long time to respond to queries concerning eligibility of expenses. **Reporting arrangements concerning the progress and achievements were considered as appropriate, clear and user friendly**. On the other hand, beneficiaries experienced some difficulties and expressed concerns about the **excessive bureaucracy** linked to financial reporting as well as lack of flexibility in case of changes to be made to the original applications.

The most important shortcoming however is the **lengthy award procedure**. This affects largely the timely starting of the projects and frequently results in the need to amend the original proposal. The problem is particularly pertinent in case of the operating grants that should support the general operating costs of an entity for a specific budgetary year. Therefore there is no flexibility in terms of (re)scheduling the activities.

This is not only an operative problem for the beneficiaries of the grant, but it also has a negative effect on the performance of the DPIP against the actual policy priorities.

Although the introduction of the electronic grant management system somewhat simplified the procedure, freed some resources of the Commission, especially in terms of administrative tasks related to the physical handling and registering of the applications, significant acceleration of the procedure has not been achieved. Elements of the procedure imposed by the basic act (consultation of the Member States and the right of scrutiny of the European Parliament) and the administrative requirements for processing a high number of supporting documents remain a considerable obstacle.

In addition the management of the lengthy administrative process takes away valuable resources from substance-focused monitoring or guidance activities, or the dissemination of results and the use of outputs. This was also one of the recurring points raised by the beneficiaries in relation to the Commission's management.

3.4. Sustainability of the DPI Programme

The question of sustainability is all the more important as the economic downturn has eroded the budgets allocated to drugs policy at national level. This conclusion of the Commission report on the review of the EU Drugs Action Plan (2009 – 2012)¹⁰ was confirmed by the survey concluded among the grant beneficiaries of the calls 2007 and 2008.

The evaluation indicated that projects heavily rely on EU funding to implement the activities and to impact on the ground. Grant holders meet difficulties in finding co-funding from other institutions and organisations as well as in ensuring continuous funding from the Commission and other national and international institutions. This is especially the case for smaller organisations such as NGOs or associations, with limited financial resources. Though the majority of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the DPIP activities stated that they were making efforts to find new financial prospects, in most of the cases, other sources of funding were not accessible.

Overall, the projects have put in place activities and tools, which might be self-sustained over the longer period. Examples of sustainable results produced in the framework of the DPIP include the establishment and consolidation of transnational partnerships and the development of toolkits and publications.

The findings of the evaluation also show that partnerships established and consolidated in the framework of the DPIP are likely to continue after the Commission's funding has ceased and might result in new activities in the near future.

¹⁰ COM(2010) 630 final Report from the Commission 2010 progress review of the EU Drugs Action Plan (2009-2012) SEC(2010) 1321

Finally, given the projects focus on development of tools that may be used by the target audiences to address ultimate target group needs, it is reasonable to assume that (at least some of) the impacts of the DPIIP will be sustainable and that the target audiences will be able to use the results produced by the implemented activities.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Interim evaluation confirmed the relevance of the DPIIP. Its assessment has proven that both the general and the specific objectives are pertinent to the needs and problems of the target groups. It also concluded that during the first 3 years of its implementation, the DPI Programme could boast certain achievements in terms of reaching its originally-set objectives, and it has shown the potential to achieve good results in the field, despite its limited financial resources.

The limited budget however is preventing the achievement of an impact at a large scale with considerable EU dimension which has also limited the number of participating organisations. In order to **reinforce the programme** so that it can achieve long-lasting results at EU level **there is a need to strengthen its financial resources** with a view to a possible future comprehensive financial instrument in the field of drugs.

The findings of the evaluation confirmed that there are no major difficulties hindering the successful implementation of the programme. However, in order to maximise the potential of the DPIIP within its existing framework, to strengthen its impact and to optimize the implementation there is a need for certain adjustments. The Commission proposes the following measures to address these:

4.1. Increased EU dimension and EU added value and impact

In order to gain visibility for the programmes and to ensure that the projects achieve an impact not limited to local or regional level, broader and better elaborated projects with a higher EU added value and sustainability should be favoured. To deliver activities with a broad European dimension, coverage and sustainability, the financing possibilities within the DPIIP should be streamlined and the limited available funding should be concentrated on multiannual actions implemented by several partners. To this end the Commission will assess the added value of the operating grants provided for organisations only for one budgetary year which have had limited impact so far.

The Commission should further strengthen the synergies between the financial instruments supporting the objectives of the EU Drugs Strategy. The cooperation and communication among the programmes should be enhanced (in particular between ISEC and DPIIP and DPIIP and the Public Health Programme) at the level of programming during the formulation of the annual work programmes in order to avoid duplications and to allow potential beneficiaries to target their applications more efficiently.

4.2. Increased efficiency of management of DPIIP

The lengthy and administratively demanding procedures have been identified as major obstacle to success. To this end the Commission will take measures to reduce the time spent between the publication of the calls for proposals and the actual conclusion of the grant agreement to quicken the provision of funding. Further consideration should be to address the procedural obligations imposed by the basic act, namely the consultations on the outcome of

the selection of grant beneficiaries with the DPIP committee and the European Parliament, which should also be viewed in the context of the future financial perspectives.

It was confirmed that abolishing of the paper-based application process had a positive impact on the management, and was perceived positively by the target audience of the DPIP. The new PRIAMOS system has proven its usefulness and showed good potential to become an integrated interface of communication with applicants and beneficiaries. The Commission will take further steps to improve its functionalities and speed in order to facilitate the gradual transfer of the entire grant management process to it.

4.3. Improved dissemination and better use of results

The evaluation identified certain deficits in relation to the exploitation of the result of the projects financed under the DPIP. It was indicated that making the results centrally available for the public would not only directly contribute to one of the specific objectives of the DPIP but also would allow the generation of better projects. This would help the current and future beneficiaries as well as the Commission to avoid duplications and allow to build on already existing achievements.