



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE, FREEDOM AND SECURITY

Directorate C
Unit C/4: Financial support - Migration and Borders

SOLID/2009/38

**Committee
General programme
Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows**

Subject: Template for the intermediate report for the External Borders Fund

Summary

According to Article 52(2), point a) of Decision 573/2007/EC, Member States shall submit by 30 June 2010 an evaluation report on the implementation of actions co-financed by the Fund. On the basis of the reports from the Member States, the Commission shall submit to the EP, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions, by 31 December 2010 an intermediate report on the results achieved and qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the Fund.

A draft template for the report to be submitted by Member States was presented at the conference of 22 and 23 September 2009. Please find enclosed the final version of the template consisting of a word version and an excel work sheet.

Action to be taken

Preparation of the report on the basis of the template.

The report should be sent to JLS-SOLID-COMMITTEE@ec.europa.eu by **30 June 2010**.

In case of any questions on how to fill in the template please contact the desk officer in the Commission dealing with your country's annual programmes.

Template for preparation by Member States of the

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND**

(Report set out in Article **52(2) (a)** of Decision **No 574/2007/EC**)

Please fill in the enclosed template

(preferably in English, French or German)

*and submit it to the Commission **no later than 30 June 2010***

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. *The enclosed template is intended to assist Member States in the preparation of the evaluation report which they have to submit to the Commission no later than 30 June 2010, as set out in Article 52(2) (a) of Decision No 574/2007/EC.*

Please always use this format, as this is the only way to ensure a homogeneous evaluation across all Member States and for the Community wide evaluation subsequently.

You are free to add any further document you think can be useful in the context of this evaluation. If so, enclose them as an annex, but not as part of this template.

2. *When filling in this template please be as concrete as possible, providing facts, examples, figures, etc. - It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with the national programme concerned. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities.*
3. *A maximum length of description is indicated for many items. As far as possible this limit should be respected.*
4. *The analysis and assessment of the annual programmes under review start with a summary of the most important features of the multiannual programme and of the programmes approved by the Commission. The reason we ask for this is that we need to have a homogeneous presentation for the subsequent Community wide report. In this context, we think you are the best placed to identify the most relevant features of your programmes.*
5. *When your opinion is asked for, please explain the reasons on which your opinion is based.*
6. *As the content of this mid term evaluation report is on implementation it is not required to have recourse to evaluation expertise: the report can be prepared by the Responsible Authority itself. However, for your convenience, you may choose to have recourse to evaluation expertise.*

In any case please fill in first the questionnaire on the first page of the template.

Whether you had recourse to evaluation expertise or not, the evaluation report must always be signed by the Responsible Authority. The Responsible Authority remains responsible for its content.

**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND**

(Report set out in Article 52(2) (a) of Decision No 574/2007/EC)

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: (Member State)

[Cyprus Republic](#)

Date:

[01/06/2010](#)

Name, Signature (authorised representative of the Responsible Authority):

[Alexandros Kolveris](#)

Name of the contact person (and contact details) for this report in the Member State:

[Constantinos Kyprianou](#)
ckyprianou@moi.gov.cy
tel. +357 22409999

GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON EVALUATION EXPERTISE AND ON METHODOLOGY

- Did you have recourse to an evaluation expertise to prepare this report?

No

- If yes, for what part(s) of this report?

- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:

* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.) : (please describe)

-

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

-

Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise

-

Important remark

Any evaluation expertise must be obliged by the Responsible Authority to:

- use this template, exclusively
- fully comply with any instruction, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out in this template.

**EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND**

CONTENTS

1. SUMMARY OF THE MULTIANNUAL PROGRAMME: ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS IN THE MEMBER STATE AND STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES
2. SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
(EXCLUDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEASURES AND INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY)
3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD
4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
5. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD
6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
7. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009
8. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EBF PROGRAMMES 2007 THROUGH 2009

Part I

Summary of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013

ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS IN THE MEMBER STATE AND STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your multiannual programme 2007-2013 as approved by the Commission, in particular Parts 2 and 3 of the multiannual programme*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available*
- *Any other relevant information available to the Responsible Authority*

The multiannual programme has been approved by the European Commission with Decision dated 5.12.2008.

1. ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS IN THE MEMBER STATE

Please provide a summary of Part 2 of your multiannual programme (“Analysis of requirements in the Member State”)

A concise, but very concrete description is required. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities.

Maximum length: 1 page in total, broken down as set out below

The requirements in the Member State in relation to the baseline situation was prepared by the **Cyprus Police** and by the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** representing the general needs of Cyprus Republic as regards external borders control and consular affairs.

The actions which, in light of the baseline situation and aforementioned analysis, need to be implemented in order for the Cyprus Police to be able to secure the external borders of the Republic of Cyprus and the EU, together with the implementation of the Police Multiannual Strategic Plan for 2008-11, are summarized below in terms of the main three requirements:

Requirement 1: Improve the operational capacity of the police on the borders by modernizing and upgrading its material and technical infrastructure.

Requirement 2: Improve/develop the expertise of border guards.

Requirement 3: Strengthen measures to prevent and suppress illegal immigration and other cross-border offences.

With regard to the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs** the actions which, in light of the baseline situation and aforementioned analysis, need to be implemented in order to satisfy the national political context in terms of the consular affairs are summarized below:

Requirement 1: Improve security in consulates

Requirement 2: Upgrade material/technical infrastructure in consulates

Requirement 3: Develop expertise and skills of consular officials and

Requirement 4: Improve the visa process

- The operational objectives of the Member State designed to meet its requirements

Operational objectives to meet the requirements for the external borders control:

- Upgrade and extend IT services
- Upgrade and improve telecommunications and electronic equipment
- Renew and modernize means of transport
- Develop and improve building infrastructure and set up illegal immigrant Detention Centres
- Purchase modern equipment for border control and surveillance
- Establish a National Coordination Centre (NCC)
- Run training courses and circulate information to border guards
- Step up surveillance and control operations on borders
- Improvement of Knowledge base Intelligence capacity of Cyprus
- Improve operational cooperation with Frontex and other Member States

Operational objectives to meet the requirements of the consular affairs:

- Install modern security technology and modify buildings
- Upgrade and extend IT applications in consulates
- Training courses / circulate information
- Prevent illegal immigration
- Implement a common visa policy
- Improve service to applicants

2. **STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES**

Please provide a summary of Part 3 of your multiannual programme (“Strategy to achieve the objectives”), broken down by Priority (each of the five Priorities as defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission - Decision C(2007)3925 of the Commission) as set out on the next pages.

Under each Priority, describe:

- the objective(s) pursued*
- examples of key actions*
- key actions considered as implementing specific priorities under the chosen priority*

Finally list in a separate item all quantified objectives set out in Part 3 of your multiannual programme.

A concise, but very concrete description is required. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities.

A maximum length is indicated for each item.

Priority 1: Support for the gradual establishment of the common integrated border management system as regards checks on persons and the surveillance of the external borders

The contribution from the Fund will support further application of the integrated border management system both in terms of controls of individuals and in terms of border surveillance by the Republic of Cyprus. The strategy for Priority 1 has been broken down into the following four objectives:

Objective 1: Upgrade and improve telecommunications and electronic equipment

This objective is expected to help improve the efficacy and efficiency of the departments involved in border control and surveillance and to meet the challenges of cross-border crime, especially illegal immigration.

Example of actions under this objective are: upgrading/extending of the wired and wireless networks and the purchase of a system for transmitting sound and images from operational centres (the Tetra system)

Objective 2: Develop and improve building infrastructure

Achieving this objective is expected to satisfy the efficient management by the Member States of the flows of persons at the external borders in order to ensure a high level of protection at the external borders and improve detention conditions for illegal immigrants. In general it is expected to satisfy the operational requirements in terms of buildings, stations, offices, warehouses, machine-shops, laboratories, hangars, fences, installations and special illegal immigrant detention sites.

Example of actions under this objective are: the erection of a Detention Centre for illegal immigrants and improving and extending existing buildings.

Objective 3: Purchase modern equipment for border control

This objective is expected to satisfy the primary and secondary requirements of departments involved in guarding external borders and to give new impetus to the fight against illegal immigration. It will also help to improve the efficacy of the police departments directly involved in surveillance and control of the external borders, the coastline and territorial waters of the Republic of Cyprus.

Example of actions are: purchase of personal equipment (e.g. bullet-proof jackets), collective equipment (e.g. thermal imaging cameras, surveillance cameras, night vision cameras), fixed equipment (e.g. CCTV Systems, passport readers) and portable equipment (e.g. electricity generators, airborne searchlight, x-ray units).

Objective 4: Purchase of means of transport

This objective apart from improving the operational capability of the police departments is expected to contribute to operational cooperation with other Member States (as coordinated by Frontex Agency) and to interoperability with other Member States taking into account the results of the common integrated risk analysis.

Examples of actions are: the purchase and modernisation of the air, sea and land fleet e.g. inflatable boats, fast patrol vessels, 4x4 Vehicles, motor vehicles, Twin Engine Light Helicopter to be used for patrolling maritime borders etc.

All actions proposed under Priority 1 satisfy the strategic guidelines set out by the EU in the general programme. However key actions considered as specific priorities is the upgrade and improvement of telecommunications and electronic equipment.

Priority 2: Support for the development and implementation of the national components of a European Surveillance System for the external borders and of a permanent European Patrol Network at the southern maritime borders of the EU Member States

The Republic of Cyprus is not going to implement actions under this priority. The requirements concerning this priority are going to be financed under the national budget.

Priority 3: Support for the issuing of visas and the tackling of illegal immigration, including the detection of false or falsified documents by enhancing the activities organised by the consular and other services of the Member States in third countries

The scope of this objective is to establish a safe environment for the consular officers dealing with the examination of applications and the issuance of visas and at the same time to enhance the security of the issuing procedure itself by maintaining the standards provided for by the CCI and the catalogue of best practices. The strategy for Priority 3 has been broken down into the following objectives:

Objective 1: Install modern security technologies and modify buildings

The scope of this objective is to establish a safe environment for the consular officers dealing with the examination of applications and the issuance of visas and at the same time to enhance the security of the issuing procedure itself by maintaining the standards provided for by the CCI and the catalogue of best practices. Examples are: purchasing equipment and installing metal detectors, door security, CCTV systems, alarm systems, safes, bullet-proof glass etc.

Objective 2: Detection of forged documents

The lack of modern forged document detection equipment and passport readers in Cypriot consulates prevents detailed and effective control of applications and their accompanying documents, causing increased risks of illegal immigration and other crimes.

Examples of actions are: purchasing modern equipment to detect forged documents.

Objective 3: Co-operation with other Diplomatic Missions

Due to its limited representation the Republic of Cyprus plans to extend its consular representation in Third countries in which at this stage is not represented, inter alia, through cooperation with other member states, i.e Joint Embassies/Consulates, Common Application Centres.

Examples are: initiatives to set up joint Missions, participation of Cyprus in Common Application Centres/ establishment of CAC, Consular Representation Agreements etc.

Objective 4: Purchase of equipment to Improve service to applicants

This objective will provide visa applicants with a faster and higher standard service, free consular officials so that they can carry out more detailed controls of applications and accompanying documents, improving the image of the Community and the application of the common visa policy.

Examples are: purchasing and installing automatic telephone system, etc.

The key action considered as implementing specific priorities under Priority 3 is the implementation of a common visa policy.

Priority 4: Support for the establishment of IT systems required for the implementation of the Community legal instruments in the field of external borders and visas

The contribution from the Fund will help towards upgrading and extending the information systems required in order to apply Community legal acts in connection with external borders and consulates. The strategy for Priority 4 has been broken down into the following four objectives:

Objective 1: Upgrade and extend IT services at external borders

Achieving this objective is expected to improve the efficiency of police services at the borders and cooperation with other Member States of the EU. It will also help towards faster and real-time exchange of information between departments and save human resources, which can be used on other border missions.

Examples of actions are: extend and upgrade the Schengen Information System (SIS II) and connect the Visa Information System (VIS) on the border controllers' terminals.

Objective 2: Upgrade and extend IT applications in consulates

Achieving this objective is expected to improve the efficiency of consulates and allow fast compilation, analysis and exchange of information between the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus involved in border control (e.g. cooperation between consulates, the police, Population and Migration Records Department etc.) and promote cooperation with consular, police and other authorities responsible for border controls in the other Member States. It will also help to improve controls carried out when visas are issued and, by extension, help to prevent illegal immigration and other criminal activities.

Example of actions: Extend the VIS and connect it to the SIS

The key action considered as implementing specific priorities under Priority 4 is to extend and upgrade the SIS and the VIS.

Priority 5: Support for effective and efficient application of relevant Community legal instruments in the field of external borders and visas, in particular the Schengen Borders Code and the European Code on Visas

The contribution from the Fund will help to support the effective application of the relevant Community legal acts in connection with visas (especially the European Visa Code).

Objective 1: Run training courses and circulate information to consular officials

Achieving this objective will help to circulate information to consular officials with the aim of developing their expertise, skills and qualifications so that they can perform their duties more efficiently.

Examples of actions: transfer of knowhow to consular officials in connection with the Schengen Acquis and the application of the European Visa Code (through seminars, CD-ROM etc).

Finally, list the most important indicators set out in Part 3 of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013 and the corresponding quantified/qualitative targets, broken down by Priority:

Priority 1
(Main indicators, targets)

Description of targets concerned and the indicators used:

INDICATORS		
Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of equipment purchased. -Number of equipment and means of transport purchased, replaced and /or upgraded. -Number of patrols at sea and air. -Number of operations coordinated on borders for the efficient control borders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Better working conditions for border guards. -Quality of available equipment for border guards increased. -Better working conditions for border guards. - Increased quality of available equipment for border guards. -Increased reaction capacity with regards to detection and interception of illegal border crossers. -Enhance the ability of the Republic to control the borders. -Reduce danger of illegal immigrants entering Cyprus borders. -Increased of operational ability in the air and at sea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased border security.

Priority 2
(Main indicators, targets)

The Republic of Cyprus is not going to implement actions under this priority. The requirements concerning this priority are going to be financed under the national budget.

Priority 3 (Main indicators, targets)

Description of targets concerned and the indicators used:

INDICATORS		
Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of premises and buildings upgraded. -Number of equipment purchased for detecting forged/ falsified documents in consulates. -Number and scope of practices and procedures established jointly. - Number of data items relating to visas exchanged with other Member States. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Safer consular offices. -Increase capacity of officers to detect forged documents -Co-ordinated implementation of common visa policy at level of Member States. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Safer environment for consular officers as well as maintaining the standards and best practices for visa issuing provided by the CCI. -Detect forgery and reduce illegal Immigration. -Equal and fair treatment of visa applicants.

Priority 4 (Main indicators, targets)

Description of targets concerned and the indicators used:

INDICATORS		
Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number and scope of new software and procurement of hardware and equipment for border control developed with a view to the comprehensive operation of the SISII. -Number and scope of new software and procurement of hardware 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Better performance of the system. -Larger sweep of alerts. -Improved ability to manage alerts. -Improve the efficiency of consulates - Allow fast compilation. - Analysis and exchange of information between the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Better integration of the Immigration control process at borders. -Promote a better cooperation with consular, police and other authorities responsible for border controls in the other Member States.

and equipment. - Number of data items exchanged between the SIS and VIS.	authorities of the Republic of Cyprus involved in border control.	
---	---	--

Priority 5
(Main indicators, targets)

Description of targets concerned and the indicators used:

INDICATORS INDICATORS		
Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
-Number and scope of courses organized. -Number of participants. -Percentage of consular officers trained.	-Good knowledge of the applicable rules by consular officers.	-More coherent application of EU rules and standards in consular matters.

Part II

SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009

(excluding Technical Assistance measures and Information and Publicity)

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *Your annual programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009 as approved by the Commission, in particular the description of actions*
- *All other relevant information available to the Responsible Authority*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available*

Please provide a summary of the actions contained in your annual programmes 2007 through 2009 (based on the description included in item 1 of each action – purpose and scope), broken down by Priority (each of the five Priorities as defined in the Strategic Guidelines of the Commission - Decision C(2007)3925 of the Commission) as set out on the next pages.

Under each Priority describe separately actions/projects implemented under the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and those under the “executing body” method, on the other hand (where applicable).

No breakdown per year is required, however you will be asked to highlight any significant change to the actions of the programmes concerned in a specific item (see the template on the following pages).

A concise, but very concrete description is required. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities.

A maximum length is indicated for each item.

The **revised** version of 2007 annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission, with Decision dated 1.2.2010.

The **revised** version 2008 annual programme is at the final stages for approval. The current report includes evaluation for the actions that were introduced in the revised version of the 2008 annual programme. The revised version was submitted to the European Commission on 31.03.2010.

The **initial** version of 2009 annual programme was approved by the European Commission, with Decision dated 8.07.2009.

It is noted that a revised version for the annual programme 2009 is expected to be submitted to the Commission shortly. Most of the actions included in the initial version will be removed and replaced by new ones.

1. Summary of actions under Priority 1 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

Not applicable.

None of the actions included in the annual programmes (2007, 2008 and 2009) are implemented under the “awarding body” method.

Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

- Under Priority 1, the action regarding the **purchase of two medium size twin engine, utility helicopters** is being implemented. This action implies a continuation in the following Annual Programmes of 2008, 2009 and 2010.

More specifically the annual programme of 2007 includes the prepayment for the purchase of two helicopters. The annual programme of 2008 includes the second payment and the 2009 & 2010 annual programmes the final payment of the two helicopters. The purpose of the action, after its completion, is to achieve the objective of having equipment, which allows more efficient control and surveillance of air and maritime borders.

- Under Priority 1 the **purchase of forty (40) 4X4 Vehicles** has already been implemented. The action is included in the annual programme of 2008 and covers a part of the actual needs of the Cyprus Police. The vehicles are being used for patrolling the maritime external borders of the Republic of Cyprus in order to prevent the entrance of illegal immigrants and unwanted persons into the country.

- An action that is included in the initial version of the 2009 annual programme under Priority 1, concerns the purchase of **two (2) Category B – Medium sized Patrol boats** for the replacement of the current fleet. The medium-size patrol boats are going to be used by the

coastal stations of the Port and Marine Police are considered “the backbone of patrolling” by the Port and Marine Police. The boats to be purchased will be 15-16 meters long, achieving a top speed of 43 Knots at good weather conditions. During their normal patrol, they will be manned by three officers. The Boats will be able to patrol all year round. These types of boats will operate day and night. Their mission will be to patrol the sea areas under the control of the Republic of Cyprus. Based on the programmed patrols these boats will operate for 6 hours per day. However it is noted that, if there is an emergency situation these boats might operate for 24h daily.

- Two actions concerning the purchase of modern equipment for border control and surveillance are included in 2009 annual programme. More specifically, the actions will co-finance **three (3) Fixed/ Permanently Mounted Observation Systems** (with Day/ Night cameras) which are going to be installed on the two medium sized Patrol Boats and in the Marine Police Station in the Eastern Area; and **Three (3) Portable/Transportable Observation Systems** to be installed on the Patrol Boats. The above actions are expected to achieve the need of improving the operational capability of the Police departments involved in control of land and sea border surveillance and combat illegal immigration and other illegal activities as well as to improve the operational capacity of police on borders by modernizing and upgrading its material/technical infrastructure. These actions will allow the observation of a big area where frequent events of illegal immigration are taking place and towards locating any suspected boats of being involved in illegal immigration or other illegal activities.

- The 2009 annual programme includes an action concerning the erection of a **Detention Centre** for illegal immigrants. The centre will be built and used exclusively for persons who are refused entry to the Republic of Cyprus, for persons who are arrested after illegal entry into territory of the Republic of Cyprus and for persons who approach the external borders with the intention to illegally enter the territory of the Republic of Cyprus.

This Detention Centre for illegal immigrants will be erected in Menoyia, which is located in South-East of Cyprus between Kofinou village and the town of Larnaca (where the one of the two airports of the island is located). The construction in Menoyia will consist of two phases. The Fund will co-finance **only** the first phase which includes a metallic structure of 256 people capacity, while the second phase involves the construction of an appropriate facility with the capacity to hold 300 people.

2. Summary of actions under Priority 2 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

As it is determined in the Multi-Annual programme, the Republic of Cyprus is not going to implement actions under this priority. The requirements concerning this priority are going to be financed under the national budget.

3. Summary of actions under Priority 3 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

Not applicable.

Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

- Under Priority 3 of 2009 annual programme is the action that concerns **the purchase of equipment for the detection of forged documents**. The objective of the action is to ensure uniform standards of controls as regards the detection of forged documents at consulates and to improve controls of the visa process and contribute to the prevention of illegal immigration and other crimes. Eight (8) devices for the detection of forged documents to be installed in 8 Cypriot consulates.
- An action, under 2009 annual programme, co-finances the **purchase and installation of automatic telephone system** (Sixteen (16) automatic telephone systems will be installed in sixteen Missions. Meeting this need is expected to contribute to a faster and better service to visa applicants for 24 hours and at the same time it will allow consular officers more time for dealing in depth with the procedure of examining applications/issuing visas.
- This action is co-financed by the 2009 annual programme and concerns the **Co-operation with other Diplomatic Missions**. In order to improve the common visa policy, the Republic of Cyprus is planning to extend its consular representation in third countries, through co-operation with other Member States (Joint Embassies/Consulates, Common Application Centres). To be more specified the action has to do with the co-operation between Republic of Cyprus and Republic of Malta for the establishment of a Joint Representation in the Palestine Authority in Ramallah. One of the Representation’s substantial activities will be related to the issuance of visas.
- The action for the **purchase of one fingerprint equipment** is included in the 2009 annual programme. The purpose of this action is to achieve the objective of extending and improving the national VIS in order to support and create the IT systems required for the application of the Schengen Acquis in the field of consulates/visas. Upgrading and extending IT applications in consulates is expected to improve their efficiency and allow fast compilation, analysis and exchange of information between the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus involved in border control (e.g. cooperation between consulates, the Ministry of the Interior, Cyprus Police, the Asylum Service and the Immigration Department, etc.) and promote cooperation with consular, police and other authorities responsible for border controls in the other Member States. It will

also help to improve controls carried out when visas are issued and, by extension, help to prevent illegal immigration and other criminal activities.

4. Summary of actions under Priority 4 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

Not applicable

Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

- Under Priority 4 the **Upgrading and extending of Visa Information System** is being implemented under 2008 annual programme. The scope of this action is to:
 - upgrade and extend the national VIS so as to be able to link with the central system in Strasbourg;
 - allow fast collection, analysis and exchange of information;
 - promote cooperation between consular authorities in the other Member States (this will be possible after Cyprus will become a full Schengen country member);
 - improve controls during the procedure to issue visas, and
 - by extension, improve the prevention of illegal immigration and other criminal activities.

The reason behind this need is the fact that Cyprus is currently preparing to join the Schengen area and will have to fully comply with the Schengen Acquis, including the VIS Regulation and the European Union Code on Visas. The aim is to achieve the extension and improvement of the national VIS in order to be able to connect to the central system in Strasbourg. It is noted that this action implies a continuation in the following Annual Programme of 2009.

5. Summary of actions under Priority 5 in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

Not applicable

Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

No actions are being implemented under priority 5 in the 2007, 2008 or 2009 annual programmes.

6. Any significant change to the actions of the programmes concerned (revisions of annual programmes and revisions of the financial breakdown lower than 10%)

The initial version of the **2007** annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission with a Decision dated 5/12/2008. However, a revised version of the 2007 annual programme was submitted to the European Commission on the 30th of September 2009, due to the complications which have arisen during the implementation of the actions. Consequently, all actions included in the initial version of the annual programme were removed and replaced by a single action that concerns the Prepayment for the purchase of two **medium size twin engine, utility helicopters**.

The initial version of the **2008** annual programme was submitted on 5th May 2008. The initial version of the 2008 annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission with a Decision dated 5th of December 2008. The programme has been revised mostly due to the fact that the implementation of the actions could not be completed within the timeframe of the 2008 annual programme eligibility period making them ineligible for co-financing. A revised version of the 2008 annual programme was submitted to the European Commission on the 29th of October 2009. The actions which were included in the initial version of the 2008 annual programme were removed and replaced by three new actions.

It is noted that the revised version of 2008 annual programme has not yet officially been approved by the European Commission, however it is at the last stages for its approval.

As far as the **2009** annual programme is concerned, the **initial** version was approved by the European Commission, with Decision dated 8.07.2009. Most of the actions included in the approved programme are not being implemented. Thus, a revised version is expected to be submitted to the Commission within June/July of 2010. At least 4 actions are going to be removed and not be funded under the annual programmes of the EBF, while other actions (1 or 2) are expected to be co-financed by the following annual programmes. However, 1 or 2 actions are expected to remain the same as incorporated in the initial version.

So far, actions that have already been implemented under the abovementioned programmes¹ do not have any revisions of the financial breakdown lower than 10%. Nevertheless, it is expected that all actions which have been incorporated in the annual programmes of 2007, 2008 and 2009 will not have any revisions of the financial breakdown.

¹ e.g. the single action of 2007 and the two actions out of three of 2008 annual programme which have already been completed, do not have, thus far, any financial revision.

<p style="text-align: center;">Part III IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD</p>
--

Did you implement the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “awarding body” method (as defined in Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/456/EC of 5.3.2008 - the External Borders Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programmes?

Yes/No : No

If Yes, fill in this part.

If No, do not fill in Part III and go to Part IV (Implementation of the programmes in the executing body method).

III.1 Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “awarding body” method from 2007 to 2009

For each programme year from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “awarding body” method (in percentage, no decimal)

- Programme 2007: -% of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance)
- Programme 2008: -%
- Programme 2009: -%

III.2 Calls for proposals

For each programme year from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number and calls for proposals organised for the implementation of the annual programmes in the “awarding body” method

- Programme 2007: - (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2008: - (number of calls for proposals)
- Programme 2009: - (number of calls for proposals)

III.3 Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for proposals

Definitions:

- If more than one call for proposals was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that programme, figures combining all of that programme's calls.
- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary
- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the programme under which it was selected and funded.

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	-	-	-	-
Projects selected	-	-	-	-
Projects funded	-	-	-	-

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for proposals been funded?

Yes/No :

- If No, explain why :

III.4 Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals

In duly justified cases, grants may be awarded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals (Article 7 (2) of Commission Decision 2008/456/EC of 5.3.2008 - the External Borders Fund Implementing Rules, third paragraph).

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Please indicate the number of projects funded (see definition on page 18) in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals.

Projects funded in the “award- ing body” method without a call for pro- posals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Number	-	-	-	-

III.5 Total number of projects funded in the “awarding body” method in the programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Projects funded after calls for proposals (see table III.3)	-	-	-	-
Projects funded without a call for proposals (see table III.4)	-	-	-	-
TOTAL Projects funded in the “awarding body” method	-	-	-	-

<p style="text-align: center;">Part IV IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD</p>
--

Did you implement the 2007, 2008 and 2009 programmes in the “executing body” method (as defined in Article 8 of Commission Decision 2008/456/EC of 5.3.2008 - the External Borders Fund Implementing Rules), at least for part of the programmes?

Yes/No: **Yes**

If Yes, fill in this section

If No, do not fill in Part IV and go to Part V(Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body method” and in the “executing body” method, 2007 through 2009).

IV.1 Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the “executing body” method from 2007 to 2009

For each programme year from 2007 to 2009, enter the share of the overall EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance) which was granted in the “executing body” method (in percentage, no decimal).

- Programme 2007: 100% of the EU contribution to the programme
(excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance)
- Programme 2008: 100% of the EU contribution to the programme
(excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance)
- Programme 2009: 100% of the EU contribution to the programme
(excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance)

IV.2 Calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method

For each programme year from 2007 to 2009, please provide the number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar organised for the implementation of the EBF annual programmes in the “executing body” method

- Programme 2007: 1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008: 3 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009: 8 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

IV.3 Proposals received, selected and funded after calls for expression of interest, call for proposals or similar selection method in the “executing body method”

Definitions:

- If more than one call for expression of interest, call for proposals or similar was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that annual programme, figures combining all of that annual programme's calls.
- Project funded = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary
- If multiannual projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

Definition of a multiannual project: According to the legal basis, the end of the eligibility period for projects under the 2007 Programme is 31st December 2009. For the 2008 and 2009 Programmes the end of the eligibility period for projects is 30th June 2010 and 30th June 2011, respectively. A multiannual project is a project approved for EBF funding under any of the programmes mentioned above, whose eligibility period extends later than the eligibility period for projects of the annual programme under which it was selected and funded.

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	1	3	8	12
Projects selected	1	3	8	12
Projects funded	1	3	8	12

Have all projects selected for funding after calls for expression of interest, call for proposals, or similar been funded?

Yes/No: Yes

- If No, explain why:

IV.4 Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar

Please indicate the number of projects funded (see definition) in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals, or similar.

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call should not be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as “projects”.

Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Number	0	0	0	0

IV.5 Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method in the programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method(see table IV.3)	1	3	8	12
Projects funded without such calls (see table IV.4)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method	1	3	8	12

Part V

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD AND IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD 2007 - 2009

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on the projects funded available to the Responsible Authority (description of the project supported to be found in each grant agreement)*
- *All information on implementation available to the Responsible Authority*
- *Any external evaluation of relevance to the items addressed below, if available*

Please provide a summary description of the projects funded (see definition on page 18) under your annual programmes 2007 through 2009, broken down by Priority as set out on the next pages. Under each Priority describe separately projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition please describe separately (as set out in the template) projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals and projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, for proposals, or similar selection method.

No breakdown per year is required in the items 1 to 6.

Describe separately any change to the distribution for projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and for projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand.

In addition , highlight any significant change to the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, on the one hand, and to projects funded in the “executing body” method, on the other hand (other than their distribution).

It is not required to make a full description of all projects. What is needed is a concise, but very concrete description of the types of operations implemented under each Priority. Wherever relevant highlight national specificities. It is essential that

the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

You will be asked to highlight 1-5 projects under each annual programme which deserve, in your opinion, particular mention since you consider them as a good practice, or of an innovative nature, of interest for other Member States or of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirements.

Finally, you will be asked to describe one "success story" and one "failure", among all projects funded from 2007 to 2009.

For each item the maximum length is mentioned beneath the item's description.

1. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 1 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the "awarding body" method

Same as Part II (see point 1)

In the "executing body" method

Same as Part II (see point 1)

2. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 2 in the "executing body" method in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the "awarding body" method

Same as Part II (see point 2)

In the "executing body" method

Same as Part II (see point 2)

3. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 3 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Same as Part II (see point 3)

In the “executing body” method

Same as Part II (see point 3)

4. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 4 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Same as Part II (see point 4)

In the “executing body” method

Same as Part II (see point 4)

5. Summary description of the projects funded under Priority 5 in the annual programmes, 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Same as Part II (see point 5)

In the “executing body” method

Same as Part II (see point 5)

6. Summary description of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Not applicable.

No projects are funded in the “awarding body” method under the External Borders Fund.

Please refer to Table III.4. Excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for proposals. Neither should Technical Assistance measures be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.

7. Summary description of the projects funded in the “executing body ” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar selection method, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Not applicable.

No projects are funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar selection method, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009.

Please refer to Table IV.4. Excluding the continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call for expression of interest, a call for proposals or similar. Neither should Technical Assistance measures be taken into account, since they are not considered as “projects”.

8. Explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “awarding body” method, by Priority and by Specific Priority, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

Not applicable.

No projects are funded in the “awarding body” method under the External Borders Fund.

9. Explain any significant change to the distribution of the projects funded in the “executing body” method, by Priority and by Specific Priority, in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

There is no significant change to the distribution of projects funded under the executing body method when comparing the AP 2007, the AP 2008 and the AP 2009.

More specifically, in the revised version of the 2007 AP approved on 1/02/2010 under *Priority 1* one (1) single action has been supported by the entire programme amounting to €4.738.235 (€2.083.547 EU contribution). In the revised version of the 2008 AP approved on 20/07/2010 two (2) actions have been supported under *Priority 1* amounting to €5.615.915 (€1.328.425,50 EU contribution) and one (1) action under *Priority 4* amounting to €791.145 (€593.358,75 EU contribution). As regards the approved version of the 2009 AP, which will be revised shortly, four (4) actions have been included under *Priority 1* amounting to €4.535.000 (€2.827.435,60 EU contribution), three (3) actions under *Priority 3* amounting to €395.107,33 (€296.330,50 EU contribution) and one (1) action under *Priority 4* amounting to €48.682 (€36.511,50 EU contribution). It should be noted that in the revised version of the 2009 AP to be sent to the Commission, it is expected that one (1) action will be supported under *Priority 1* and three (3) actions under *Priority 3*.

10. Highlight any significant change (other than the distribution referred to under points 8 and 9) to the projects funded in the “awarding body” and “executing body” method in the annual programmes 2007 through 2009

In the “awarding body” method

Not applicable.

In the “executing body” method

Not applicable.

11. Important projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2009

Please describe 1-5 projects under each annual programme which deserve, in your opinion, particular mention since you consider them as a good practice, or of an innovative nature, of interest for other Member States (example of a project supporting an EU policy priority) or of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and your national requirements.

In this case: project= action

2007 annual programme

A project that is considered as a good practice is the purchase of two medium size twin engine, utility helicopters.

This action is a multiannual project, thus it implies a continuation (a subsequent stage) in the following Annual Programmes of 2008, 2009 and 2010.

The purpose of the action, after its completion, is to achieve the objective of having equipment, which allows more efficient control and surveillance of air and maritime borders.

It is very important that this action will strengthen the control and the surveillance in the areas which it will be implemented, while at the same time will increase the operational capacity of the police departments working in these areas in order to ensure that the external borders are effectively protected and guarded.

The primary objective of the purchase of the helicopters is patrolling the air and sea borders and the terrestrial areas controlled by the Republic of Cyprus. Furthermore, the action supports the priority of EU for the further gradual establishment of the common integrated border management system as regards the surveillance of the external borders.

Consequently, the helicopters are considered necessary to meet the continuously increasing demands for the abovementioned targets and fulfill the Republic's obligations to International Organizations for missions such as combating illegal Immigration.

However, the project is believed to be a good practice not only for the purposes described above, but also due to the fact that the relevant action is of a big value and absorbs the whole funding from 2007 annual programme. The decision of revising the programme and including this action has made the implementation procedure simpler, as the limited time frame of the eligibility period was preventing the implementation of any additional actions. The fact that the project was of an advanced stage definitely increased the possibilities of being implemented within the definite eligibility period and absorb the 100% of the amount set in the annual programme without any revisions of financial breakdown.

2008 annual programme

No actions may be considered as a good practice, or of an innovative nature, of interest for other Member States or of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and national requirements.

2009 annual programme

No actions may be considered as a good practice, or of an innovative nature, of interest for other Member States or of particular value in the light of the multiannual strategy and national requirements.

12. Description of one “success story”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2009

It is up to you to judge whether a project is to be considered a “success story” in terms of project implementation. If you think the project is also an example of “good practice” which could usefully be implemented elsewhere, please explain why. However, please note that this part is on a success story and it needs not be “good practices”.

It is necessary to provide a very concrete description of the project concerned and of the reasons you consider this is a “success story”. It is essential that the description can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

In this case: project= action

A project that can be considered as a “success story” in terms of project implementation is action 2- under 2008 annual programme: *Purchase of Forty (40) 4X4 vehicles*. The scope of this action is to improve the operational capability of the Police Departments involved in control of maritime borders and international airport areas (arrest of illegal immigrants etc), to improve the working conditions of the Police Officers dealing with Patrolling and handling illegal immigration inci-

dents, to increase the reaction capability/response time with regards to detection and interception, etc.

This action is considered to be a “success story” because it was implemented as initially planned in the description of 2008 annual programme, without any delays or alternations.

The aforementioned forty (40) 4X4 Vehicles are already in use since January 2010, achieving the purpose of their purchase by covering the actual needs of the Cyprus Police. A small number of vehicles were deployed at the ports and airports of the Republic of Cyprus while the rest were posted to the coastal stations and other relevant police departments in order to be used for patrolling and handling illegal immigration incidents.

Apart of the abovementioned, another reason that this action may be considered as a success story is the fact that the Responsible Authority, during its monitoring visit to coastal stations and airports, based on a sample basis verifications, verified that all the users of the vehicles were informed about the co-financing as well as about the eligible use of the vehicles. What is essential is the fact that police officers, who are using these vehicles, were effectively informed about the European Union contribution. This was accomplished by the distribution of a circular letter to all users and by organising several meetings with the attendance of the heads of the departments, presenting the eligibility of the vehicles and their obligations regarding the evaluation of the action on the basis of the relevant indicators.

13. Description of one “failure”, among all the projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2009

Among all the projects funded under the programmes from 2007 to 2009, there may be one project which you would regard as an important “failure”, because it proved impracticable, it did not meet expectations, or any other reason for you to judge, and you think there are lessons to be drawn from its failure, selection and/or evaluation of projects.

The project should not be identified (i.e. the name of the project or beneficiary should not be mentioned).

It is essential that the description of the project, your justification for a “failure”, and the lessons to be drawn can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.

In this case: project= action

When the implementation of the first annual programme started, due to the limited time frame of the eligibility period, the programming as well as the implementation of the actions was complex and risky.

As a general rule, the responsible authority used to start the implementation of the actions included in the annual programmes after their official approval by the European Commission, due to the risk of the actions not being approved.

The “failure story” in terms of programming, concerns an action that was included under the initial version the 2008 Annual Programme of the External Borders Fund. In the frame of its implementation, a call for tenders was published and, although there was a great interest for the specific call, the interested parties did not fulfil the requirements of the call. As a result, the whole procedure was cancelled and due to the limited time frame of the eligibility period it was not useful for a new call to be published. If a call for tenders was republished, the implementation of the action would exceed the eligibility period and the action would be considered as ineligible according to the timeframe of the 2008 annual programme.

However, the opportunity for revision of the annual programme, gave the chance to replace the action with another one. The new action was of an advanced stage even though the tender procedure was at the initial stages of its implementation and more specifically at the stage of contract execution.

Consequently, it can be said that the lesson drawn from the abovementioned “failure story” was to include actions which are of an **advanced stage** and can indisputably be practically implemented within the definite eligibility period.

<p style="text-align: center;">Part VI</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY</p>
--

Reference documents to be used for this part:

- *The information on technical assistance and on information and publicity available to the Responsible Authority*
- *Any relevant national document and information available to the Responsible Authority in these matters*
- *Any independent evaluation of the items addressed below, if available*

1. Technical assistance

Please provide a concrete description of the activities implemented under the Technical Assistance measures of the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Technical Assistance measures are being directed towards the activities outlined in Annex 11 of the Implementing Rules. The technical assistance of the underlying annual programmes (2007, 2008 and 2009) includes among others the salaries of the staff, mainly of the Responsible Authority and the Delegated Authorities, who are involved in the programme. Moreover, it covers expenses related to travel and accommodation of the Designated Authorities as regards to preparation, management and implementation of the Annual Programmes (eg. SOLID Committee meetings, bilateral meetings with DG JLS Unit, participation to seminars organized by the DG JLS Unit etc). In addition a press conference launching the four funds was organized under the technical assistance, within the framework of information and publicity. Educational/Training seminars were also organised for the staff of the Delegated Authorities and Final Beneficiaries regarding the procedures set in the Management and Control System and the Manual of Procedures drawn up by the Responsible Authority. IT equipment and consumables have also been financed as well as the translation of the relevant approved Programmes in the Greek language.

2. Information and Publicity

Please provide a concrete description of the information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EBF Implementing Rules) implemented under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009. No annual breakdown is required.

Describe separately the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority and those by the final beneficiaries.

As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the yearly information activities which you have organised up to now, as of 2008, the launch of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2)(a) of the EBF Implementing Rules.

Please also describe when you developed the website referred to in Article 33(2) (b) of the EBF Implementing Rules and indicate, for each annual programme, when the required data was introduced on the website.

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority

Maximum 15 lines

Information and publicity activities (as per Articles 33 and 34 of the EBF Implementing Rules) were implemented by the Responsible Authority under the annual programmes 2007 through 2009, aiming at increasing the visibility and transparency of European Union activities and informing the major potential final beneficiaries and the public in general, by using various forms and methods of communication.

More specifically the following measures took place during the year 2008:

- The Responsible Authority launched its web page (19th of November 2008).
- The emblem of the Responsible authority was created, in order to be displayed on all relevant documents and publicity items, indicating the co-financing by the Funds.

During the year 2009:

- A press conference for the “Launch of the Implementation of Actions in the Framework of the EU Solidarity Funds” was organised by the Responsible Authority, on the 19th of February 2009, according to article 33 (2) (a) of the implementation rules. The scope of the conference was to present the launch of the multiannual programmes the four Solidarity Funds, their targets and priorities, as well as the actions to be implemented in the frame of multiannual programmes 2007-2013.
- Publicity items (e.g. portfolio, pens, stress balls etc), carrying the emblem of the Responsible Authority were created to be distributed to all staff employed by the Delegated Authorities, the Final Beneficiaries as well as to all people participating in the seminars, meetings, and committees organised by the Responsible Authority.

- posters as well as a power point template was designed for the measures organised by the Responsible Authority (e.g. educational or other presentations).
- significant sized flags of the European Union and the Republic of Cyprus, were displayed in a prominent point, at the entrance of the Responsible Authority's premises.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

The article 35 of the implementation rules is being followed by the final beneficiaries.

Based to the abovementioned article:

- all relevant documents are indicating the co-financing by the Fund e.g. Publication of Calls for Tenders in the Gazette of the Republic of Cyprus etc.
- all the equipment purchased or projects implemented under EBF actions include the technical characteristics as mentioned in article 35 of the implementation rules.
- the final beneficiaries, in the case of acting as a Contracting Authorities (Call for Tenders method) follow commonly used **means of publication** (e.g. Official Journal of the European Union, Gazette of the Republic of Cyprus, Internet, Local newspapers) in which the co-financing of the Fund (contribution of EU) is mentioned/ shown.

Part VII

ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009

Based on:

- All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each annual programme*
- Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority*

Provide your assessment of the implementation of the annual programmes from 2007 through 2009 for the following items.

In each case please explain the reasons for your judgement. If for any item you cannot provide an assessment by June 2010, please answer “Not known by June 2010”.

VII.1. Assessment of the implementation of the 2007 Annual Programme

1. Has the 2007 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?

The initial version of the 2007 annual programme was officially approved by the European Committee with a Decision dated 5/12/2008 (Reference: Brussels, 5.12.2008, E(2008) 7759 final. The programme was not implemented as it was originally planned in the initial version. Its actions were 100% replaced by a revised programme.

The revised version of the 2007 annual programme was submitted to the European Commission on the 30th of September 2009. The actions included in the revised annual programme were already completed as planned without any modifications or financial breakdowns.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2007 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

During the implementation of the initial version of the 2007 annual programme, following the monitoring procedures, it was appreciated that the actions included in the programme could not be implemented within the eligibility period and the timeframe set in the annual programme. As a result, their implementation exceeded the eligibility period and the actions were considered ineligible in the frame of the annual programme of 2007 annual programme.

After assembling the partnership committee, which is responsible, among others, for the preparation of the annual programmes and the monitoring of the actions, all bodies involved expressed their views and problems as regards the implementation of the initial programme and the actions included. All participants have contributed with their experience for the immediate revision of the programme. Due to the timeframe limitations, it was decided to incorporate in the revised annual programme, a single new action of an advance stage, replacing all others included in the initial version.

3. Has a revision of the 2007 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?

The initial version of the 2007 annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission with a Decision dated 5/12/2008 (Reference: Brussels, 5.12.2008, E (2008) 7759 final. A revised version of the 2007 annual programme was submitted to the European Commission on the 30th of September 2009.

The revision was necessary due the complications which have arisen during the implementation of the actions. As a result, their implementation would have exceeded the eligibility period and the actions would be considered as ineligible in the frame of the annual programme.

All actions included in the in the initial version of the programme were replaced by a new single action. More specifically, in the version approved on 5/12/2008 three (3) actions were included under *Priority 1* and two (2) actions under *Priority 4*. In the revised version of the annual programme approved on 1/02/2010 all actions included under *Priority 1* were replaced by a new action (purchase of two medium size twin engine, utility helicopters) and all actions included under *Priority 4* were removed.

- 4. Have you implemented the 2007 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)**

The single action included in the annual programme has been completed. At the moment all the relevant expenses were certified and a final report was drawn up to be submitted to the EC.

- 5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?**

The expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2007 programme, as set out in the revised programme approved by the Commission, have been achieved. The objective of the single action included in the programme was to achieve the first pre-financing payment of the helicopters (the action is completed through a multi-annual project).

- 6. In the light of the implementation of the 2007 programme, do you consider that the distribution of funding between the actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

It is considered that all actions, included in both the initial version and revised version of the 2007 annual programme, were appropriate based on the needs of the relevant authorities implementing actions under EBF. The requirements were basically based on the political context of the Police Multiannual Strategic Plan for 2008-2011 and the analysis of the procedures for issuing visas. Even though the actions included in the initial version were considered appropriate as well as the distribution of funding, the revision of the programme was deemed to be necessary due to the complications encountered during their implementation. The new actions were simpler and more practical in their implementation.

VII.2. Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme

1. Has the 2008 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?

The initial version of the 2008 annual programme was submitted on 5th May 2008. The initial version of the 2008 annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission with a Decision dated the 5th of December 2008. Reference: Brussels, 5.12.2008, E (2008) 7759 final.

A revised version of the 2008 annual programme was submitted on the 31st of March 2010 with its approval still pending.

Two out of three actions included in the revised annual programme have already been completed as planned in the specific revised annual programme without any modifications or financial breakdown. The third action is at its final stages of implementation.

2. Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2008 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?

During the implementation of the initial version of the 2008 annual programme, following the monitoring procedures, it was appreciated that the actions included in the programme could not be implemented within the eligibility period and the timeframe set in the annual programme. As a result, their implementation exceeded the eligibility period and the actions were considered ineligible in the frame of the 2008 annual programme.

After assembling the partnership committee, which is responsible, among others, for the preparation of the annual programmes and the monitoring of the actions, all bodies involved expressed their views and problems as regards the implementation of the initial programme and the actions included. All the participants have contributed with their experience for the immediate revision of the programme. Three new actions which were considered to be simpler in their implementation were included in the revised version.

3. Has a revision of the 2008 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?

The initial version of the 2008 annual programme was submitted on 5th May 2008. The initial version of the 2008 annual programme was officially approved by the European Commission with a Decision dated 5th of December 2008. Reference: Brussels, 5.12.2008, E (2008) 7759 final. A revised version of the 2008 annual programme was submitted on the 31st of March 2010 with its approval still pending (the programme has been approved on 20/07/2010).

The revision was deemed to be necessary due the complications encountered during the implementation of the actions. As a result, their implementation would have exceeded the eligibility period and the actions would be considered as ineligible in the frame of the annual programme.

All actions included in the initial version of the programme were totally replaced by three new actions. More specifically, in the first version of the programme one (1) action was included under *Priority 1* and two (2) actions were included under *Priority 3*. In the revised version of the programme that was approved on 20/07/2010 the action included under *Priority 1* was replaced by two (2) new actions whereas both actions included under *Priority 3* were removed and a single action was added under *Priority 4*.

4. Have you implemented the 2008 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

Three actions were included in the revised version of the 2008 annual programme. Two out of three actions were already completed. The expenses of these two actions were already verified by the Responsible Authority and at this stage the reports have been sent to the Certifying Authority for the expenses to be certified. The third action is at the final stages of its implementation and it is expected to finish by the end of June.

5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?

The expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008 programme, as set out in the revised programme approved by the Commission, have been achieved. The objective of the first action was to achieve the second financing for the purchase of two helicopters. The second action was the purchase of 40 4x4 vehicles. The scope of the action was completed as all the number of means of transport was purchased and deployed at the areas that were initially planned (e.g. the airports, coastal stations and other relevant police departments). The purpose was the helicopters to be used for the transportation of the officers and coastal guards to their duties, as regards the patrolling and handling illegal immigration incidents.

However, it must be said that the results of the actions are still under evaluation. The final results will be drawn up with the submission of the programmes' final report.

6. **In the light of the implementation of the 2008 programme, do you consider that the distribution of funding between the actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

It is considered that all the actions, included in both the initial version and the revised version of the 2008 annual programme, were appropriate based on the needs of the relevant authorities implementing actions under EBF. The requirements were basically based on the political context of the Police Multiannual Strategic Plan for 2008-2011 and the analysis of the procedures for issuing visas. Even though the actions included in the initial version were considered appropriate as well as the distribution of funding, the revision of the programme was necessary due to the complications encountered during their implementation. The new actions were considered to be simpler and more practical in their implementation.

VII.3. Assessment of the implementation of the 2009 Annual Programme

1. **Has the 2009 programme been implemented as originally planned and broadly in line with the programme schedule?**

The **initial** version of 2009 annual programme was approved by the European Commission, with Decision dated 8.07.2009. More of the actions included in the initial version were not implemented.

A revised version for the annual programme 2009 is expected to be submitted to the Commission shortly. Most of the actions included in the initial version will be removed and replaced by new ones. At least 4 of the actions are going to be removed and not be funded under the annual programmes of the EBF, while other actions (1 or 2) are expected to be co-financed by the following annual programmes. However, 1 or 2 actions are expected to remain the same as incorporated in the initial version.

2. **Have you encountered problems on implementation of the 2009 annual programme? If so, what measures did you take?**

During the implementation of the initial version of the 2009 annual programme, it was appreciated, that the initial version of the programme was better to be revised. After the assessment of the actions' implementation stage, the programme was decided to be revised with the addition of simpler actions in a practical way of implementation due to:

- the complications encountered during the implementation of some actions;
- the fact that alternative actions were considered to be essential for the Republic;

The revised annual programme is expected to be submitted to the Commission shortly.

3. Has a revision of the 2009 programme by the Commission been necessary? If so, what were the main changes?

The annual programme of 2009 consists of eight (8) actions. It is noted that most of the actions that are currently included in the initial version of 2009 annual programme are supposed to be replaced by other actions. More specifically in the approved version of the programme dated 8/07/2009 four (4) actions were included under *Priority 1*, three (3) actions under *Priority 3* and one (1) action under *Priority 4*. The revised 2009 annual programme has not yet been submitted to the Commission. However, the changes mainly refer to the replacement of all four (4) actions under *Priority 1* with a single action the replacement of two (2) of the three (3) actions under *Priority 3* with two (2) new actions and the removal of the action under *Priority 4*.

The programme will be revised due to the complications in launching of the procurement procedures which have arisen during the implementation of the actions included in the initial version. Actions that are considered to be more necessary for the Republic will be implemented under the 2009 annual programme.

4. Have you implemented the 2009 programme (the case being, the revised programme) fully? (= all or nearly all actions set out in the programme approved by the Commission, or in the revised programme approved by the Commission, could be implemented by the end of this programme)

A revised version for the annual programme 2009 is expected to be submitted to the Commission shortly (see more in VII.3. question 1). The implementation of the actions that will be included under the revised version has already started. It is expected that the first action of the revised programme will be completed until Dec. 2010. The other actions are expected to be completed within next year (2011).

5. Have the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the 2009 programme - as set out in the programme / revised programme approved by the Commission - been achieved at the end of this programme?

The actions under the 2009 annual programme were not completed yet, thus no quantitative or qualitative results, as set out in the programme, have been achieved.

However, it must be said that the results of the actions will be drawn up with the submission of the programmes' final report.

6. **In the light of the implementation of the 2009 programme, do you consider that the distribution of funding between the actions was appropriate? Were the actions set out in the programme you submitted to the Commission appropriate?**

15 lines maximum

It is considered that all actions, included in both the initial version and the revised version of the 2009 annual programme, were appropriate based on the needs of the relevant authorities implementing actions under EBF. The requirements were primarily based on the political context of the Police Multiannual Strategic Plan for 2008-2011 and the analysis of the procedures for issuing visas. Even though the actions included in the initial version were considered appropriate as well as the distribution of funding, the revision of the programme was necessary due to the complications which have arisen during their implementation. The new actions were simpler and more practical as far as their implementation is concerned.

VII.4. The Management and Control System for the Fund and the implementation of the Annual Programme 2007 through 2009

Based on:

- All information available to the Responsible Authority on the implementation of each annual programme 2007 through 2009*
- The Management and Control system of the External Borders Fund in your Member State*
- Any external evaluation available to the Responsible Authority*
- Any other analysis carried out by your government as regards the Fund*

Provide your assessment for the following item. Please explain the reasons for your judgement.

1. **Has the Management and Control System of the External Borders Fund which you designed in 2007-8, been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far?**

The Management and Control System (MCS) has been designed in order to be operational for the implementation of the annual programmes under External Borders Fund.

The MCS has the infrastructure required by a wide range of users to communicate, allowing them to response to their duties properly and avoid any conflict of interest. Moreover the MCS has been in a position to apply with European Commission fund management rules as well as to have the financial capabilities and skills to manage the funds allocated to the Republic of Cyprus under the External Borders Fund.

More specifically the procedures set out for the implementation of the actions under the annual programmes, such as monitoring, validation and payments of the actions were followed as described in the Management and Control System.

2. Please list any changes you have made in the Management and Control System of the External Borders Fund which you designed in 2007-8, bearing in mind the experiences gained/ lessons learned during the implementation of the annual programmes 2007 – 2009 and/or any comments from the Commission and/or audits

A version for the Management and Control System for External Borders Fund was preliminary submitted to the European Commission as four separate descriptions for all the four funds were drawn up. The Commission had examined these four descriptions together and had proposed to submit only one revised joint description of the Management and Control System for the four funds, given the fact that there is one MCS common for all the four funds. The Commission's observation had simplified the whole procedure, shortened the assessment process, contributed to a quicker approval and made simpler the monitoring of the whole system.

It is noted that the Commission, with a letter dated 09 Jan. 2009, mentioned that "the description allow a good understanding of the compliance of the system". However outstanding comments/issues were forwarded to the Responsible Authority, in order to finalise the MCS (with letters dated 09/01/2009 and 19/01/2010). Examples of such comments are given below:

- indication of the date of the official delegation of the tasks of the Responsible Authority to the four delegated authorities (through Act of Delegations).
- adequacy of human resources allocated to the delegated bodies and the Certifying Authority.
- indication when the Manual of Procedures was finalised and when was operational.
- Etc.

Those comments were fulfilled by the RA and the MCS is considered as finalised.

Moreover, it is mentioned that on the 8th of Dec. 2009, an audit was carried out by the Audit Authority to verify the effective functioning of the MCS in accordance with the decisions and the relevant regulatory framework of the Solidarity Funds. With a letter dated 13th of April 2010, the Audit Authority stated that the audit to the MCS is considered satisfactory.

A change that was made, bearing in mind the experiences gained during the implementation of the Management and Control System, was the modification regarding the Certifying Authority of the four Funds. In the initial version of the Management and Control System, the Accounting Office of the Ministry of the Interior has been designated as the Certifying Authority. However, the Republic had decided to change the Certifying Authority of the Funds. The scope of this modification was to designate an authority that could be operationally independent from the other authorities involved with the Solidarity Funds, with clear separation of functions. Moreo-

ver, an authority with experience in European Funds would contribute to a more efficient and effective implementation of the procedures set in the MCS. Thus, the Treasury of the Republic has been designated as the Certifying Authority of the Solidarity Funds. The Treasury of the Republic is an independent government Service and is separate from all the Designated Authorities. The Treasury of the Republic is also the Certifying Authority for all interventions cofinanced by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund of the European Union. The Treasury has also been designated as National Fund for the Pre-accession Aid and the Transition Facility Assistance.

Part VIII

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES 2007 - 2009

In case you had recourse to an external expertise for other parts of this report : this part must always be filled in by the Responsible Authority itself

VIII.1. What is your overall assessment of the implementation of the External Borders Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009?

Assessing the overall implementation of the External Borders Fund programmes of 2007 to 2009 it can be said that the actions, either have already been completed or they are at the final stage of their implementation. It is considered that all actions under the abovementioned annual programmes will absorb the whole amount of the funds distributed to Cyprus. More specifically the single action of 2007 annual programme had already been completed, as well as the two out of three actions of the 2008 annual programme; the third action of the 2008 programme is at the final stage of its implementation.

It is noted that the initial version of the 2009 annual programme, as approved by the Commission, is considered to be an exceptional case since most of its actions are not being implemented as it was originally planned. A revised version is going to be submitted within June 2010 introducing new actions. However, most of these new actions are at the final stage of their implementation.

It is believed that the flexibility of adjusting programmes, given by the provision of the article 23 (1) of the implementation rules (2008/456/EC), it is very important for the absorption of the funds allocated to the Republic. Actions included in the initial versions could not have been implemented, if such an opportunity was not given. The revised versions of the annual programmes are further organised in a practical manner, as the Member State is more "mature" to assess the status of actions' implementation.

Thus, if the programmes had not been revised, it is believed that the capacity to effectively exhaust the funds allocated to the Republic would not be achieved. The revisions had finally attained to amend the actions in order to allow an effective implementation of the national programmes.

However, it can be said that a lesson drawn during the implementation of the national programmes is to include actions which are towards an advanced stage of implementation and can indisputably be practically implemented within the definite eligibility period.

VIII. 2 Taking into account the overall implementation of the External Borders Fund in your Member State from 2007 to 2009, what is your preliminary assessment in relation to the following aspects of the External Borders Fund on the following aspects?

1. Relevance of the programme's priorities and actions to the national situation

Please describe how relevant the programme's objectives are overall to the problems and needs identified in the field of external border control and visa policy. Has there been an evolution which required a reshaping of the intervention?

15 lines maximum

As it is described in the Multi-Annual programme of the Republic where the national situation is explained, the biggest problem at present, is the large numbers of illegal immigrants entering the Republic of Cyprus from areas under the illegal control of the Turkish army, slipping through the zone between the ceasefire line, mentioned as the “green line”, into areas under the exclusive control of the Republic of Cyprus.

Even though illegal immigration via the “green line” is considered as an acute problem, no actions can be co-financed under the EBF national programmes, satisfying Republic’s identified needs.

Therefore programmes, in terms of external border control, satisfy only a part of Republic’s actual needs as those are identified based on the statistics kept by the relevant Authorities of the Republic. Nevertheless, the programmes as submitted to the Commission, achieve an essential part of the Republics’ requirements in the field of air and maritime border control.

2. Effectiveness of the programme

Please highlight the key results of the programme overall and the extent to which the desired results and objectives (as set out in the multiannual programme strategy) been attained. Are the effects resulting from the intervention consistent with its objectives?

15 lines maximum

Taking into account the overall implementation of External Borders Fund programmes from 2007 to 2009, some of the objectives set in the Multiannual programme had already been achieved.

So far, the actions satisfy the desired results and objectives as set in the multi-annual programmes. The outcome was to achieve in general better working conditions for border Guards,

increase quality of available equipment, increase reaction capacity and operational ability in the air and sea, enhance the ability of the Republic to control the borders, reduce danger of illegal immigrants etc. The general impact of the actions implemented under the multiannual programme is the increase of border security.

It is noted that due to the fact that the abovementioned programmes contain an action which is completed through a multiannual project (purchase of helicopters) no actual results can be drawn at the moment, until the entire completion of the project with the delivery of the helicopters (under 2010 annual programme).

However, it must be said that the effects of the actions are already under evaluation and the final results will be drawn with the submission of the programmes' final reports.

3. Efficiency of the programme

Please estimate the cost of the management of the External Borders Fund so far and whether in your opinion the programme's objectives are being developed in accordance with the original planning and at a reasonable cost.

15 lines maximum

According to chapter V of the Basic Act (574/2007/EC) and the respective Implementing Rules, a Management and Control System has been developed. At least ten officers, in all designated authorities, are dealing partly or exclusively with matters regarding the implementation of the procedures set in the management and control system, for the External Borders Fund. In addition to the abovementioned administrative cost, salaries, the cost of consumables, training and the organization of promotional events for both Authorities should also be calculated. Therefore, an important amount of financial resources is being spent on the management of the Fund.

However, it is estimated that if more funds were available to the Republic, the cost regarding the management would remain approximately the same compared to the present cost. This is due to the fact that the time-consuming bureaucratic procedures which were necessary to be set according to the basic acts and the implementation rules, would still be the same.

4. Complementarity

Please indicate any issues you have had with establishing the complementarity and/or synergies with other programmes and/or EC financial instruments

such as the other Funds of the General Programme, the Thematic Programme on Asylum and Migration and/or the Structural Funds.

15 lines maximum

The Cyprus Police and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are the final beneficiaries implementing actions under the EBF annual programmes. However, as far as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is concerned, it does not implement any other activities in relation to other regional, national or Community funding instruments. Therefore, no complementarity of the strategy of consular affairs with other Community financial instruments can be achieved.

As regards the external borders, so far no equipment or measures were acquired through other Financial Instruments of the European Union. The requirements of the Republic have been covered through the State Budget.

However, Cyprus participates in the INTERREG IVC programme. The INTERREG IVC Programme is part of the European Territorial Cooperation Objective. It is a European Union's programme that helps regions of Europe work together to share their knowledge and experience (launched in 2007, the programme will run until 2013). For the implementation of this programme Cyprus co-operates with Greece.

Nevertheless, in order to ensure coordination with other Community financial instruments and ensure the avoidance of double financing projects, certain procedures were put in place (see MAP, SECTION 4). It is noted that consistency with other instruments is achieved, among others, throughout internal procedures, as Cyprus Police and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which are the final beneficiaries for all other actions included in the EBF, are also responsible for the implementation of all other community financial instruments also.

In view of the abovementioned, no issues were encountered in establishing complementarity and/or synergies with other programmes.

5. Added value

Please indicate how you perceive the programme's added value in comparison with existing national programmes/policies at national, regional and local level, and in relation to the national budget in the area of intervention of the External Borders Fund.

15 lines maximum

European added value is a relatively undefined term, yet paramount in the formulation of the objectives and underlying ideas of programmes initiated and supported by the EU. A project's

methodology, aims, effects, prospects and aspirations should apply not only to a specific local or regional context, but to the European arena as a whole.

In terms of the effective control and protection of external borders, requirements were identified and operational objectives determined at all levels of the national context. The requirements were primarily based on the political context of the Police Multiannual Strategic Plan for 2008-2011 in light of which the baseline situation was analyzed along with the gaps and shortcomings.

The requirements regarding the procedure for issuing visas or consular affairs were identified after study and detailed examination of the needs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs based on the gaps, shortcomings and problems.

Programs play an important role in funding national activities as there are clear additional benefits from collective efforts or ‘EU added value’, compared with action taken by Member States, either individually or in co-operation. Generally speaking, the appropriations in the annual budget are too limited to satisfy all of the above requirements in terms of the infrastructure needed in order to guard the external borders securely as well as to cover the needs of consular affairs. Therefore activities, outputs and other elements are likely to be delivered as a result of accessing the Fund, and are additional to outcomes expected through the utilization of national funding alone.

VIII.3. Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the annual programming exercise in general?

Half a page maximum

No suggestions

VIII.4. Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in the regulatory framework (basic act and implementing rules) and the Commission guidance documents which would help you to streamline and improve the implementation of the actions / projects and the control mechanisms on the actions/ projects?

Half a page maximum

We suggest that each Member State should define the eligible expenditure to be applied, in relation to the national rules and procedures. We propose that a relevant discussion with the SOLID Committee should take place.

VIII. 5. Any suggestions / recommendations for improvements in terms of the guidance and support by the Commission to the Member States on the implementation of the programming exercise and the management and control system?

Half a page maximum

No suggestions

End of the report

