



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL HOME AFFAIRS
Directorate C
Unit C/4: Financial support - Migration and Borders

SOLID/2011/24
final

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

Subject: Template for the ex-post evaluation report for the External Borders Fund

Summary

The documentation for the preparation of the national ex-post evaluation report consists of a guidance document, an excel workbook to be filled in and a narrative report to be completed.

The final version takes into account the many useful comments received from Member States and the results of further informal consultations. The updated documents provide for more information on how to deal with the output and result indicators, on who should perform the evaluation tasks and how to achieve an independent judgment as part of the evaluation exercise.

The deadline for submission of the reports remains unchanged. Member States should report on the data available by 31 October 2012.

Action to be taken by the Commission

By mid-November, the Commission shall send to each Member State an individualised Excel work book completed with the country-specific data available from the mid-term evaluation. Please use those sheets to start the exercise and not the mock template provided in this package.

Action to be taken by the Member State

Complete the narrative report and the excel document and return them by 31 October 2012 to the email addresses home-solid-committee@ec.europa.eu and luciana.sandu@ec.europa.eu.

For any questions please contact Luciana Sandu (Luciana.Sandu@ec.europa.eu).

Background

According to Article 52(2), point b) of Decision 574/2007/EC, Member States shall submit by 30 June 2012 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 2012 an ex-post report on the results achieved and qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the Fund.

In light of the fact that the eligibility period for actions for the 2010 annual programme ends at the end of June 2012, and in order to allow for the integration of the results of this annual programme in the report, it is proposed that Member States send their contributions by 31 October 2012.

Template for preparation by Member States of the

**EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007 TO 2010**

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

**EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007 TO 2010**

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

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: (Member State¹)

Republic of Estonia

Date:

.....

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

Tarmo Türkson
Secretary General

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

Karin Tahvonen
Adviser to the Foreign Financing Department
Estonian Ministry of the Interior
Phone +372 612 5258
karin.tahvonen@siseministeerium.ee

Important remark

This evaluation is to be performed by

1. staff with evaluation expertise within the Responsible or Delegated Authorities
2. a dedicated evaluation department within the national administration
3. external evaluation expert
4. or a combination thereof.

OR

This evaluation is to be carried out by the Responsible or Delegated Authority and then reviewed by

1. a dedicated evaluation department within the national administration
2. external evaluation expert
3. or a combination thereof.

All options can be supported by the technical assistance.

¹ Throughout this document, whenever reference is made to Member State(s), reference to the Associated States with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis is also implied

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

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

Yes

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

External evaluator was used for the parts III and IV 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.):

* External evaluation expertise: **Evaluation for the parts III and IV of the report was conducted by an external independent evaluator CPD OÜ. The external evaluator has experience in large-scale national and international evaluations, researches and analyses. For the evaluation of External Borders Fund annual programmes 2007 to 2010 the evaluator conducted document analysis and interviews.**

Important remark

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

- use this template, exclusively
- fully comply with any instructions, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out as annex to this template.

**Ex-Post EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND
ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2008 TO 2010**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY	7
PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED	8
1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD	8
PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION	12
2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD....	12
2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD...	12
2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS	15
2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)	15
2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP	16
PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS	19
3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT.....	19
3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD	29
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS.....	29
3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT	33
3.5. OVERALL RESULTS ACHIEVED WITH THE FUND'S INTERVENTION.....	33
3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES	35
3.7. LESSONS LEARNED.....	37
PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE	39
4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS.....	40
4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT	41
4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION	45
4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME	46
4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME	47
4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY	48

INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY

- 0.1. Please present an overview of the evaluation system set up as part of the implementation of the External Borders Fund. What information is required from the final beneficiaries on the progress and final results of the project and how is it assessed?

For fulfilling the task of **evaluation** required by the basic act (evaluation reports must be submitted in accordance with the Article 52(2)) there are three options foreseen:

- 1) the preferred option is to outsource the evaluation service from external independent evaluator;
- 2) there is also the possibility to assign this duty to the existing Monitoring Committee as it includes all the main experts within the responsible authority (RA) available in this area;
- 3) if the need occurs, a separate committee specifically for the evaluating exercise may be formed.

The decision which method shall be used (the external evaluator or the committee within the Ministry of Interior – MoI) is made prior to the evaluation exercise and taking account the specific needs and requirements. For the current evaluation the service was outsourced from external independent evaluator.

Final beneficiaries are obliged to send progress and final reports to RA. In the progress report the final beneficiaries have to bring out the activities according to the timetable, the result planned and the actual result achieved. If the mentioned results differed then an explanation is requested from the final beneficiaries. An evaluation on achieving the goals of the project and an evaluation on efficiency and implementation of the project is required. Also descriptions of problems that may have arisen during the implementation of the project and solutions have to be brought out in the progress report. Final beneficiaries have to indicate to activities implemented to ensure the visibility of EBF co-financing. In addition the activities of the next reporting period have to be described. Following annexes have to be added to the progress report:

- detailed expense report
- all the materials that have been completed during the project
- copies of all the signed contracts during the project
- copies of all the account of charges
- request for payment
- declaration by the beneficiary
- check-list of the procurement (if applicable)

In the final report the beneficiaries have to in addition to the requirements of progress report give an evaluation on the achievements and failures and describe the impact of the project.

RA carries out accuracy and eligibility check. The first level eligibility check is done by fulfilling a check-list to assess:

- whether the expenditure is in line with the objectives of the EBF;
- corresponding to the eligible actions set out in the basic act;
- if the activities that are part of the multi-annual (MAP) and annual programmes (AP) were carried out;
- complying with the principles of sound financial management;
- accordance with the specific provisions in the agreement;
- accordance to the Eligibility rules annexed to the Implementing rules for the EBF.

Before making payments to the final beneficiaries, the accounting specialist of the Finance Department of the MoI carries out the second level eligibility checks of expenditure declared for actions (conformity with the Union and national accounting rules; a checklist is fulfilled) and verifies the payment request. The payment requests were approved by the Head of the Financial Department and signed by the Deputy Secretary General for Internal Security.

In addition RA conducts on-the-spot checks to ascertain that the accounting systems are reliable, expenditure is based on verifiable supporting documents, expenditure declared complies with applicable Union and national rules, transactions are legal and regular. All the on-the-spot verification results are documented according to check-lists which were used.

It is foreseen that at least one on-the-spot visit per project is carried out. When the project is multi-annual the RA, taking account the characteristics of the specific project, decides whether there is a need to carry out more than one visit.

- 0.2.** Please provide also information on any specific / additional data collection methodology used for this report.

Data for this report is collected from the multi-annual programmes, annual programmes, progress/final reports from member state to EC, progress/final reports of final beneficiaries to RA and statistics in the field of external borders. For the parts III and IV of the report the external evaluator conducted document analysis and interviews.

PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED

1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD

- 1.1.1.** Within the national budgetary framework, how do you secure the national resources available for national and private co-financing for the Fund? What was the approach for the 2008-2010 annual programmes? Do you envisage changes for the future?

The national resources (public co-financing) are included in the state budget on a yearly basis. The basis of the calculations is the approved multi-annual programme, drafted annual programme(s) and any other envisaged costs taking account the experience gained from previous years (regarding the use of technical assistance - TA).

As from 2010 (calendar year) the necessary planning and drafting is made by the RA who pays out the appropriate amount of public co-financing to the final beneficiary based on the provisions of the grant agreement. Before that date the final beneficiaries had to guarantee the existence of the required co-financing in their budgets themselves.

By including the foreseen needs for co-financing into the state budget, the public contribution is secured.

Under the EBF in Estonia there has been no private co-financing involved and we do not envisage any changes regarding this matter.

1.1.2. What investments did you undertake at national level in the field of external borders management and visa policy? (Please mention under which field(s) and expenditure category/ies the costs for the VIS roll-out are included).

Border Management

Table n° 1:

	Infrastructure and equipment	Staff	Other	Total
2007 total	6 390 939	26 331 757	8 102 586	40 825 282
2008 total	3 491 675	32 047 985	8 991 535	44 531 195
2009 total	4 754 592	28 195 764	7 301 889	40 252 245
2010 total	2 376 489	20 934 832	3 357 001	26 668 322
2011 total	4 148 753	21 091 211	4 473 768	29 749 732
2012 total (as planned)	4 100 743	21 114 782	7 513 925	32 729 450
2012 total for first half year	1 365 862	10 556 688	3 750 658	15 673 208

Visa Policy

Table n° 2:

	Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections	Staff at visa sections and headquarters	Other	Total
2007 total	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008 total	n/a	n/a	n/a	5 761 673
2009 total	n/a	n/a	n/a	5 021 809
2010 total	n/a	n/a	n/a	5 244 299
2011 total	n/a	n/a	n/a	4 929 571
2012 total (as planned)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012 total for first half year	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

IT Systems

Table n° 3:

	VIS (total investments/all authorities)	SIS (total investments/all authorities)	Total
2007 total	717313,22	766939,78	1484253,00
2008 total	n/a	191734,95	191734,95
2009 total	79989,14	n/a	79989,14
2010 total	65220,17	n/a	65220,17
2011 total	180386,45	n/a	180386,45
2012 total (as planned)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012 total for first half year	142644,95	n/a	142644,95

Other, if applicable:

Table n° 4

	Total
2007 total	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008 total	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009 total	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 total	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 total	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012 total (as planned)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012 total for first half year	n/a	n/a	n/a

- 1.1.3.** Do the above tables include all your expenditure in the field of borders, visa and IT systems? If not, what is excluded / not properly taken into account?

The above tables include estimate expenditure in the field of borders, visa and IT systems (related to VIS, SIS).

- 1.1.4.** Please indicate an estimate of the share of the contribution from the Fund (% of all) in relationship to the total national expenditure in the area of intervention by field (border management, visa policy, IT systems) and the total.

Estimate of the share of the contribution from the Fund under annual programmes 2007-2010:

Border management – approximately 5,24 %

IT systems (VIS, SIS) – approximately 17,64%

Visa policy – no contribution from the Fund

Total – approximately 5,40 %

- 1.1.5.** Please outline briefly any important national developments in border and visa management since the approval of the multi-annual programme which are having an impact on the operations undertaken by authorities receiving funding under the External Borders Fund (including legislative changes, administrative and operational measures, changes in the institutional set-up, changes in response to changes in the size of the flows to be managed, the number of border crossing points or consulates etc). See also section 4.0 on the flows.

When describing the above, please provide the following data:

- Number of border crossing points under the Schengen Borders Code – 42
- Number of consular posts in accordance with the Visa Code - 109²
- Estimate(s) of number(s) of travellers crossing external borders annually (2007-2011)
- 2007 – 14 337 977
- 2008 – 6 465 880
- 2009 – 7 199 222
- 2010 – 6 614 996
- 2011 – 7 393 919

² representation offices and diplomatic missions/consular posts responsible for issuing visas and representation arrangements in accordance with Article 8 (1) of the Visa Code; where applications are submitted to an external service provider in accordance with under Article 43 of the Visa Code.

- Numbers of visa applications annually (2007-2011)
 - 2007 – 113 169
 - 2008 – 99 198
 - 2009 – 96 051
 - 2010 - 120 804
 - 2011 – 149 612
 - List of the main services implementing border control and visa policy
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs*
Ministry of Interior
The Police and Border Guard Board
Security Police Board

On 1 January 2010 Police Board, Central Criminal Police, Public Order Police, Border Guard Board, and Citizenship and Migration Board (CMB) were merged. On the basis of the former police prefectures, border guard territories and regional offices of CMB, four territorial prefectures were formed which will be also incorporated into PBGB and form one authority as of 2012.

By merging the agencies, all resources related to the ensuring of internal security – people, experience, funds and equipment were combined under one management. This way the field of internal security is developed as a whole and the existing resources are utilised in the most effectual way. Accession to the Schengen visa space that lifted border control at internal borders of the European Union established one of the preconditions for the merging of the police and border guard, but brought along the requirement of using compensatory measures in the border territories, making it mainly the task of Public Order Police. Also incorporation of the supporting staff of the merged agencies allowed retrenchment as there was no longer a need for separate book-keeping, personnel, and other similar systems for each agency.

Police and Border Guard Board is a police authority. All officers, regardless of their full title or position, whether a border guard, a traffic police officer, an investigator or a pilot – are police officers. The general name of the organisation is the police.

On 5th April, 2011, several amendments to the Aliens Act which are important from the viewpoint of visa proceedings entered into force. These were the extension of the validity term of long-term visas to 12 months, the supplementation of the grounds for refusal to grant long-term visas, the aliens' right to contest a decision of refusal to grant, revoke or declare invalid a visa, and refusal to extend the length of stay or premature termination of the length of stay.

On 11th October, 2011, Estonia joined the central database of the Schengen Visa Information System (VIS). VIS facilitates the exchange of data concerning visa applications and the related decisions between the Member States, in order to simplify the visa application procedure and prevent the trade in visas. In addition, VIS also makes it easier to fight fraud and perform control procedures at the border points on the external border and in the territory of the Member States. Upon receiving a visa application, the applicant's biometric data (finger prints) are recorded and entered into the VIS. In accordance with the requirements of the common information system, visa applicants are fingerprinted at border checkpoints, upon applying for an extension of the length of stay at the Estonian Police and Border Guard Board and at the Estonian Embassy in the Arab Republic of Egypt. The rest of the Estonian foreign representative offices forward the alphanumeric personal data and photos of visa applicants to the VIS. It is worth noting that Estonia and the Kingdom of Belgium are the only Member States to have introduced VIS at all their foreign representative offices issuing visas.

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION

2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD (*IF APPLICABLE*)

Not applicable.

2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD

2.2.1. Description of the selection process under the "executing body method"

According to what logic do you organise the selection process under the executing body method?

The selection procedure is organized as described in the description of Management and Control System and EBF Annual Programmes (point 1.3).

Even though the key actions for co-financing under the EBF in 2007-2013 have been presented upfront in the MAP, there still is a selection process for the AP (in the MAP the list of key actions is not comprehensive and they may include several specific actions/projects).

After the approval of AP the national competent bodies (potential final beneficiaries who due to the characteristics and the security reasons linked with the defined actions have the monopoly in the field) submit project proposals which must comply with the actions defined in the MAP and the AP. The ones which are the most justified and prioritized are chosen for financing. The selection criteria are consistent with minimum criteria defined in the basic act (art 16(5)).

The RA (fund coordinator in the Foreign Financing Department, Ministry of the Interior) carries out administrative and eligibility check on project proposals before presenting them to the Monitoring Committee for evaluating. If there are any insufficiencies in the proposals (a check-list is used), these are asked to be eliminated before further processing³.

After passing the administrative and eligibility check performed by the RA, the project proposals are looked through and approved or declined by the Monitoring Committee. The aforementioned committee members are high officials from the MoI. Several observers are involved in the work of the Committee from the national competent bodies to give explanations and comments should the need occur. Subsequently the Secretary General of the MoI approves by directive the final list of projects to be financed. The Secretary General does not take part in the selection process.

Taking into consideration that Decision 574/2007/EC foresees multi-annual projects (for a period of up to three years), Estonia has provided the applicants with the possibility to carry out multi-annual projects. There are three multi-annual actions/projects under AP-s 2008-2010. The proposals must be presented for evaluation even for the continuations (intermediary or final programming year) of multi-annual projects.

³ The process is described in detail in the EBF procedural rules (the latest version approved on 8 August 2012 by the Minister of the Interior – order No 1-3/95).

If you also select projects without a call for expression of interest or similar method, what are the reasons for using both such methods?

There is no other method for selecting projects than through properly presented project proposals. All the project proposals are evaluated prior to the financing decision as described above.

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

Table n° 8⁴

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Proposals received	10	2	2	3	17
Project selected	10	2	2	3	13
Projects funded	10	2	2	3	13
Out of which multiannual projects	0	2	2	3	3

If not all projects were selected for funding after the calls, please explain the reasons why, per annual programme, where applicable:

Annual Programme 2007: n/a

Annual Programme 2008: n/a

Annual Programme 2009: n/a

Annual Programme 2010: n/a

2.2.3. Projects funded in the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or similar selection method

All projects co-funded in the framework of the EBF were selected as described under point 2.2.1 of this report after the potential final beneficiaries presented their project proposals to the RA.

⁴ Under 2008AP two multi-annual projects started (ending under 2010AP);
Under 2010AP one new multi-annual project started (ending under 2011AP);

2.2.4. Total number of projects funded in the “executing body” method in the programmes 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010

Table n° 10

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, or similar selection method (see table 8)	10	2	2	3	13
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method (including multi-annual)	10	2	2	3	13

2.2.5. Co-financing

Please describe the procedures for verifying and ensuring the presence of co-financing by the final beneficiaries whose projects were selected.

Until 2010 (calendar year) the final beneficiaries had to guarantee the existence of the required co-financing in their budget. All the potential final beneficiaries under the EBF are state institutions and thereby financed from the state budget, hence the necessary co-financing has always been planned into the state budget and used for that purpose. Confirmative clause has also been stipulated in grant agreements by which the beneficiaries have taken the responsibility to ensure the necessary co-financing.

As from 2010 the final beneficiaries are not obliged to co-finance the projects but the necessary planning and drafting is made by the RA (all the final beneficiaries of the EBF in Estonia are in the governing area of the Ministry of the Interior). The RA pays out the appropriate amount of public co-financing to the final beneficiaries based on the provisions of the grant agreement. In addition, final beneficiaries may add supplementary funding if deemed necessary.

2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS

2.3.1. Overview of revisions for 2007-2010 annual programmes

Table n° 11

AP	EU contribution allocated	Was a revision concerning a change of more than 10% of the allocation needed? (Y/N)	Percentage of allocation concerned by the revision, if a revision was needed
AP 2007	2 407 533,34	N	n/a
AP 2008	2 708 471,87	N	n/a
AP 2009	3 608 410,00	N	n/a
AP 2010	3 417 428	N	n/a

2.3.2. In case a programme revision was necessary, please provide the main reasons. Please select one or more from the list below and provide a brief explanation, for the annual programme concerned

None of the EBF programmes have been revised to date.

2.3.3. In case you revised the annual programme, was the revision useful? To what extent did it lead to a better consumption of the allocation?

n/a

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010⁵

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	72 226,34	825,07
2008	196 956,87	36 859,18
2009	230 210,00	48 875,21
2010	225 820,00	43 856,46
Total 2007-2010	725 213,21	130415,92

⁵ The amounts under this paragraph represent only the EU contribution; 2010 data on the consumption of TA is situation at 30.04.12.

Table n° 13

AP/Use of TA (€)	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°/€)	IT and equipment	Office/ consumables	Travelling/ events	Monitoring, project management	Reporting, translation	Total
2007	38,09	n/a	406,54	326,14	n/a	54,30	825,07
2008	34 111,92	514,23	n/a	631,42	1467,60	134,01	36859,18
2009	45 109,49	n/a	n/a	1 702,37	2 063,35	n/a	48875,21
2010	38393,84	1 178,30	n/a	1 650,27	1 760,00	874,05	43856,46

2.4.2. Did the TA support prove to be useful? For what was it most helpful? Would you have preferred that the TA allows for other elements to be funded as well and if so which ones?

The TA support is useful; it simplifies the implementation of the EBF programme and ensures the quality and consistence of the programme.

TA has been most helpful for salaries of personnel from RA, auditing authority (AA) and certifying authority (CA)⁶ and also for trainings and seminars for the personnel in RA and AA.⁷ The TA has also been very helpful for attending in the SOLID Committee meeting arranged by the European Commission.

At the moment the funding from TA is reasonable and there are no suggestions to change it.

2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP

2.5.1. Has there been a review of the management and control systems at national level during the reporting period? In case any changes occurred, please briefly mention why they were needed and what they consisted of.

There has been a review of management and control systems three times.

First revision consisted of amending the organisation chart due to change in the number of posts. There was also a change in the procedure of approving annual programmes – the requirement for internal approving was abolished due to implementation of annual programmes as presented by the responsible authority and approved by the European Commission. Improvement regarding the Monitoring Committee's selection process was following: the Monitoring Committee's selection process of projects was allowed to be in a form of a meeting or a written procedure. As from the 17 October 2008 the structure of the Ministry of Finance (the certifying authority) changed, the new organisation chart was added and the change in structure was also communicated under point 1.5.4 in the description of management and control systems. The expected completion date of procedural rules of the EBF was modified taking account the actual phase of the drafting – initially presented 3rd quarter of 2008 was changed to 4th quarter of 2008. Also following amendment was done: "The procurement contract is signed by the head of relevant national competent body or if

⁶ CA salaries since 2009AP;

⁷ AA trainings and seminars since 2009AP;

the international value threshold is exceeded, by the Secretary General of the MoI – depending on the procurement, there may also be a tripartite agreement between the winning tenderer, the national competent body and the RA.” The dates of presumable entries into force of the EBF procedural rules and the regulation of the Government of the Republic have been updated taking account the real situation. A remark was made that the possibility to outsource audit procedures is not only for system audits but if the need occurs for project audits as well.

Second revision consisted of amendments related to the structural changes of the MoI and the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Estonia. The tasks of the RA of the External Borders Fund are from 01.02.2010 carried out by formed Foreign Financing Department. The duties of the Monitoring Committee were clarified and formulation of duties of the Evaluation Committee was approved.

Third revision consisted of changes in the names of the person responsible and the contact person in the RA. Reference to the Regulation of the Government of the Republic concerning the responsibilities of the designated authorities was deleted throughout the document. There was no need to adopt such regulation as the responsibilities of the authorities and the cooperation between them was defined in procedural rules adopted for every designated authority separately. Following specification was added: from 01.01.2011 Estonia will be part of the euro zone and euro will be the official currency used in Estonia. The roles of the Committees were more specified as requested by the European Commission. New organization chart of the Certifying Authority was introduced; reference to the new procedural rules of the Responsible Authority was added in the description; the principles of the procurement procedure were clarified further, especially the roles of different parties (the RA and the national competent authority with whom the projects are being implemented); the description of qualification of the staff in the AA was amended to reflect the requirements set for the auditors; the wording was corrected where considered suitable in order to be more clear.

2.5.2. To what extent were you legally or financially dependent on the approval of the Commission Decisions for launching the implementation of the annual programme?

We have been both legally and financially dependent on the approval of the Commission Decisions for launching the implementation of the annual programme.

None of the projects are selected and thereby no grant agreements concluded prior to the official decision of approving the annual programme for the specific programming year. Final beneficiaries may, however plan and implement their activities before the project proposals are approved by the RA, provided that the eligible costs are incurred during the eligibility period of the annual programme (in this case there is a possibility to conclude the grant agreement retrospectively). Should these exceptional cases occur, it may solely be on the responsibility of the authority implementing the project before the legal grounds and bearing in mind that the project in question may not be selected for co-financing under the EBF.

As the conclusion of grant agreements is dependent on the approval of the annual programme, there has been no possibility to make any of the payments to the final beneficiary before the first pre-financing payment has been received from the Commission. Hence, there remains a risk, that any financial commitments, even though eligible, that the final beneficiaries take prior to the official approval of the programme (but during the eligibility period), may not be reimbursed. As most of the projects under the EBF in Estonia

are highly expensive and big scale investments, this has sometimes been quite problematic for the final beneficiaries, especially when it comes to multi-annual projects where the financial commitment agreed upon within one AP extends also over the coming AP(s) for which the approval will be made in the future.

2.5.3. What was the implementation rate by priority? (how much did you spend out of the amount you actually allocated?)

Table n° 14

Implementation rates by priority												
	Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5		Total	
	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP 2007	100,57%	105,80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95,84%	105,51%	n/a	n/a	99,60%	105,74%
AP 2008	99,92%	106,15%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99,92%	106,15%
AP 2009	99,99%	100,15%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99,99%	100,15%
AP 2010	99,86%	99,92%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99,86%	99,92%
%	100,04%	101,90%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95,84%	105,51%	n/a	n/a	99,86%	102,02%

2.5.4. Please fill in Annex 2 to this report.

2.5.5. In light of Annex 2, what is your overall assessment of the implementation of the External Borders Fund allocations in your Member State from 2007 to 2010? Please choose among the options below:

- ☐ Not satisfactory
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Good

X Very good

2.5.6. Please explain your choice in relation to question 2.5.5.:

Considering that Estonia has used on average more than 99% of the contribution to the projects implemented under EBF, the overall assessment of the implementation of the EBF allocations from 2007 to 2010 is “very good”.

Infringements have not taken place; basically all expenditures have been eligible (except during project “Supplementary development of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II” under annual programme 2007 where ineligible expenditure in the amount of 407,63 was identified).

In conclusion the contribution to the EU external border security has been maximum through the projects implemented under EBF.

PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS

3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT

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

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

3.1.1 What were the results achieved through the projects implemented at the level of these priorities, grouped by action?

1) Updating and upgrading the surveillance equipment at the Estonian external land border together with improving the infrastructure

There were five projects implemented under this action. The surveillance system was renovated at the dry river bed at Narva city (relevant infrastructure established - e.g. observation booths together with the needed furnishing, stairs, fence; data communication lines and surveillance equipment purchased and installed; building inspection guaranteed). After the project, illegal border crossings can be discovered around the clock. An integrated surveillance system for Lake Lämmijärv was created (the Mehikoorma radar tower was built and a surveillance camera installed, a radar signal digitaliser and software for the integrated surveillance system procured). Mehikoorma Border Station was renovated and as a result of that the needed conditions for border control at Mehikoorma were ensured. A video surveillance system was created for the Gulf of Kulje. The main objective of the project was to have a permanent overview of activities in the Gulf of Kulje, and to detect and stop illegal border crossings in the Gulf of Kulje during daylight.

One of the proposed expected results was not fulfilled - there was no proposal to modernize the Tõruvere radar station. The funds allocated within the action were limited; therefore the applicant had to choose the best approach to meet the objective of the action.

2) Updating vessels communication and navigation systems

Five border guard vessels were equipped with the necessary communication and navigation systems (incl. radar, a navigation computer with the relevant software, GPS, gyrocompass, Automatic Identification System). The vessels are in conformity with the relevant systems in the member states of the EU and interoperability has been achieved. The improved systems correspond with the relevant directive of the Government of the Republic (29.01.2004 No 24).

3) Procurement and renovation of border guard vessels

As a result of the action, two border guard vessels are renovated and therefore the reliability and sustainability of the vessels are increased. The reaction time to border incidents has been shortened.

The AP foresaw an opportunity to procure a patrol boat. However, the project proposals presented by the national competent authority did not include procurement of such a patrol boat. As the funds allocated within the action were limited, the applicant had to prioritise and choose the best approach to meet the objective of the action, taking account the national priorities.

4) Procurement of a Helicopter

This is a multi-annual project (2008-2010). The helicopter has been constructed according to the agreed technical specification. Due to the particular characteristics of the project (constructing one

piece of equipment under three annual programmes), a complete assessment of the implementation of the multi-annual project can only be carried out after the final year of implementation. The helicopter will be based in Western- Estonia (on the blue external border) once the complementary project of constructing a hangar and a cordon will have been finished under the EBF programmes for 2010 and 2011.

5) Elaboration of Border Guard Information System

This is a multi-annual project (2008-2010) and 2009 was its second programming year. One project was implemented under this action. By developing the operational management module and software for mobile equipment, the situation in the Estonian border guard was adjusted to the police systems in a way which allows all the necessary alerts, messages and also the management of the mobile patrols to be carried out on the basis of a uniform system. By developing the analyzing module, the data from the relevant existing databases was integrated and is in optimized form available through the developed software. Thus it is possible to create operative and flexible statistical reports with specific analysis. By developing the service planning module, it is possible to plan the work of the border guards more efficiently, manage the patrols and create activity reports. This helps considerably to save time for border guard officials and prevent human errors while entering data. The service planning module also contributes to raising the effectiveness of the services and its arrangements in the future.

6) The construction of a cordon and a helicopter hangar

One multi-annual project is being implemented under this action. As this is an ongoing project (from 2010), the final results of the project cannot be described at this stage.

Table n° 15a **(1)Updating and upgrading the surveillance equipment at the Estonian external land border together with improving the infrastructure**

	Common Core Indicators																	
	OUTPUT									RESULTS								
2. Border surveillance systems	Number of systems acquired or upgraded			Number of stakeholders connected						Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)					
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010			
Total	3	1	4	n/a	n/a	n/a				25	764	789	n/a	n/a	n/a			
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded									% of equipment renewed out of the total equipment			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)			Length of the external borders covered (km)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	2	14	80							100*	20	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5. Border infrastructure	Number of Border Crossing Points developed or upgraded			Number of places in detention facilities at external borders			Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded			Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures			% of Border Crossing Points's modernised out of the total number of Border Crossing Points			Average waiting time for travellers at borders		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	20	25	24	244	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* 100% of the respective equipment renewed during projects

Table n° 15b (2) Updating vessels communication and navigation systems

	Common Core Indicators																	
	OUTPUT									RESULTS								
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded									% of equipment renewed out of the total equipment			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)			Length of the external borders covered (km)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	Total	64	14	80						100*	20	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* 100% of the respective equipment renewed during projects

Table n° 15c **(3) Procurement and renovation of border guard vessels**

	Common Core Indicators																	
	OUTPUT									RESULTS								
1. Means of transport	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded									Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised out of the total			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Boats	2	7*	9							48**	300***	288****	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* Includes hovercraft

** Average number of patrols per year; one patrol lasts about 3-4 days

*** Average number of patrols with all vessels per year

**** 288 is the number of patrols with ships, overall number of patrols of all vessels (boats, speedboats, ships) is 7095

Table n° 15d **(4) Procurement of a Helicopter**

	Common Core Indicators																	
	OUTPUT									RESULTS								
1. Means of transport	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded									Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised out of the total			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Helicopters	1	2	2							n/a*	0**	73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* Patrols of helicopter acquired under EBF 2008, 2009 and 2010 annual programmes (multi-annual project) are included in the overall at national level 2007-2010 indicator, separately could not be brought out

** Patrols were carried out by planes

Table n° 15e **(5) Elaboration of Border Guard Information System**

	Common Core Indicators																
	OUTPUT									RESULTS							
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded									Number of institutional stakeholders involved			Improvement in average time consultations/number of consultations (Yes/No)				
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010					
Total	1	4	1							1	5	1	n/a				

Table n° 15f **(6) The construction of a cordon and a helicopter hangar**

	Common Core Indicators																	
	OUTPUT									RESULTS								
5. Border infrastructure	Number of Border Crossing Points developed or upgraded			Number of places in detention facilities at external borders			Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded			Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures			% of Border Crossing Points's modernised out of the total number of Border Crossing Points			Average waiting time for travellers at borders		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Multi-annual project; the cordon and the hangar are built under 2011 annual-programme; under 2010 annual-programme the building design is finished)	20	25	Multi-annual project; the cordon and the hangar are built under 2011 annual-programme; under 2010 annual-programme the building design is finished)	244	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

3.1.2. To what extent are the achievements of the 2007-2010 annual programmes consistent with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme and in the annual programme in question? (Please detail)

AP 2007

Action 1. Updating and upgrading the surveillance equipment at the Estonian external land border together with improving the infrastructure

Altogether five projects were implemented under Action 1. It can be said that the projects were successful – they were implemented as planned. None of the projects reported any differences between the actual and planned results. Minor dissimilarities regarding budget use were reported by the projects VPF 2007-5, VPF 2007-6 and VPF 2007-7 (costs increased for VPF 2007-5 and VPF 2007-7, but decreased in the case of VPF 2007-6). However, the objectives were achieved and all the planned activities were implemented – the necessary equipment was procured and works were carried out.

Action 2. Updating vessels communication and navigation systems

One project was implemented under Action 2. There were no differences between the actual and planned results. Project cost decreased. For five vessels, the necessary equipment was procured and tested as foreseen.

Action 3. Procurement and renovation of border guard vessels

Two projects were implemented under Action 3. In general there were no differences between the actual and planned results. There were a few delays in the delivery of certain equipment in project VPF 2007-3; however, all the renovation works were carried out.

The expected results and targets of the annual programme 2007 under priority 1 were mainly achieved. However, among others due to the limited funds, not all results proposed in the AP 2007 could be obtained. For example, the proposed procurement of a patrol boat did not materialise. Also, there was no proposal to modernize Tõruvere radar station. It was planned to equip six vessels with communication and navigation systems, while in reality, the number of vessels was five.

AP 2008

Action 1. Procurement of a helicopter

Under this action, one multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented. The activities intended for 2008 were carried out as planned.

Action 2. Elaboration of Border Guard information system

Under this action, one multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented. The activities intended for 2008 were carried out as planned. However, due to technical and financial restrictions, there was a slight change in the order of the implementation of certain activities compared to the initial plans.

As the projects implemented within the annual programme 2008 are multi-annual, the achievement level of final results cannot be assessed under the year 2008. It can be concluded that the expected intermediary results were mainly achieved.

AP 2009

Action 1. Procurement of a helicopter

Under this action, one multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented. The activities intended for 2009 were carried out as planned.

As the project/action is multi-annual, the achievement level of final results cannot be assessed in the framework of the AP for 2009. However, the expected intermediary results were achieved.

Action 2. Elaboration of Border Guard information system

Under this action, one multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented. There was a slight change in the order of the implementation of certain activities compared to the initial plans. The analysis and realisation of the GIS system which was initially foreseen to be implemented under the AP 2009 was postponed to be carried out under the AP 2010. Instead, part of the action initially foreseen to be implemented under the AP 2010 was now carried out under the AP 2009. However, this exchange of activities between the two APs did not affect the overall implementation of the project and action.

As the projects implemented within the annual programme 2009 are multi-annual, the achievement level of final results cannot be assessed within the framework of the AP 2009. However, it can be concluded that the expected intermediary results were mainly achieved.

AP 2010

Action 1. Procurement of a helicopter

One multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented under this action. There were no significant differences between the actual and planned results. A planned training for two pilots was expanded to include two technicians as well.

Action 2. Elaboration of Border Guard information system

One multi-annual (2008-2010) project was implemented under this action. As the final report for the year 2010 of this project has not been approved yet⁸, no final conclusions on the achievement of the targets of this action can be made. However, considering the earlier implementation, there is no indication that this project will not deliver according to plan.

Action 3. The construction of a cordon and a helicopter hangar

One multi-annual project is being implemented under this action. As this is an ongoing project (from 2010), only one interim report has been submitted so far. According to this report there has been a delay, but the first phase of the project has been implemented.

As the final report of the AP 2010 has not yet been approved, no final conclusions on the achievement of the targets of the annual programme 2010 can be made. According to the interviews with the project managers the results are in general achieved as planned except for the helicopter hangar, which is currently being constructed.

3.1.3. To what extent did the projects and the actions, through their results, contribute to improving overall border management in your country? In answering, please refer to the outputs and results at section 3.1.1. above.

All the projects and their actions contributed to the improvement of the overall border management in Estonia.

The projects referred to under section 3.1.1 relating to upgrading the surveillance equipment at the Estonian external land border together with improving the infrastructure improved the working

⁸ at the time of conducting the evaluation by the independent evaluator

conditions and security measures in cordons as well improved significantly the reaction time to illegal border crossings.

Updating vessels' communication and navigation systems and procurement and renovation of border guard vessels is contributing to the objective of being visible to foreign vessels, to prevent illegal actions, and also to have the ability to perform vessel checks at sea.

Other actions under 3.1.1 have wider impacts on all the levels of border management improving the reaction and communication possibilities between the counterparts on border and mainland.

3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD

Priority 3 – Support for issuing of visas and 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

This priority was not implemented in Estonia

3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS

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

3.3.1. What were the results achieved through the projects implemented at the level of these priorities, grouped by action?

1) Modification of Estonian SIS central system (E-SIS), SIRENE workflow system and if possible the related authorities' information systems in connection with the exchange of information within SIS II

One project was implemented under this action. The main objective was to reach adequate SIS information in time by all related authorities in Estonia, to exchange the corresponding Estonian information to other Schengen member states and to benefit from added data categories and data integration. The following key operations were funded and results achieved:

1. Estonian national SIS is modified and is able to exchange data with the European SIS II central System (data input, exchange and queries).
2. Analyze for compatibility is done
3. Information system of the SIRENE bureau is modified and is able to exchange data in SIS II format
4. NS.SIS and DEM modules are implemented

2) Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II and improving the existing queries

There was also one project implemented under this action. The following key operations were funded and results achieved:

1. SIS queries are adjusted to SIS II requirements
2. lists of air- and sea travellers can be checked against SIS databases
3. passport reader is connected to border guard information system fixed workstation
4. analysis is done for connecting mobile device to border guard information system for reading biometrical passports

As a result SIS II queries are enabled for border guard officials for tackling illegal immigration and countering cross-border criminality.

During the implementation of the VPF in Estonia the EC requested to allocate funds to SIS II from the VPF, since some of the rules for SIS II were changed and its implementation had been delayed at EU level. In order to facilitate that requests, some smaller projects had to be cancelled (e.g. purchase of smaller ice-class vessels was left out of the programme). However these changes were implemented during programming and therefore there were no major changes in the programme.

Table n° 17a **(Modification of Estonian SIS central system (E-SIS), SIRENE workflow system and if possible the related authorities' information systems in connection with the exchange of information within SIS II)**

	Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			RESULTS			
6. SIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS			% of successful connection tests	Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)		
					YES	NO	NA
Total	65,9%*			Connection tests were not carried out at the end of the project due to postponing of SIS II European central system due date and therefore the tests could not be done			x

* Not taken into account EBF Community Actions

Table n° 17b **(Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II and improving the existing queries)**

	Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			RESULTS			
6. SIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS			% of successful connection tests	Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)		
					YES	NO	NA
Total	75%*			Connection tests were not carried out at the end of the project due to postponing of SIS II European central system due date and therefore the tests could not be done			x

* Not taken into account EBF Community Actions

3.3.2. To what extent are the achievements of the 2007-2010 annual programmes consistent with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme and in the annual programme in question? (Please detail)

AP 2007

Action 4. Modification of Estonian SIS central system, SIRENE workflow system and if possible the related authorities' information systems in connection with the exchange of information within SIS II

One project was implemented under this action. The main objectives of the project were achieved regardless of the constantly changing environment (e.g. the delay in the development of SIS II European central system; restructuring in national authorities). The precondition for the full implementation of the project was the completion of SIS II European central system due date. As this was not accomplished, the compatibility tests could not be done.

Action 5. Supplementary development of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II

One project was implemented under this action. The project was rather successful and the objectives have been achieved in majority.

Action 6. Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)

There was no project submitted under this action. The main reason for the cancellation of this action was the insufficient planned budget compared to the goals set.

The achievement level of expected results and targets of the annual programme 2007 under priority 4 was not that high compared to priority 1. As mentioned above, the delay in the development of SIS II European central system had a clear impact on the projects related to SIS II.

3.3.3. To what extent did the projects and the actions, through their results, contribute to the development of the IT systems necessary for the implementation of EU instruments in the field of external borders and visas? Please breakdown for SIS, VIS and, where applicable, other IT systems. In answering, please refer to the outputs and results at section 3.3.1. above.

As the achievements of the projects and actions described within section 3.3.1 are mainly related to software development, they have made a considerable contribution to the development of the IT systems necessary for the implementation of EU instruments in the field of external borders. Due to the cancellation of the action "Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)", there was no direct effect on the implementation of EU instruments related to visas.

Concerning the development of SIS, the Estonian national SIS has been modified and is able to exchange data with the SIS II central system⁹ (SIS queries are adjusted to SIS II requirements). It is possible to check lists of air and sea travellers against SIS databases. Also the information system of the SIRENE bureau is modified and it is now able to exchange data in SIS II format. The workflow system of the SIRENE bureau now enables to manage relevant data more efficiently and therefore to react more quickly and precisely to new information. In addition, the developments of IT systems

⁹ All the developments were made according to the requirements set to the system at that time. As the SIS II global central system was not completed during the implementation of the AP 2007, the requirements have been specified since and there is a need for additional developments to comply with the conditions set to the SIS II national components.

include the connection of a passport reader to fixed workstations of the border guard information system and an analysis for connecting mobile devices for reading biometrical passports to the border guard information system.

3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT

Priority 5 – Support for effective and efficient application of relevant EU legal instruments in the field of external borders and visas, in particular

This priority was not implemented in Estonia

3.5. Overall results achieved with the Fund's intervention

3.5.1. Please insert an overview table presenting the overall achievements through the Fund's intervention.

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

Table n° 19a

	Common Core Indicators								
	RESULTS								
1. Means of transport	Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised out of the total			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline (1)	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	48	300	361	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Helicopters	n/a (4)	0 (5)	73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Boats	48 (7)	300 (8)	288 (9)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Border surveillance systems	Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)					
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010			
Total	25	764	789	n/a	n/a	n/a			
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	% of equipment renewed out of the total equipment			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)			Length of the external borders covered (km)		

	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	100 (10)	20	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5. Border infrastructure	Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures			% of Border Crossing Points's modernised out of the total number of Border Crossing Points			Average waiting time for travellers at borders		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	24	244	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8. Other ICT systems	Number of institutional stakeholders involved			Improvement in average time consultations/number of consultations (Yes/No)					
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
Total	1	5	1	n/a					

(1) 2000-2006 statistics on means of transport was gathered as overall kilometres. There is no separation of statistics on kilometres that were used only for patrols

(2) Includes snowmobiles and ATVs

(3) Includes snowmobiles and ATVs

(4) Patrols of helicopter acquired under EBF 2008, 2009 and 2010 annual programmes (multi-annual project) are included in the overall at national level 2007-2010 indicator, separately could not be brought out

(5) Patrols were carried out by planes

(6) Includes hovercraft

(7) Average number of patrols per year; one patrol lasts about 3-4 days

(8) Average number of patrols with all vessels per year

(9) 288 is the number of patrols with ships, overall number of patrols of all vessels (boats, speedboats, ships) is 7095

(10) 100% of the respective equipment renewed during projects

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

Table n° 19b

	Common Core Indicators				
	RESULTS				
6. SIS	% of successful connection tests	Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)			Number of institutional stakeholders involved
		YES	NO	NA	
Total	Connection tests were not carried out at the end of the project due to postponing of SIS II European central system due date and therefore the tests could not be done			x	n/a

3.5.2. How do you assess the results of section 3.5.1. in the national context of implementation of the External Borders Fund?

- ☐ Neutral
☒ **Positive**
☐ Very positive
☐ Excellent

3.5.3. Please comment on the overall results achieved (as presented in Table n° 16) in relation to your initially set expectations as stated in the annual programmes.

On the basis of the interviews carried out, the results achieved can be assessed as positive or very positive (mostly positive at project level and very positive at programme level). The reason not to assess the results achieved as very positive or excellent often relates to practicalities; there are always bigger needs than there are resources available. Also, the funding mechanism has proven to be causing some complications in practice: goals are set in the framework of a multi-annual programme, but the needs are changing during that period and, as might often happen, even during the implementation of a project. On the other hand, the financing level is determined annually in the framework of state budgeting. This in turn is causing some uncertainty and inconvenience in implementation even if a multi-annual project is approved. Still the objectives set in multi-annual programme can be considered as achieved.

3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES

3.6.1. Important/successful projects funded in the annual programmes 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010

Apart from the action which was not started (Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System) all the relevant key actions which were planned to be implemented under AP 2007 were put into practice. Through the successful

implementation of the projects under the AP 2007, the Estonian Border Guard's capability to conduct effective border control, react to border incidents and discover illegal immigration timely is increased substantially. Due to the database development projects, the Border Guard's capability to collect and exchange relevant information quickly is ensured.

Priority 1.

Under AP 2007 10 projects have been implemented. These projects are all considered very important to Estonia. For example the **renovated vessels „Kõu“ and „Valvas“** are now in accordance with international conventions and laws, the vessels are safer and up-to-date. As a result the reaction time for border incidents is shortened.

One other important project was „Renovating the surveillance system at **„Narva city dry river bed“**“. The main objective of the project was to have an overview of the activities in Narva city dry river bed and to detect and stop illegal border crossings. As a result the surveillance system was renovated and the relevant infrastructure was established - e.g. observation booths together with the needed furnishing, stairs, fence; data communication lines and surveillance equipment. The total eligible cost of the project was 688 904,96 EUR, from which the EC contribution was 431,403.63 EUR. Some lessons were also learned during the implementation of this project : 1) More time should be planned for the implementation of such large-scale projects; 2) As the procurement was more expensive than planned, there was a need for some extra funds. But in general the project was very successful and the achieved results have been applied immediately.

Priority 4

Under AP 2007 there were two projects related directly to software development: **„Development of information system for SIS II“** and **„Supplementary development of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II“**. The expected results and targets were mainly achieved for both projects. The following key operations were funded:

1. Estonian national SIS is modified and is able to exchange data with the European SIS II central System (data input, exchange and queries);
2. analysis for compatibility is done;
3. information system of the SIRENE bureau is modified and is able to exchange data in SIS II format;
4. NS.SIS and DEM modules are implemented;
5. SIS queries are adjusted to SIS II requirements;
6. lists of air- and sea travellers can be checked against SIS databases;
7. a passport reader is connected to border guard information system fixed workstation;
8. analysis is done for connecting mobile device to border guard information system for reading biometrical passports.

Priority 1

The project **„Procurement of a helicopter“** is of great importance as well. This is a multi-annual project (2008-2010) under which a helicopter together with the needed equipment for reaction to border incidents is procured. The helicopter will be based in Western- Estonia (on the blue external border) once the complementary project of constructing a hangar and cordon is finished under the EBF programmes 2010-2011. The procurement of a helicopter located in Western-Estonia is foreseen both in the Development Plan of the Governing Area of the Ministry of the Interior for 2008–2011 and in the Principles of Development of the Estonian Border Guard Aviation Group 2007-2020.

The following key operations were funded under AP 2008:

1. the negotiations with the supplier were held and the contract signed;

2. the construction of the helicopter was started according to the agreed technical specification and schedule;
3. The contractual advance payments were made to the supplier as agreed in the contract.

Some problems occurred during the first year of implementation: a) changes in procurement prices and the need to reallocate (or add extra) funds after the approval of the programme and the grant agreements; b) The change in the rate of value added tax.

3.6.2. Description of best practices derived from the implementation of the External Borders Fund

The software development projects required a lot of cooperation at national and international level. The precondition for full implementation of the projects was the completion of the SIS II European central system by the due date. As this was not accomplished and the deadline was postponed at the European level, the compatibility tests could not be carried out. Regardless of this constantly changing environment, the main objectives set to these projects were still achieved. However, some developments may be needed due to the changed requirements at EU level.

It could be added by the RA that software development projects were implemented during the period of restructuring the national authorities, transfer of information technology support from one authority to another and in addition the lack of clarity of developing the SIS II European Central System. Despite the complex situation the main objectives set for the projects were achieved due to cooperation between different parties that were related to those projects. However, there are no examples of any special best practices that could be valuable for other Member States.

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

3.7.1. Description of 3 less successful projects, among the projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2010

In the framework of AP 2007, there were no project proposals submitted under the action "Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)". The main reason for cancellation of this action was the insufficiency of the planned budget compared to the set goals. The EC allocation (19,173 EUR) together with the initially planned public contribution for this action was reallocated, mainly to project VPF 2007-3 which final cost was considerably higher than planned. As the change in financial breakdown did not exceed 10% of the whole amount allocated to actions in AP 2007, the programme was not amended. The higher cost of a project was beyond the control of the RA and final beneficiary. However, the cancelled action is very important for Estonia. Hence it is implemented as part of the project approved under Community Action 2008 - "Use of Visa Information System and Entry-Exit functionality - Pilot Project", which is led by the Finnish Border Guard.

3.7.2. Lessons learned

3.7.2.1. Please describe what are the lessons learned and practices developed for the future both in terms of Fund/project management and in terms of practices developed for the management of border/visa.

- 1) In some projects there were **changes in procurement prices and the need to reallocate (or add extra) funds** after the approval of the programme and grant agreements (e.g in „Procuring the helicopter“). In general, there were no changes within the actions which would have required an amendment of the APs. During the implementation, there were **slight reallocations of amounts between the projects within and between the actions**. All the reallocations which exceeded 10% of the total cost of the action were approved by the Monitoring Committee within the RA. Also, **the change in the rate of value added tax** caused the need for extra funds.
- 2) In construction projects of the earlier APs, **construction and design were often combined** in one contract, which weakens the control over the contractors and the estimation of the needs and costs of the object. Therefore, it is preferred in the future to have construction and design in separate contracts.
- 3) As the funds allocated within the actions are limited, in some cases the applicant had to set priorities and select the best approach to meet the objectives of the action, taking account the national priorities. As a result, **not all possible results proposed in the APs could be obtained**; e.g. some of the proposed expected results in AP 2007 were not fulfilled - there was no proposal to modernize Tõruvere radar station or to procure a patrol boat for one vessel.
- 4) In some case there was a **slight change in the order of implementation of certain activities** as compared to the initial plans, but this did not have any impact on achieving the expected results (e.g in „Elaboration of Border Guard Information System“).
- 5) One of the difficulties that the final beneficiaries had overcome, was the **complexity of describing the specific actions implemented during the intermediary year of a multi-annual project**. The main principle in solving this issue was that if the overall results and goals of the project were not affected, the order of specific actions could be changed as long as this was duly justified and necessary for guaranteeing the achievement of the goals and results of the project. (e.g in „Procuring the Helicopter“).
- 6) **The outcome of the actions cannot be put immediately into practice in all cases**. For example, the precondition for full implementation of the actions for „Modification of Estonian SIS central system, SIRENE workflow system and if possible the related authorities' information systems in connection with the exchange of information within SIS II“ and „Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II and improving the existent queries“ was the completion of the SIS II European central system by the due date. As this was not accomplished and the deadline was postponed at European level, the compatibility tests could not be carried out. Regardless of this constantly changing environment, the main objectives set to these actions were achieved. However, as long as the SIS II European central system is not operational, a considerable part of the outcome of these actions cannot be put into practice and there may be other developments needed due to the changed requirements from the EU level.
- 7) **Some procurements/deliveries took longer than planned, which caused delays in project implementation** (e.g in Renovating Border Guard vessel "VALVAS", „Procuring a helicopter“).
- 8) **Complexity of the projects related to the software development**. A number of related information systems were under fundamental change at the time of implementation. This fact was already considered in planning phase. Therefore, the priority was to work with developments to which other systems had the smallest impact. Still, it wasn't possible to

prevent all such impact. There was also a lack of information and therefore, it was vital to actively participate in relevant EU Council and Commission working groups and horizontal working groups. However, participation has been hindered because of two main lacking resources; manpower and financial resources. In addition, some compatibility tests could not be carried out.

- 9) **It is a challenge to follow project plans and timetables while maintaining the eligibility of expenditure in an unstable environment** (emphasized especially in software development projects).
- 10) Although the SIS II software development projects were in general considered as good practices since the delay provided for possibilities to figure out the requirements and real needs more thoroughly than it could have been done before (and therefore the functionalities implemented are well built), the **changes in the IT project management setup** had its implications as well: a new structure under the Ministry was created (SMIT) which added one more management layer between the project leaders and the supplier who was new from the project's point of view. This added some extra costs and bureaucracy in the short run although finally the objectives were achieved.

3.7.2.2. Were you already able to integrate some of these practices in the management of the projects?

The following lessons have been integrated by now into standard project management procedures:

- The planning process has to be of very high quality and the project managers have to be more included into it in order to be able to give feedback on how long different actions will take in practice (i.e. they will not be the last ones to receive the plans and ordered to implement them when there's not much time left). This has already clearly improved
- In the framework of works contracts, construction and design are now in separate contracts (e.g. the helicopter hangar), which allows for a better control over the contractors and for better estimation of the needs and costs. The IT and vessel projects are very complicated due to their nature – the needs often become more clear during the works (e.g. repairing a vessel's engine – when it's taken apart it is possible to understand what really is the scope of the work and how much has to be replaced).

PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	17876364 (total crossings)	7 199 222	7393919
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	3502	915	3326
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	146	69	97
Visa applications made	129239	96 051	149612
Visas issued	127155	91803	149601

4.02. Please specify whether, in your opinion, the intervention through the Fund contributed to changes in migration trends in your country and if so, explain the reasons.

It is likely that EBF activities (AP 2007) have influenced discovering of illegal border crossings. The Estonian Border Guard's capability to conduct effective border control, react to border incidents and discover illegal immigration timely is increased substantially. Also, the Estonian border is now guarded with better equipment and some parts of the border are harder to cross (Narva dry river bed). It is likely that third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally have decreased in 2009 and 2011 compared to 2006 because of the secured and more guarded border.

As one of the planned activity “Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)” of AP 2007 was cancelled, the impact of EBF on Visa applications made is probably minimal. Furthermore, it is likely that due to the elaboration of the Border Guard Information System, it is possible to accelerate the process and make the crossings quicker.

Although the impact has been positive, it has to be taken into account that the economic recession is also likely to have had its impact; the needs for foreign workforce decreased significantly. For example, the quota set for immigration by the government for the year 2009 was not met.

4.03. Please specify to what extent migration flows influenced decisions on the intervention of the Fund? Did you (re)shape the programming through the Fund in order to meet any (new/unforeseen) specific needs within the migratory context at national level? If, why?

The migration flows did not influence the decisions on the intervention of the Fund.

During the implementation, there have been some slight reallocations of amounts between projects within the same action and between actions (AP 2007, A1,A2, A3). There were no changes within actions which would have required the amendment of the AP. Under A2 (AP 2008) there was a slight change in the approved financing pattern - the level of programmed costs in AP is lower than the level of costs actually committed with the procurement contract. This is due to the fact that the public contribution was increased to match the payment schedule of a procurement contract. The EC contribution remained the same as approved. Under A2 (AP 2009) there was a slight change in the order of the implementation of certain activities compared to the initial plans, but this did not have any impact on achieving the expected results. Under A2 (AP 2010) there was a slight change in the schedule of procurement contracts, but this also did not affect achieving the expected results.

4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT

Volume effects:

- 4.1.1.** Taking into account the information in part I, how and where in particular did the Fund's intervention contribute most significantly to the overall range of activities in support to border management (checks and surveillance) in your country?

The Fund contributed significantly to physical border protection and the discovery of illegal activities on the border (renovation of vessels, cordons, new surveillance systems) and decreased the reaction time to illegal border crossings (new surveillance systems, information system). The information about the ability to react spreads among potential illegal migrants as well and therefore it has been noticed that the number of illegal crossings in updated areas has decreased (although this cannot yet be confirmed in official statistics).

- 4.1.2.** Taking into account the information in part I, how and where in particular did the Fund's intervention contribute most significantly to the overall range of activities in support to visa issuing in your country?

N/A (priority not implemented in Estonia)

- 4.1.3.** Taking into account the information in part I, how important was the support of the External Borders Fund to the national efforts in developing the IT systems VIS and SIS?

The contribution has been significant since the recession period was seriously affecting the level of investments. Considering the latter, the contribution has been very significant and many systems developments would probably have been postponed or cancelled without it.

- 4.1.4.** To what extent did the Fund contribute to strengthening the image of having secure borders in your society?

As mentioned under 4.1.1, the information about the ability to react spreads among potential illegal migrants as well and therefore it has been noticed that the number of illegal crossings in updated areas has decreased and the discovery of illegal actions increased.

According to the Standard Eurobarometer 73¹⁰, only 8% of respondents in Estonia had an opinion that there was not in enough control at external borders. Therefore it can be said that the image of having secure borders in society is prevailing

- 4.1.5. How do you perceive the programmes' 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?

There are no other programmes or funds available in this field in Estonia, neither at national nor at regional level. Also, in the national budget there are no significant funds available for such investments (especially during the recession period). Usually, the funds allocated are used for maintaining the situation. So the added value has been significant in this respect.

Scope effects:

- 4.1.6. How did the Fund enhance your response capacity in relation to detecting irregular crossings and apprehending irregularly entering third-country nationals? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

All the surveillance system renovations on the eastern border have significantly increased the detection and reaction speed to irregular border crossings. For example, in Narva city dry river bed was in urgent need of updating its surveillance system, since it is a short distance between Estonia and Russia which can be crossed by foot. At the same time the dry river bed is located close to the city centre, which in turn means that the illegal crossings have to be discovered fast – otherwise the person is lost in the city and finding him would be more difficult.

- 4.1.7. To what extent did the Fund contribute in particular to preparing your country for the introduction of the integrated, interoperable European system of surveillance, e.g. EUROSUR?

The Fund contributed to EUROSUR in a rather moderate way; all the systems have been developed in order to be able to give input data to EUROSUR systems, but it has not been the main objective so far.

- 4.1.8. To what extent did the Fund contribute to increasing and improving (local) consular co-operation and creating economies of scale in consulates? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

N/A (priority not implemented in Estonia)

- 4.1.9. To what extent did the Fund allow you to research, develop, test and introduce innovative / state-of-the-art technology at borders and in consulates? (such as ABC gates and Registered Traveller Programmes).

In cooperation with a company called SMARTEC, new devices have been developed which help to discover illegal crossings on border. This new technology has been

¹⁰ http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb73/eb73_first_en.pdf

implemented on the border and for 2013 AP project has been prepared to take this new systems into use on other border areas as well.

- 4.1.10.** What alternatives would you have used to address the problems identified at national level should the Fund not have been available? To what extent and in what timeframe would you have been able to address them?

Taking into account the recession period, most of the investments would not have taken place at all or at least not in the next 5 years. Probably, a small amount of money would have been allocated from state reserves, mainly covering developments required by EU directives. There are no alternatives available for such activities aside the EBF, except for the state budget, which is very limited.

- 4.1.11.** Taking into account the above analysis of your programmes' achievements, please evaluate the overall impact of the programmes under the External Borders Fund (choose one or more options and explain):

Border management

- ☐ consolidation and limited extension of border management capabilities in your country
- ☒ consolidation and significant extension of border management capabilities in your country
- ☐ limited modification of practices/tools supporting border management in your country
- ☐ significant modification of practices/tools supporting border management in your country
- ☒ introduction of new practices/tools supporting border management in your country
- ☐ other (please specify)

Due to the renovation of surveillance systems and renovating vessels and cordons the ability to discover illegal actions on border areas has risen significantly. Accordingly, the ability to react has also been strengthened.

As a new tool, the common management information system developed for the border guard had a great impact on having an overview of deficiencies and on planning better the use of limited resources available.

Visa – N/A

- ☐ consolidation and limited extension of visa policy capabilities in your country
- ☐ consolidation and significant extension of visa policy capabilities in your country
- ☐ limited modification of practices/tools supporting visa policy in your country
- ☐ significant modification of practices/tools supporting visa policy in your country
- ☐ introduction of new practices/tools supporting visa policy in your country
- ☐ other

IT systems

- ☐ limited contribution to investments in SIS in your country
- ☐ significant contribution to investments in SIS in your country
- ☒ crucial contribution to investments in SIS in your country
- ☐ limited contribution to investments in VIS in your country
- ☐ significant contribution to investments in VIS in your country
- ☐ crucial contribution to investments in VIS in your country
- ☐ other (please specify)

During the projects related to SIS, all the requirements were fulfilled to be ready for joining SIS II system. Even when the final objective- joining the common system- was not yet met, the EBF made it possible to build up the system according to the scope required and to have the functionalities needed for joining. The contribution should be considered as crucial, since there were no other funds available for such a development.

Role effects:

- 4.1.12. To what extent did the Fund enable you to address specific national weaknesses and/or deficiencies at external borders? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

The EBF enabled to increase the surveillance capacity on the external borders as there's much more information available now helping to prevent illegal actions in border areas. Also, the development of a management and information system for the border guard has had a great impact: planning and execution of tasks and analysis is now combined into one system, while it was fragmented before leading to an insufficient overview of different areas and their needs.

- 4.1.13. To what extent did the Fund enable you to address specific national weaknesses and/or deficiencies in the services and facilities available for your country in third countries with regard to visa issuing and/or the (preparation for the) entry of third-country nationals into your country and the Schengen area? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

N/A (priority not implemented in Estonia)

- 4.1.14. What other effects did the implementation of the Fund bring at national level; different from what was initially expected or estimated? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

The authorities are under the impression that since the image of Estonia has changed to a country more strict on the borders, there might be a certain displacement effect as illegal migration flows are being diverted to other routes in bordering countries.

- 4.1.15. Please indicate to what extent the activities co-financed by the Fund would not have taken place without the financial support of the EU and explain:

☒ they could not have been carried out

☐ they could have been carried out to a limited extent

☐ they could have been carried out to a significant extent

☐ part of the activities carried out by public authorities (namely...) could not have been carried out

☐ the co-financing of the Fund, activities by other organisations could not have been carried out (namely, if applicable)

☐ other

As explained above, the recession had its own implications as well and therefore the EBF contributed significantly since there were no other funds available for such activities.

Even in a normal economical situation, the state budget has very low capacity for such investments and therefore it can be concluded that most of the investments co-financed by the EBF would not have taken place at all in the period under evaluation or in next 5 years.

Process effects:

- 4.1.16. To what extent did the Fund contribute to an efficient management of passenger flows at border crossing points? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects.

All the IT projects had their impact on smoother management of border crossings. For example, the implementation of a single management information system had its impact as well through the better planning of human resources in border areas.

- 4.1.17. To what extent did the Fund make a difference in the overall development of your national border management system and/or strategies? When applicable, please illustrate by referring to specific actions and/or projects that changed the set-up and/or approach of your public administration.

The biggest difference made by the EBF was to increase the ability to detect and react on illegal actions in border regions. The new common management information system developed for the border guard had a great impact on having an overview of deficiencies and on plan bettering the use of limited resources available.

In combination these effects have strengthened Estonia's image as a stricter destination for illegal crossings.

There has been no significant effect on public administration in this sector as previous EU funded programmes (PHARE, Transition Facility, Schengen Facility) had already supported this to a large extent and capacity was already at a relatively high level.

4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION

- 4.2.1. Building on the results in the excel sheets and on the analysis under PART III of this questionnaire, please describe, in general terms, how relevant the programme's objectives are to the problems and needs initially identified in the field of borders management. Has there been an evolution which required a reshaping of the intervention?

The problems on which the strategy for the EBF was based have not been stated very clearly in the Multi-annual programme. However, most of the problems could be still derived from the description of the situation in the Member State (Estonia) and from the necessary measures for achieving the results described in the Multi-annual programme.

There is a very clear link between objectives and needs. Also, the objectives correspond to the identified problems. None of the EBF programmes have been revised to date.

During the implementation, there have been slight reallocations of amounts between the projects within and between the actions (AP 2007, A1,A2, A3). There were no changes within the action which would have required an amendment of the AP. All the reallocations which exceeded 10% of the total cost of the action were approved by the Monitoring Committee within the RA.

Under A6 (AP 2007) no project proposals were submitted, the consequently cancelled action is implemented as part of a project approved under Community Action 2008 – „Use of Visa Information System and Entry-Exit functionality – Pilot Project" (led by the Finnish Border Guard). The main reason for cancellation of this action was the insufficiency of the planned budget compared to the set goals.

Under A2 (AP 2008) there was a slight change in the approved financing pattern - the level of programmed costs in AP is lower than the level of costs actually committed with the procurement contract. This is due to the fact that the public contribution was increased in order to match the payment schedule of the procurement contract. The EC contribution remained the same as the one that was approved.

Under A2 (AP 2009) there was a slight change in the order of the implementation of certain activities as compared to the initial plans, but this did not have any impact on achieving the expected results. Under A2 (AP 2010) there was a slight change in the schedule of procurement contracts, but this did not have any impact either on achieving the expected results.

4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME

4.3.1. Building on the results in the excel sheets and on the analysis under PART III of this questionnaire, 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) have been attained. Are the effects resulting from the intervention consistent with its objectives?

It can be concluded that the implementation of the programme up to the present moment has been successful. As the annual programmes were drawn up to be in line with the possible key actions and objectives of the multi-annual programme (MAP), it can be said that the implementation of the actions under different annual programmes has contributed to attaining the targets set out in the MAP. Still, it is important to note that the projects implemented under the AP 2008 and 2009 are multi-annual and the final results of the projects and the assessment of the progress made in implementing the MAP can be drawn up after the finalization of the AP 2010.

The main results achieved so far include:

- There is an increased capacity of detecting violations of the border regime on the sea and lake borders. Also, the response time to border incidents has improved;
- Updated communication and navigation systems of vessels conforming to EU member states' relevant systems and interoperability is achieved;
- The area of technical surveillance is increased at the external land (incl. river and lake) border (different surveillance systems/border station renovated, upgraded and created);
- The needed software for transition to SIS II on the border has been developed and a preparedness to access SIS II through the national information system is enabled thus ensuring better capacity to fight international crime and illegal immigration;

- The Estonian national SIS is modified and is able to exchange data with the European SIS II central System¹¹. The information system of the SIRENE bureau is modified and is able to exchange data in SIS II format;
- Different modules (analysing, service planning, operational management) and software have been developed. The system of the Estonian border guard have been adjusted to the police systems (there is a uniform system; data from existing databases have been integrated).

In general, the majority of targets were achieved to the extent as presented in the annual and multi-annual programmes. However, the initially planned action “Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)” was not implemented due to an insufficiency of the planned budget. Also, the objectives related to the start-up of the SIS II were not fully achieved.

4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME

4.4.1. What were the programme management costs according to the categories below for the programme years 2007 to 2010?

Table n° 21

Calendar year	TA contribution (€)	National contribution (€)	National contribution in-kind (offices, IT tools) – (€ estimate)	Total (€)
2007	0	0	X	X
2008	0	0	X	X
2009	31 262,17	10 102,44	X	X + 41 364,61
2010	57 466,36	14 143,16	X	X + 71 609,52
2011	38 493,12	4 374,59	X	X + 42 867,71
First six month 2012	3 194,27	0	X	X + 3 194,27

Estonia started using technical assistance in 2009. Hence, in 2008 the costs for management of the Fund were covered from the national budget. Estonia has co-financed technical assistance (TA) under the 2008 and 2009 annual programmes. TA contribution and national contribution consist of: salaries of employees of competent authorities, costs for translation of documents, travel costs, training costs, costs for distribution of information about the Fund. In-kind national contribution consists of: office costs, IT-tools, staff costs (e.g. migration and border policy department, legal department etc.) etc.

There have been certain national in-kind expenses but it is not possible to provide exact sums, therefore the share of national in-kind contribution is marked as X.

¹¹ All the developments were made according to the requirements set to the system at that time. As the SIS II global central system was not completed during the implementation of the AP2007, the requirements have been specified since and there is a need for additional developments to comply with the conditions set to the SIS II national components.

4.4.2. Breakdown by different categories of the national contribution in-kind (from point 4.4.1. above)

Table n° 22

Calendar year	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°/€)	IT and equipment (€)	Office/ Consumables (€)	Travelling/ events (€)	Total (€)
2007	X	X	X	X	X
2008	X	X	X	X	X
2009	X	X	X	X	X
2010	X	X	X	X	X
2011	X	X	X	X	X
First six month 2012	X	X	X	X	X

Staff costs for those officials who are working directly with the Fund are covered under the EBF. Staff costs who provide support for implementation of the EBF (e.g. migration and border policy department, legal department etc.) are in-kind costs, as are equipment and office consumables. Costs for travelling/events are mostly covered by the Fund, but there are certain costs which are in-kind (e.g. trainings which are organised for all officials engaged in management of foreign financing and not only Solid-Funds etc.).

As mentioned above, it is not possible to provide exact sums for national in-kind expenses, therefore those are marked as X

4.4.3. What is your opinion on the overall efficiency of the programme implementation?

In general, the implementation of the programme has been efficient. The cooperation and communication both at the programme and projects' level has been good and efficient.

However, there were some issues which influenced the implementation of the programme. For example, there was a need to reallocate funds after the approval of programme and grant agreements (changes in procurement prices). The change in the rate of value added tax had an impact on the implementation of the programme as well.

It should also be noted that one of the difficulties in managing the programme was related to the planning of activities of multi-annual projects. As the budget of the programme is changed annually, it was difficult to plan procurements before the annual programme had been approved (for example, one year the budget was decreased). However, the issue was tackled by the principle of changing the order of specific activities as long as it was duly justified and did not affect the achievement of the overall results and objectives of the project.

In financial terms, as 99% of the support will be used by the member state and in this respect the implementation of the programme can be considered very good.

4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY

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

Many projects complement investments made from other funds before. For example, the investments continued in line with previous investments from Schengen include renovation of the vessel KÕU (combining two sources finally led to a fully functional vessel), surveillance systems in Narva-Kuivajõe and Lämmijärve, SIS II.

Procurement of a helicopter, renovating cordon and building a hangar for it can be considered as a good example of funds complementing each other: the Schengen Facility supported the procurement of one helicopter while state funds allowed for procuring the second. Adding the latter to the ability to react with helicopters to different situations on the border, the system is now fulfilling the minimum needs required internationally.

- 4.5.2.** Please indicate, for the period 2007-2010, any complementary funding available in the area (besides national sources mentioned already at point 1.1.2.)

There are no other similar funds available in Estonia. From the structural funds, most of the activities are not eligible. Management information systems have received some funding from the SF.

* * *

**Overall list of outputs and results indicators
ANNEX 1**

Category	ANNEX 1																	
	OUTPUT								INDICATORS									
1. Means of transport	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded									Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised out of the total			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline ¹²	Overall at national level 2007-2010	After the intervention through the Fund			Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	3	163	167							48	300	21559	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a
1.1. Motorbikes	0	29 ¹³	29 ¹⁴							n/a	n/a	1519	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.2. Cars (including SUVs, vans, trucks, but excluding mobile surveillance units)	0	125	127							n/a	n/a	19679	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.3. Planes	0	0	0							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Helicopters	1	2	2							n/a ¹⁵	0 ¹⁶	73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Boats	2	7 ¹⁷	9							48 ¹⁸	300 ¹⁹	288 ²⁰	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2. Border surveillance systems	Number of systems acquired or upgraded			Number of stakeholders connected						Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)					
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010			
	3	1	4	n/a	n/a	n/a				25	764	789	n/a	n/a	n/a			
3. Operating equipment for	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded									% of equipment renewed out of the total			Average intervention time (time between the alert and			Length of the external borders covered (km)		

¹² 2000-2006 statistics on means of transport was gathered as overall kilometres. There is no separation of statistics on kilometres that were used only for patrols.

¹³ Includes snowmobiles and ATVs.

¹⁴ Includes snowmobiles and ATVs.

¹⁵ Patrols of helicopter acquired under EBF 2008, 2009 and 2010 annual programmes (multi-annual project) are included in the overall at national level 2007-2010 indicator, separately could not be brought out.

¹⁶ Patrols were carried out by planes.

¹⁷ Includes hovercraft.

¹⁸ Average number of patrols per year; one patrol lasts about 3-4 days.

¹⁹ Average number of patrols with all vessels per year.

²⁰ 288 is the number of patrols with ships, overall number of patrols of all vessels (boats, speedboats, ships) is 7095.

border surveillance										equipment			arrival on the spot)					
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	66	14	80							100 ²¹	20	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
4. Operating equipment for border checks	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded									% of Border Crossing Points covered with modernised equipment			Average time spent with the verification of a traveller's entry					
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010			
Total	0	409	792							n/a	95	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.1. ABC gates	0	0	0							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.2. Documents verification	0	359	738							n/a	100	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.3. Other	0	50	54							n/a	90	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
5. Border infrastructure	Number of Border Crossing Points developed or upgraded			Number of places in detention facilities at external borders			Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded			Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures			% of Border Crossing Points's modernised out of the total number of Border Crossing Points			Average waiting time for travellers at borders		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	0	1	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	20	25	24	244	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6. SIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS									% of successful connection tests			Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)			Number of institutional stakeholders involved		
	70,45% ²²									Look explanation ²³			YES	NO	NA	n/a		
													n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
7. VIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of VIS									Number of consulates connected to VIS			Number of border crossing points connected to VIS			Number of other stakeholders connected		
	0	0	0							24			n/a			n/a		
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded									Number of institutional stakeholders involved			Improvement in average time consultations/number					

²¹ 100% of the respective equipment renewed during projects.

²² Not taken into account EBF Community Actions.

²³ Connection test are carried out since 2011; projects related to SIS in Estonia were carried out under 2007 AP; therefore no % of successful connection tests on the asked period (Achieved through APs 2007-2010, Baseline, Overall at national level 2007-2010) can be brought out. Connection tests that have been carried out since 2011 have a 100% rate of success.

													of consultations (Yes/No)					
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	n/a					
Total	1	4	1							1	5	1						
8.1. API	0	0	0							n/a	n/a	n/a						
8.2. FADO	0	0	0							n/a	n/a	n/a						
8.3. Other (i.e. national systems)	1	4	1							1	5	1						
9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	Number of joint consular practices developed			Number of Member States with whom such practices were developed			Number of ILOs deployed			% of consular posts affected			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			% of visa applications affected		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
10. Consular infrastructure	Number of visa sections in consular posts new/renovated			Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality of the consular service (security doors, bulletproof windows)						Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			Reduction of incidents (Yes/No)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline				
	n/a	11	11	n/a	n/a	n/a				n/a	33307 ²⁴	235563	n/a	n/a		n/a		
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded			Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded						Average waiting time for visa issuing								
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline							
	n/a	288	151	n/a						n/a	8-9 days							

²⁴ Baseline 2001-2006

12. Training and risk analysis	Number of persons trained			Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of reports issued			Share of staff trained (compared to total)			Number of institutional collaborations on risk analysis developed		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010			Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	0	9896	16741	n/a	n/a	n/a				n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a
12.1. General	0	783	320	n/a	n/a	n/a				n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12.2. Specialised	0	9113	16421	n/a	n/a	n/a				n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
13. Info campaigns and promotion	Number of events organised			Number of attendants						Number of medias used								
	0			n/a						n/a								

Legend:

Baseline – situation before the beginning of the intervention (it should be calculated as an average of the 6 and a half years before the implementation of the programme; thus it would be a comparable reference with the duration of implementation for 2007-2010 programmes (1 January 2007- 30 June 2012).)

OVERALL MANAGEMENT OF THE ACTIONS IN THE APS 2007-2010

Legend	Questions:												
	1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?												
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
	Yes	No (please explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2007													
A1 Updating and upgrading the surveillance equipment at the Estonian external land border together with improving the infrastructure		One of the proposed expected results was not fulfilled. The funds allocated within the action were limited and the applicant had to choose the best approach to fulfill the scope of the action.	During the implementation there were slight reallocations of amounts between the projects within and between the actions.		x			x		x	x		
A2 Updating vessels communication and navigation systems	x			x	x			x		x	x		

A3 Procurement and renovation of border guard vessels	x		During the implementation there were slight reallocations of amounts between the projects within and between the actions.		x			x		x	x		
A4 Modification of Estonian SIS central system (E-SIS), SIRENE workflow system and if possible the related authorities' information systems in connection with the exchange of information within SIS II	x		During the implementation there were slight reallocations of amounts between the projects within and between the actions.		x			x		x	x		
A5 Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with SIS II and improving the existing queries	x			x	x			x		x	x		

A6 Supplementary developments of Border Guard Information System for linking it with Visa Information System (VIS)		No project proposals were submitted under this action, cancelled action is implemented as part of the project approved under Community Action 2008 – „Use of Visa Information System and Entry-Exit functionality – Pilot Project" (lead by the Finnish Border Guard).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x		
AP 2008													
A1 Elaboration of Border Guard Information System	x			x	x			x		x	x		
A2 Procuring a helicopter	x		The public contribution was increased due to the payment schedule of procurement contract.		x			x		x	x		
AP 2009													

A1 Procuring a helicopter	x			x	x			x		x	x		
A2 Elaboration of Border Guard Information System	x		The public contribution was increased due to the higher cost of procurement.		x			x	There was a slight change in the order of the implementation of certain activities compared to the initial plans, but this did not have impact on achieving the expected results.		x		
AP 2010													
A1 Procuring a helicopter	x			x	x			x		x	x		
A2 Elaboration of Border Guard Information System	x			x	x			x	There was a slight change in the schedule of procurement contracts, but this did not have impact on achieving the expected results.		x		
A3 The construction of a cordon and a helicopter hangar	x			x	x			x	There was a slight change in the schedule of the project and eligibility period of the project was extended in		x		

									accordance with annual programme maximum eligibility period (2,5 years), but this did not have impact on achieving the expected result finishing the building design.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

End of the report

