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 State[1])

CZECH REPUBLIC.

Date:

23rd January 2013

………………………
Zdeněk Král, Deputy Director of Dept. for Asylum and Migration Policy, Ministry of the Interior

On behalf of

Tomáš Haišman, Director of Dept. for Asylum and Migration Policy, Ministry of the Interior

Name of the contact person (and contact details) for this report in the Member State:
Michal Ďuriš, Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, Nad Štolou 936/3, 170 34, Prague 7
phone: 00420 974 832 259, e-mail: solidarita@mvcr.cz

---

[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?

NO

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

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

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

This report was evaluated by <u>Mr. Robert Solich</u>, who performs "Schengen evaluation" within the Ministry of the Interior.

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)
_____

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

CONTENTS

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?

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

Answer to these questions is based on available data and information concerning implementation, material describing in detail the projects financed under the EBF, reports on the implementation of projects and results of a questionnaire survey among organizations that implemented projects. All organizations that implemented projects were surveyed. Furthermore the information from the annually published Reports about the situation in the field of migration and integration of foreigners in the Czech Republic territory was used and information from AIS.

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 2007-2010 annual programmes? Do you envisage changes for the future?

Resources for national co-financing for the Fund are ensured by the Ministry of the Interior (for Police of the Czech Republic) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (as beneficiary) through the state budget. These resources are planned one year before the expected launch of the Annual Programme. Resources for private co-financing were not use. There is no reason for change in the future.

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:

(in thousands €UR)	Infrastructure and equipment	Staff	Other	Total
2007 total	10,8	99 811,4	37 682,0	137 504,2
2008 total	396,6	71 601,6	30 654,9	102 653,0
2009 total	209,6	70 095,6	30 021,5	100 326,8
2010 total	1 329,8	90 562,9	2 079,3	93 972,0
2011 total	2 211,8	16 458,4	1 132,6	19 802,8
2012 total (as planned)	128,1	14 325,4	2 637,9	17 091,4
2012 total for first half year	108,2	7 251,0	1 096,3	8 455,4

Visa Policy

Table n° 2:

(in thousands €UR)	Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections	Staff at visa sections and headquarters	Other	Total
2007 total	1 500,0	8 317,0	776,0	10 593,0
2008 total	1 640,0	8 742,0	860,0	11 242,0
2009 total	1 400,0	8 742,0	952,0	11 094,0
2010 total	2 000,0	8 652,8	952,0	11 604,8
2011 total	1 280,0	8 652,8	1 008,0	10 940,8
2012 total (as planned)	1 040,0	8 626,4	1 055,2	10 721,6
2012 total for first half year	400,0	4 313,0	527,6	5 240,6

IT Systems

Table n° 3:

(in thousands €UR)	VIS (total investments/all authorities)	SIS (total investments/all authorities)	Total
2007 total	3 648,6	4 474,1	8 122,7
2008 total	2 214,0	1 797,2	4 011,2
2009 total	2 673,2	1 288,8	3 962,0
2010 total	477,0	1 722,0	2 199,0
2011 total	2 200,5	884,3	3 084,8
2012 total (as planned)	4 259,1	913,0	5 172,2
2012 total for first half year	1 554,4	228,8	1 783,2

1.1.3. Do the above tables include all your expenditure in the field of borders, visa and IT systems? Yes.

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.

Border management: 0,11 %

Visa policy: 0,47 %

IT systems: 5,64 %

TOTAL: 0,41 %

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.

The situation in border and visa management changed significantly, as the Czech Republic joined the Schengen area in the beginning of the period concerned. Border control at internal land borders was lifted on 21 December 2007 and border checks at internal air borders were abolished as of 30 March 2008.

Consequently, number of border crossing points (BCPs) dropped from over 350 (incl. 200 BCPs for local border traffic and on tourists paths) to only 18 border crossing points at airborders and land border ceased to be surveilled. Most of border traffic became internal and thus not subject to border control.

Number of consulate posts decreased from 116 (in 2006) to 102 (in 2011).

Shortly before the entry into Schengen area, the Czech Republic started to operate the Schengen Information System (SIS 1) on 1 September 2007. Since 11 October, the Visa Information System (VIS) has been operational in the Czech Republic and its roll-out to specific regions follows the common timetable set up by the EU.

National system for collection of Advanced Passenger Information (API), system "Obzor", is in use since 2007. This system was significantly upgraded in 2012, since when it has been operating via the SITA network.

In December 2011 the Czech Republic started the pilot operation of the first automated border control gate (e-gate).

When describing the above, please provide the following data:

- Number of border crossing points under the Schengen Borders Code: 18 (6 public and 12 non-public airports)
- Number of consular posts in accordance with the Visa Code: 79
- Estimate(s) of number(s) of travellers crossing external borders annually (2007-2011): 6 million in average
- Numbers of visa applications annually (2007-2011): 599 186 in average
    - 708 834 in 2007
    - 647 970 in 2008
    - 490 010 in 2009
    - 560 026 in 2010
    - 589 092 in 2011
- List of the main services implementing border control and visa policy
    - Directorate of Alien Police Service (border control)
    - Ministry of Foreign Affairs (visa policy)
    - Ministry of Interior (asylum and migration policy, issuance of residence permits)

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION

2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE "AWARDING BODY" METHOD

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 Responsible Authority implements only national projects together with other national administrative bodies. This method was applied to all projects of the AP's 2007-2010 because due to the nature of the projects, it was not possible to find other implementers of projects "in the market". The implementers are competent with regard to their professional knowledge of issues concerned and with regard to specialisation. Thus, it is a case of a legal monopoly.

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

All projects were selected on the basis of "Call for expression of interest" or "Instruction for submission of project proposals". These calls/instructions followed-up the actions and requirements in the particular Annual Programme. Only one project was selected without above mentioned, called "Training of dispatched consular staff" within the Annual Programme 2007.

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° 8

Number of …	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Proposals received	13	11	12	7	42
Project selected	9	11	12	7	39
Projects funded	7	10	5	5	27
Out of which multiannual projects	0	0	0	0	0

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

All projects were selected after the calls/instructions. Only project "Training of dispatched consular staff" was selected without call. Some projects couldn't be implemented due the connection depending on purchase of IT sets within the Visa Information System. The final beneficiary informed the Responsible Authority about impossibility to implementing action "Creation of training consular module" and requested RA for a change in the Annual Programme. RA consulted this change with the contact person at the EC with a positive result. After that RA sent request to final beneficiary for a submission of a new project proposal, which was approved for implementation.

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

Table n° 9

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	1	0	0	0	1
Out of which multiannual	0	0	0	0	0

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)	7	10	5	5	27
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL Projects funded in the "executing body" method (including multi-annual)	8	10	5	5	28

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.

In the project proposal the potential beneficiary confirm the ensuring of resources for the co-financing. This is also referred in the grant agreement. Resources for co-financing are resources from state budget, because all beneficiaries are public bodies.

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	1 973 113,72 €	No	-
AP 2008	1 813 238,85 €	No	-
AP 2009	1 844 892,00 €	Yes	31,87
AP 2010	1 804 591,00 €	Yes	73,37

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

Annual programme 2007
- ☐ Financial change beyond 10%
- →Changes in the substance/nature of the actions
- ☐ New action(s) needed
- ☐ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration:
There we no major problems during the implementation of the projects, but one project could not be implemented for its relation to the procurement of VIS sets. The name of this project was "Creation of a consulate training centre". The related project "Creation of consulate training module" lost its usefulness and a change proposal was submitted.

The change in the above project was consulted with the contact person for the EC. A new project "Training of dispatched consular staff" was proposed, following the information provided. The contact person with the EC recommended this project for implementation. Despite the time constraints, the project was successfully implemented.

Annual programme 2009
- → Financial change beyond 10%
- ☐ Changes in the substance/nature of the actions
- → New action(s) needed
- ☐ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration:
One action (Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visa at Czech embassies) could not be implemented due the cancelling of the contract between final beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and its supplier. The final beneficiary renewed an old contract with another supplier. Costs could not be funded within the fund, because the EBF conditions are not fulfilled. This action calculated with more than 10 % of the EU total allocation for the Annual Programme. A new action (Implementation of the Visa Code into the national system of VIS) was added, but it was too late for its implementation.

Another action (Alteration of the Visa consular section) could not be implemented for planned consular section Kiev and Sana'a. Destinations were changed only for the Visa consular section in Baghdad. This action wasn't also implemented due the detention of purchased equipment in the port.

Finally, six of eleven actions were not implemented within the Annual Programme 2009.

Annual programme 2010
- ☐ Financial change beyond 10%
- ☐ Changes in the substance/nature of the actions
- ☐ New action(s) needed
- → All/part of the above
- ☐ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration:
Annual Programme 2010 included the follow-up action on "Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visa at Czech embassies" as also planned in Annual Programme 2009. This was the main reason for revision of the programme. Another action "Purchase of safes

for consular offices" was also canceled. A new action aimed to national system of VIS was added, called "Connecting to NS-VIS including related services". This action was successfully implemented.

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?

In case of Annual Programme 2009 the revision was not useful due the lack of time for implementation of projects. Final beneficiaries withdraw from the grant agreement concerned two projects with high EU contribution.

In case of Annual Programme 2010 the revision was very useful and successful. There is a real assumption for the first final payment for the Czech Republic from the EC.

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	168 000,00	1 695,58
2008	154 000,00	25 153,30
2009	159 000,00	69 834,60
2010	151 996,00	61 000,00*
Total 2007-2010	632 996,00	157 683,48*

*estimate

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	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 695,58	1 695,58
2008	17 517,96	0,00	0,00	5281,26	0,00	2 354,08	25 153,30
2009	53 867,89	0,00	0,00	10 371,50	2744,99	2 850,22	69 834,60
2010	58 000,00	1 317,14	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 682,86	61 000,00

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 was very useful but it was not enough consumed. Firstly the national budgetary rules were too complicated and secondly the staff ensured implementation of the fund was detached as late as in 2009. The largest volume of fund was spent for salaries. Relevant data for AP 2010 will be available in February 2013. The estimate is 61 thousand of Euros.

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.

Since July 2011 the Certifying Authority was relocated from "Financial Control Department" to another department called "Internal Audit and Inspection Department" within the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic. This change is formal of nature.

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?

Usually the Responsible Authority approved projects to implementation after the Commission Decision. All grant agreements were signed with the final beneficiaries after the Commission Decision approved particular Annual programme and after the Responsible Authority provided resources for projects implementation.

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	83,0	83,0	0	0	28,2	28,2	30,5	30,5	47,5	47,5	**33,8**	**33,8**
AP 2008	57,1	57,1	0	0	46,2	46,2	37,9	37,9	86,0	86,0	**51,1**	**51,1**
AP 2009	0	0	0	0	11,8	11,8	7,0	7,0	96,1	96,1	**15,3**	**15,5**
AP 2010	0	0	0	0	*50,8	*50,8	*87,5	*87,5	42,6	43,5	***82,2**	***82,2**
%	**59,0**	**59,0**	**0**	**0**	***34,0**	***34,0**	***41,7**	***41,7**	**69,4**	**69,5**	***45,2**	***45,2**

* - these implementation rates are not final

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
☐ Very good

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

Firstly, the implementation rates are around 45,2 % in average. Secondly, some projects (especially related to VIS) with high volume of resources were not implemented due to the problems with subcontractors or due to the lack of time for realization.

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

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

The main result was the reinforcement of border surveillance and improving the border control of the external borders at 5 international airports. There are no land borders and sea borders in the Czech Republic.

AP 2007:
Action 1: Camera systems
- Camera systems for the national airports (Brno, Pardubice)

AP 2008:
Action 1: Modernization and purchase of technical equipment to examine identification documents
- Technical equipment (videospectral comparator sets, sets for checking of documents affected, table polarising lamps, regula-devices, etc.) for international airports (Prague, Brno, Ostrava, Pardubice, Karlovy Vary)

Action 2: Modernization of a special vehicle with mobile thermovision for the surveillance of the airport perimeter
- Purchase of the mobile thermovision for the vehicle at the international airport Prague

Table n° 15

Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			**RESULTS**		
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**% of equipment renewed**		
	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	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile thermovision	1	0,72	1	100	0	100
Camera systems	2	n/a	2	40	n/a	40

Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			**RESULTS**		
4. Operating equipment for border checks	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**% of Border Crossing Points covered with modernised equipment**		
	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	150	n/a	150	100	n/a	100
Documents verification	134	n/a	134	100	n/a	100
Biometric fingerprint scanners*	16	n/a	16	100	n/a	100

Biometric fingerprint scanners under action 7, priority 4, Annual Programme 2009

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
Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2007 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Security at international airports".

AP 2008
Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2008 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Security at international airports".

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.

The projects and actions had partial impact on border management in the Czech Republic. They made it possible to introduce camera systems at 2 out of 5 international airports with regular operation, purchase new technical equipment for detection irregular documents at all 5 international airports and acquire a thermovision at the largest airport.

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

3.2.1. What were the results achieved through the projects implemented at the level of this priority, grouped by action?

The main result was improving the security at the embassies. This was achieved through purchasing of CCTV systems, bulletproof windows, security doors, security metal-detector frames, construction works, etc.).

AP 2007:
Action 2: "Alteration of consular section at the Bangkok embassy"
- Construction works and purchase of security equipment for the embassy in Bangkok

AP 2008:
Action 1: "Alteration of the consular section at the embassy in Pretoria"
- Construction works and purchase of security equipment for the embassy in Pretoria

Action 2: "Extension of camera systems in waiting rooms of consular offices"
- CCTV systems for consular offices at embassies in Abuja, Islamabad, Ottawa, Tel Aviv

Action 3: "Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices"
- Security metal detector frames for consular office at embassies in Moscow, Donetsk

AP 2009:
Action 2: "Extended camera surveillance in consulate waiting rooms "
- CCTV systems for consular offices at embassies in Havana and Riyadh

Action 3: "Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices"
- Security metal detector frame for consular office at embassy in Riyadh

AP 2010:
Action 1: "Reconstruction of the consular section Manila"
- Construction works and purchase of security equipment for the embassy in Manila

Action 2: "Extended camera surveillance in consulate waiting rooms"
- CCTV systems for consular offices at embassies in Buenos Aires, Delhi, Nicosia, Tunis

Table n° 16
(Please choose the outputs and results applicable, transfer to this page and complete the relevant categories listed in the table at the annex; where necessary add comments)

Common Core Indicators						
10. Consular infrastructure	**OUTPUT**			**RESULTS**		
	Number of visa sections in consular posts renovated			**Number of visa issued at new or renovated premises**		
	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	**15**	**n/a**	**70**	**901 168**	**n/a**	**n/a**

3.2.2. 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?

The above mentioned actions are in full compliance with the objectives set up in the multi-annual programme and with the actions set in the particular annual programme.

AP 2007
Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2007 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Development of the infrastructure of the consular offices". In total 5 actions were planned in the AP 2007, but only one action was finally implemented with the help of the fund. Other actions implemented the final beneficiary with own resources.

AP 2008
Achievements of the project are in fully compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2008 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Development of the infrastructure of the consular offices". In total 4 actions were planned in the AP 2008, but only three actions were finally implemented with the help of the fund. One action implemented the final beneficiary with own resources.

AP 2009
Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2009 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Development of the infrastructure of the consular offices". In total 5 actions were planned in the AP 2009, but finally two actions were implemented with the help of the fund. Other actions were implemented by the final beneficiary with own resources.

AP 2010
Achievements of the project are in fully compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2010 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Development of the infrastructure of the consular

offices". In total 5 actions were planned in the AP 2010, but finally two actions were implemented with the help of the fund. One action called "Purchase of safes for consular offices" was cancelled after the programme revision. Other two actions were implemented by the final beneficiary with own resources.

3.2.3. To what extent did the projects and the actions, through their results, contribute to improving visa issuing and preventing irregular entry into the EU? In answering, please refer to the outputs and results at section 3.2.1. above.

Implementation of these projects resulted in a significant increase of security level in selected areas of the diplomatic missions and in protection of consular staff during their working hours. Purchase of security equipment, camera systems and carrying out building modifications in the consular section at the respective diplomatic missions helped to improve the background for visa issuing.

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 this priority, grouped by action?

AP 2007
Action 8: "Construction of back-up centre for Alien Information System"
- Hard disc array, server infrastructure, database servers, SQL servers etc. for the back-up centre of the AIS

AP 2008
Action 7: "Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas at the embassy"
- Server, development and testing for the part of the NS-VIS allocated at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Action 8: "SIRENE operators meeting and heads of SIRENE conference"
- training in compliance with the priority of the presidency of the Czech Republic focused on a more effective utilization of the SIS

AP 2009
Action 7: "Biometric fingerprint scanner"
- 16 four-fingers biometric scanners for international airports (these scanners are primarily for border checks, secondarily for visa issuing – see table n° 15)

AP 2010
Action 1: "Transfer of passengers details by air carriers of Police of the Czech Republic"
- Connectivity to SITA data network, application software and configuration setting for individual air carriers, two workstations, two application servers, two database servers, SQL server, etc.

Action 6: "Connecting to CS-VIS including related services"

- Implementation of Visa Code for NS-VIS into the Alien Information System, Implementation of Visa Code for connection to CS-VIS, implementation of technical copy database SISone4ALL for NS-VIS.

Action 7: "Transfer of passengers details by air carriers of Police of the Czech Republic"
- Connectivity to SITA data network, replace of manual data processing by automated data processing, servers and software

Table n° 17
(Please choose the outputs and results applicable, transfer to this page and complete the relevant categories listed in the table at the annex, where necessary add comments)

Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
7. VIS (developments of the national system to comply with the CVIS)	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of CVIS			Number of border crossing points connected to CVIS		
	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	9,74	0	100	5	0	5

Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded			Number of institutional stakeholders involved		
	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	n/a	2	28	n/a	28
API – SITA	1	n/a	1	28	n/a	28
AIS – back-up	1	n/a	1	1	n/a	1

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
Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2007 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Launching of IT systems at international airports". The back-up centre ensures continuous update of data resources on a 24/7/365 basis so that it is permanently ready to substitute for the operational central systems in case they are unavailable.

AP 2008
Achievements of the projects are in full compliance with the initially set objectives in AP 2008 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Launching of the IT systems for consular offices" (for the project FVH 2008-07) and under strategy objective "Exchange of know-how of the SIRENE operators". The server, development and testing of NS-VIS fulfilled a part of requirements set up in the AP 2008. NS-VIS (part of MFA) ensures communication between the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic and the diplomatic missions of the Czech Republic, which consists in exchanging individual batches containing data of the visa applicants, collected at diplomatic missions of the Czech Republic worldwide. SIRENE meeting and conference increased the awareness of the participants on functionalities of SIS II and enhanced methods of police cooperation.

AP 2009

Achievements of the project are in full compliance with the initially set up objectives in AP 2009 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Launching of the IT systems at national airports". In total 16 biometric four fingers print scanners are used at 5 international airports to ensure the effective data search in real time at the border crossing points.

AP 2010
Achievements of the projects are in full compliance with the initially objectives set up in AP 2010 and also in the MAP under strategy objective "Launching of IT systems at international airports". Development of the VIS is one of the main priorities of the EU. Connectivity to SITA provides fully automated processing of passenger data. This improved border checks and fight against illegal migration.

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.

The projects and actions could have a significant impact on the development of the IT systems, but unfortunately some projects with high volume of the fund resources were not finally implemented. The successful projects enabled the VIS and SITA development in the Czech Republic.

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

3.4.1. What were the results achieved through the projects implemented at the level of this priority, grouped by action?

The main result related to projects implemented by the Police College in Holešov was improvement of training/study conditions. Projects implemented by the Consular policy and methodology department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic were aimed on improvement of training consular agenda.

AP 2007
Action 10: "Training of dispatched consular staff"
  - Consular training related to visa issues"

Action 11: "Construction of special training area for clearance on the external Schengen border – international airport terminal with facilities"
  - Training area for students of the Alien Police Service

Action 12: "Construction of classrooms to teach SIS and VIS"
  - Purchase of equipment for teaching SIS and VIS

Action 13: "Modernization of language classrooms"
  - Purchase of equipment and modernization of three language classrooms

AP 2008
Action 9 "Providing for education of the Alien Police Service through modern didactic techniques"
  - Purchase of equipment for education

Action 10 "Constructing class-rooms for educational training on SIS and VIS"

- Purchase of equipment for education

Action 11 "Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff on travel documents by laboratory technical means"
- Purchase of equipment for education

AP 2009
Action 9: "Finalization of the creation of the training consular module and training consular workplace"

Action 10: "Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff on travel documents by laboratory technical means"
- Purchase of equipment for special classroom (videospectral comaparator, microscopes, PC, didactic equipment)

AP 2010
Action 8: "Realisation and next development of the training consular module and training consular workplace"
- Pre-departures training courses and ongoing training for consular staff

Table n° 18
(Please choose the outputs and results applicable, transfer to this page and complete the relevant categories listed in the table at the annex, where necessary add comments)
Project 2007-01 (Action 11)

Common Core Indicators						
	OUTPUT			**RESULTS**		
12. Training and risk analysis	**Number of persons trained**			**Number of reports issued**		
	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	**2820**	**n/a**	**2820**	**16**	**n/a**	**16**
APS – general training	**1498**	**n/a**	**1498**	**4**	**n/a**	**4**
APS – language training	**343**	**n/a**	**343**	**1**	**n/a**	**1**
APS – VIS and SIS training	**654**	**n/a**	**654**	**2**	**n/a**	**2**
Consular training	**325**	**n/a**	**606**	**9**	**n/a**	**9**

3.4.2. 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)

Almost of actions were set up in the multi-annual programme and annual programme including action no. 10 (AP 2007), which was additionally added.

Projects implemented by the Police College in Holešov are in compliance with strategy objective "Setting and carrying out a training programme for officers of the Czech Police carrying out border control activities". These projects made it possible improve the training infrastructure of the immigration police specialisation. Projects implemented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are in compliance with strategy objective "Setting up and carrying out a training programme for consular

staff handling visa applications from third-country nationals". These projects made it possible to improve the quality of the system for training of consular workers.

3.4.3. To what extent did the projects and the actions, through their results, contribute to improving the application of the EU standards in the field of external borders and visas in your country and supporting overall strategy development by your administration in this area, including risk assessment? In answering, please refer to the outputs and results at section 3.4.1. above.

Implementation of the above mentioned action contributed significantly to fulfil objectives set up in the multi-annual programme. Projects implemented by the Consular policy and methodology department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are at high level of efficiency in the field of consular training. Also projects implemented by Police College in Holešov contributed to development in the field of teaching issues related to foreign police.

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.

Table n° 19: Overall 2007-2010 EBF results following aggregation by priorities
(Please transfer to this page and complete all indicators listed in the table at the annex by aggregating the results listed by priority). Please see example above.
Priority 1:

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**% of equipment renewed**		
	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**	**n/a**	**3**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Mobile thermovision	**1**	**0,72**	**1**	**100**	**0**	**100**
Camera systems	**2**	**n/a**	**2**	**40**	**n/a**	**40**
	OUTPUT			**RESULTS**		
4. Operating equipment for border checks	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**% of Border Crossing Points covered with modernised equipment**		
	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	**150**	**n/a**	**150**	**100**	**n/a**	**100**
Documents verification	**134**	**n/a**	**134**	**100**	**n/a**	**100**
Biometric fingerprint scanners	**16**	**n/a**	**16**	**100**	**n/a**	**100**

Priority 3:

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
10. Consular infrastructure	**Number of visa sections in consular posts renovated**			**Number of visa issued at new or renovated premises**		
	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	**15**	**n/a**	**70**	**901 168**	**n/a**	**not known**

Priority 4:

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
7. VIS (developments of the national system to comply with the CVIS)	**% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of CVIS**			**Number of border crossing points connected to CVIS**		
	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	**9,74**	**0**	**100**	**5**	**0**	**5**
	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
8. Other ICT systems	**Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded**			**Number of institutional stakeholders involved**		
	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**	**n/a**	**2**	**28**	**n/a**	**28**
API – SITA	**1**	**n/a**	**1**	**28**	**n/a**	**28**
AIS – back-up	**1**	**n/a**	**1**	**1**	**n/a**	**1**

Priority 5:

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
12. Training and risk analysis	**Number of persons trained**			**Number of reports issued**		
	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	**2820**	**n/a**	**2820**	**16**	**n/a**	**16**
APS – general training	**1498**	**n/a**	**1498**	**4**	**n/a**	**4**
APS – language training	**343**	**n/a**	**343**	**1**	**n/a**	**1**
APS – VIS and SIS training	**654**	**n/a**	**654**	**2**	**n/a**	**2**
Consular training	**325**	**n/a**	**606**	**9**	**n/a**	**9**

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° 19) **in relation to your initially set expectations as stated in the annual programmes.**

In the course of compiling the APs, the *outcomes* (numbers of equipment etc.) were often mistakenly included into (or instead of) the expected *results*. Therefore it is very difficult to assess whether the expected state or level was achieved.

Within the priority No 1, the required results were achieved by purchasing devices for verification of identity, camera systems and mobile thermovision. The level of border surveillance at external (air) border, mainly at airports in Prague, Brno and Pardubice, was thus improved.

Within the priority No 3, the results were achieved only in part, as the realization of some projects was partial or the projects were cancelled by the final beneficiary. In these cases the beneficiary financed the equipment from its own assets outside the Fund. Generally it can be stated, that the level of securing the consular sections of Czech consular posts in third countries is being gradually improved.

Within the priority No 4, the results are completed only partially, again from the reason of partial realization of the projects or their cancellation. This relates mainly to projects focused at the Visa Information System. On the contrary, upgrade and full automatization of the system for transferring API data can be seen as a success.

Within the priority No 5, trainings aimed at consular (visa) issues and training for Alien Police took place. With regard to the reorganization of Alien Police during the realization of the AP 2007 and 2008, in some cases the planned number of trained staff was not achieved. Significant improvement was reached in case of consular training.

3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES

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

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

AP 2007:

The project FVH 2007-01 "Construction of a special training area for clearance on the external Schengen border – international airport terminal" can be considered as successful within the AP 2007. It provides very authentic simulation of an airport area for training purposes of the Alien Police Service.

AP 2008:

Out of ten successfully implemented projects covered by AP 2008, the project FVH 2008-05 "Modernization and purchase of technical equipment to examine identification documents" can be highlighted. The project helped to acquire modern equipment for detection of falsified/fraudulent documents for all international airports operating regular flights.

AP 2009:

It is very difficult to choose one successful project related to AP 2009, because only 5 projects out of 12 planned were implemented. Moreover ineligible expenditure occurred in 3 out of these 5 projects. However, the project FVH 2009-03 "Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff on travel documents by laboratory technical means" implemented by the Police College in Holešov can be consider both successful and effective. Successful implementation was confirmed by Supreme Audit Office of the Czech Republic.

AP 2010:

Two projects out of five finally implemented can be considered as successful. The first project is FVH 2010-01 "Transfer of passenger's data by air carriers to the Police of the Czech Republic" implemented by the Alien Police Service. The new system is available for five international airports and for the Directorate of the Alien Police Service. This system performs consultation/verification

of passengers and their documents. The second one is project FVH 2010-02 "Implementation and further development of the consular training module and consular training centre". The Czech system of consular training was evaluated as one of the best during the Hungarian presidency in the first half of the year 2011.

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

Please describe a few best practices you consider you have acquired through implementation of the External Borders Fund in terms of tools for administrative management and cooperation at national level or with other Member States.

There is only one example of best practice acquired through implementation of the EBF. The cooperation between the Responsible Authority and final beneficiaries is at high level. The particular Annual Programme is based on needs and requirements of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, the Police of the Czech Republic and the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. The Responsible Authority always found optimal solution and compromise in distribution of resources for potential beneficiaries.

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

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

Some projects were not implemented, however grant agreements were signed. These projects, 10 in total, can be considered as "unsuccessful projects". Some other projects were implemented partly or with difficulties. From these the following projects have been selected as "less successful":

- Project FVH 2008-07 "Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas at the embassy". After cancellation of the subcontract only 33 % of the allocated funds covered the expenditure related to project.

- Project FVH 2009-01 "Biometric fingerprint scanner". Half of the expenditure was subsequently found as ineligible for financing from the fund as the purchased equipment has not been used.

- Project FVH 2008-05 "Modernization and purchase of technical equipment to examine identification documents". All required equipment was purchased, but only 57 % of the funds allocated to the project were spent. The project budget was overrated.

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.

Some questionable issues appeared during the implementation of the fund, specifically:

- Very short time for the project implementation of the AP 2007 and 2008 (projects implemented in 2009)
- It was not clear, whether projects implemented in 2007 and 2008 were eligible for funding in 2009
- Difference between "awarding" and "executing" body method was not clear

- The form of agreement between the Responsible Authority and beneficiaries was not clear at the national level (grant agreement, memorandum of understanding or another legal act)
- Approval procedure of grant agreement was too long and beneficiaries received the fund resources in the end of the year 2009
- In total 10 projects were not implemented, however grant agreements were signed
- Two project in the AP 2009 with high volume of fund resources were cancelled due to lack of time
- In 2010 the Responsible Authority managed five annual programmes (2007-2011)
- Relationship and responsibilities among the Responsible Authority, Audit Authority and Certifying Authority were not clear in the beginning of the fund implementation

Some of these issues were settled, e.g.:
- There is only one form of grant agreement at national level
- Time between signing of grant agreement and transferring of resources to final beneficiary was shortened
- Tasks and responsibilities among all authorities were clarified
- All issues between "awarding" and "executing" body method are clear

With regard to low consumption of the fund and high number of unsuccessful projects, there is no good practise for the future development in recommendation.

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

Not applicable.

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

4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS

4.01. **Please present a short overview on the trends in migration flows to your country during the period 2006 to end 2011 and analyse them in light of the developments influencing them (legislative, policy, etc.).**

Please start from the background provided in the multi-annual programme, outlining any changes that appeared during the reporting period. When doing so, please refer to relevant data / statistics concerning passenger flows, irregular attempts for entry, visa applications and visas issued for the years 2006, 2009, 2011. (These reference years are considered relevant milestones as they represent the start, mid-term and (almost at the) end of the intervention period analysed).

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006*	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	271 600 000	10 791 975	6 179 861
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	3 000	379	359
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally	2 768	190	80
Visa applications made	663 655	489 752	590 813
Visas issued	620 937	455 977	567 443

*In 2006 the Czech Republic was not a member of the Schengen Area

From the perspective of the Czech Republic was the entry into the Schengen Area on 21 December 2007 a milestone in the development and monitoring of migration flows. Participation of the Czech Republic in the Schengen cooperation, among other things, brought fundamental changes in the options of border controls and statistical reporting of illegal migration indicators. As is evident from the figures in the table, monitored illegal migration has declined significantly after the entry into the Schengen Area. Nevertheless it can not be assumed from this fact that factual decline of illegal migration was also that significant (the decline of the number of detected cases of illegal migration is due to the smaller number of measurable phenomenon connected to the abolition of internal border controls), on the contrary in the field of illegal migration have began to occur to a greater extent new risks. After the entry into the Schengen Area the illegal migration has become more clandestine and more connected with other criminal activities – organized crime, human trafficking, etc. The latent illegal migration and a greater occurrence of cases of the abuse of the legal migration system (eg fictitious marriages, fake study or business) have become a new trend.

The year 2009 have become a significant turning point in the development of legal (primarily economically motivated) migration. Whereas until the end of 2008, the Czech Republic registered a high annual growth rate of migration (from 2006 to 2008 the Czech Republic was one of the countries with the highest annual percentage increase of newcomers in the EU), in 2009 the situation changed. Migration flows into the Czech Republic were affected by the economic crisis and its impact on the situation in the labor market. In 2009 the number of newcomers has decreased and stagnation especially in the area of labor migration has persisted in the years 2010 and 2011. This trend is evident from the data listed in the table referring to the number of visa applications and the number of issued visas - in 2009 can be seen a relatively significant decrease in both of these categories compared with 2006 and despite a slight increase in 2011 the level of number of visa applications and issued visas in 2006 was not reached.

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.

There is no visible direct connection between the intervention through the Fund and changes in migration trends.

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?

Projects in question rather reflected the need to implement EU legislation, establish/upgrade EU information systems, promote security of consular posts and support general instruments in the area of combating illegal migration (training, anti-fraud equipment). The projects did not address specific migration challenges.

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 most tangible projects related to border checks and border surveillance were the purchase of equipment for document checks (FVH 2008-05) and modernisation of a car with thermovision for the Prague Airport (2008-06).

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?

The most tangible project related to activities in support to visa issuing was the capturing of biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas (FVH 2008-07). Projects related to improving security at embassies contributed in this area indirectly.

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 support of the Fund to VIS has been of great importance. It made it possible to implement VIS and SIS II within the time limits set up at the EU level.

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

Given the geographical position of the Czech Republic, which does not have any land and sea borders, border security issues do not seem to be a topical issue in the society. In addition, the projects co-financed by the Fund support rather background activities which are not on display for the public (information systems, security infrastructure at consular posts, training acitivities). The impact of the projects on public opinion is thus very limited.

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?

Projects co-financed by the Fund have complementary role to national projects. They allow to upgrade and promote IT systems, trainings, security of CPs to the level which could not be achieved without this support.

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.

The only projects which are directly connected with detection of irregular crossings and apprehension of irregularly entering third country citizens are the purchase of equipment for document checks (2008-05) and modernisation of a car with thermovision for at the Prague Airport (2008-06). However, the outputs of these projects can not be quantified.

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?

None, for the time being.

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.

Projects implemented by Ministry of Foreign Affairs were aimed only at consular training and purchase of equipment for consular offices. Consular co-operation wasn't supported from the Fund.

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).

Project No 2010-01 made it possible to upgrade the transfer of Advanced Passenger Information (API) in modern, effective and user-friendly way directly via the SITA network. Other projects helped to develop and finalize and VIS.

Regarding ABC gates, these are being developed and installed within a national project (without EBF funding). As for the Register Traveller Programme, the Czech Republic will take part in the new EU initiative (Smart borders) which is being prepared at the EU level; no steps at national level were taken in this regard.

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?

Priority is given to projects aimed to implementation of the EU legislation requirements (regulations, directives). In case of no possibility of EU funding, the projects are funded from the national budget.

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)

Visa

☐ 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)

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 API data transferring system was significantly upgraded with the contribution of the fund (FVH 2010-01). Originally, the system was manually operated (date insertion, search) after the upgrade it is fully automated. The purchase of thermovision (FVH 2008-06) improved security of the perimeter of the Prague Airport even during reduced visibility periods and at nights. All airports were equipped with devices for detection of false/fraudulent travel documents (FVH 2008-05).

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.

Consular offices in Pretoria (South Africa), in Bangkok (Thailand) and in Manila (Philippines) were equipped significantly with the EU contribution. Other consular offices were equipped with consular windows, CCTV systems and metal detector frames as needed.

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.

No other effects.

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 (Police of the Czech Republic, Ministry of foreign Affairs of the Czech republic) 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

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.

To limited extent. There is no direct link between management of passenger flows and the projects, however, as a side effect the management of flows was partially improved due to implementation of projects No FVH 2009-01 and 2010-01.

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.

Projects financed with the support of the EBF did not change the overall development of national border management system or strategies. However, it helped to strengthen and upgrade certain features of the existing system and strategies (information systems, security at consular posts, trainings).

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?

Programme's objectives are in full compliance with requirements stated in the field of borders management.

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?

Most of strategy objectives of the multiannual programme were gradually fulfilled.

Priority No 1: planned actions were implemented by projects FVH 2007-04, FVH 2008-05 and FVH 2008-06.

Priority No 3: planned actions were partially implemented by projects FVH 2007-10, FVH 2008-08, FVH 2008-10, FVH 2008-11, FVH 2009-06, FVH 2009-08, FVH 2010-05 and FVH 2010-06.

Priority No 4: planned actions were implemented by projects FVH 2007-05, FVH 2009-01 and FVH 2010-01.

Priority No 5: planned actions were implemented by projects FVH 2007-01, FVH 2007-02, FVH 2007-03, FVH 2007-07, FVH 2008-01, FVH 2008-02, FVH 2008-03, FVH 2009-03, FVH 2009-10 and FVH 2010-02.

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 (€ estimate)	National contribution in-kind (offices, IT tools) – (€ estimate)	Total (€)
2007	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
2008	1 695,58	0,00	0,00	1695,58
2009	25 153,30	12 800,00	0,00	37 953,30
2010	69 834,60	12 800,00	0,00	82 634,60
2011	61 000,00*	12 800,00	0,00	73 800,00*
First six month 2012	30 500,00*	6 400,00*	0,00	36 900,00*

* - estimate

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	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
2008	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
2009	12 800,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	12 800,00
2010	12 800,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	12 800,00
2011	12 800,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	12 800,00
First six month 2012	6 400,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	6 400,00

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

Overall efficiency can be considered satisfactory. High percentage of cancelled or partially realized projects remains a problem, as well as the fact that within AP 2007-2009 the Czech Republic did not fulfil conditions for receiving the final payment. On the contrary, the Czech Republic returned resources provided within the first pre-financing payment. It means that utilization of the fund resources from these APs reaches less than 50 %. In case of AP 2010 it is presumed that the Responsible body will apply for the final payment for the first time. The projects made it possible to implement significant part of actions proposed in the multi-annual programme.

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.
No issues with the complementarity and/or synergies appeared.

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.)
No other complementarity funding in the period 2007-2010.

* * *

Overall list of outputs and results indicators ANNEX 1																		
Category	**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)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	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	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a
1.1. Motorbikes	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.2. Cars (including SUVs, vans, trucks, but excluding mobile surveillance units)	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
1.3. Planes	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Helicopters	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1.4. Boats	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a	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			
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				n/a	n/a	n/a	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)		
	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
	3	n/a	3							n/a	n/a	n/a	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			

	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		
Total	150	n/a	150							100	n/a	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.1. ABC gates	n/a	n/a	n/a										n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.2. Documents verification	134	n/a	134							100	n/a	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
4.3. Other	16	n/a	16							100	n/a	100	n/a	n/a	n/a			
5. Border infrastructure	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
	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	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		
													YES	NO	NA			
	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		
	10,78	0	100							14			5			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 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	yes					
Total	2	n/a	2							28	n/a	28						
8.1. API – SITA	1	n/a	1							28	n/a	28						
8.2. FADO	n/a	n/a	n/a							n/a	n/a	n/a						
8.3.Other (i.e. national systems)	1	1	1							1	1	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

							2010											
	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	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	
15	n/a	70	27	n/a	not known				901 168	n/a	not known	3,93	n/a	yes

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	n/a	n/a	n/a						n/a	n/a				

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 2820	n/a	2820	n/a	n/a	n/a				16	n/a	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12.1. General 1498	n/a	1498	n/a	n/a	n/a				4	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
343	n/a	343	n/a	n/a	n/a				1	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
654	n/a	654	n/a	n/a	n/a				2	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12.2. Specialised 325	n/a	606	n/a	n/a	n/a				9	n/a	9	0,25	n/a	n/a	n/a

13. Info campaigns and promotion

Number of events organised		Number of attendants					Number of medias used				
n/a		n/a					n/a				

Annex 2

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 (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2007													
A1 Camera systems	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A2 Alteration to the consular section at the embassy in Bangkok	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A8 Creation of a back-up centre of the Aliens Information System	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A10 Training of dispatched consular staff	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A11 Building of a special training ground for clearing passengers at the external Schengen border – the terminal of an international airport with accessories	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A12 Building of classrooms for education on SIS and VIS	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A13 Modernisation of language classrooms	X			X	X			X		X	X		

| 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 (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2008													
A1 Modernization and purchase of technical equipment to examine identification documents	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A2 Modernization of a special vehicle with mobile thermovision for the surveillance of airport perimeter	X		X[1]		X			X		X	X		
A3 Alteration of the consular section at the embassy in Pretoria	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A4 Extension of camera systems in waiting rooms of consular offices	X			X	X[2]			X		X	X		
A5 Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices	X			X		X[3]		X	X[6]		X		
A6 Replacement of consulate windows		X		X		X[4]		X	X[7]		X		
A7 Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas at the embassy	X			X		X[5]		X	X[8]		X		
A8 Workshop concerning training and exchange of SIRENE operators – support for the introduction of SIS II	X			X	X			X		X	X		

Activity													
A9 Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff by modern didactic means	X		X^1		X			X		X	X		
A10 Constructing auditoriums for educational training on SIS and VIS	X		X^1		X			X		X	X		
A11 Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff on travel documents by laboratory technical means	X			X	X			X		X	X		

X^1 - changes in exchanger rate CZK/€UR
X^2 - only 4 out of 5 initially planed consular offices were equipped with the CCTV system.
X^3 - only 2 out of 8 initially planed consular offices were equipped with the security metal detector frame.
X^4 - no consular office out of 5 initially consular offices was equipped with the consular window.
X^5 - some instruments (almost PC stations) were not purchased.
X^6 - lack of time for implementation.
X^7 - failure to conditions for funding.
X^8 - contract withdrawal with supplier.

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 (pls explain)	Yes (why?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2009 (after revision)													
A1 Reconstruction of the consular section		X[1]		X[1]		X[1]	X[1]		X[1]			X	
A2 Extended camera surveillance in consulate waiting rooms	X			X		X[2]		X	X[2]		X		
A3 Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices	X			X		X[2]		X	X[2]		X		
A4 Replacement of consulate windows		X[1]		X[1]		X[1]	X[1]		X[1]		X		
A5 Purchase of safes for the Consular Department		X[1]		X[1]		X[1]	X[1]		X[1]		X		
A6 Implementation of VISA code into NS-VIS		X[3]	X[3]			X[3]	X[3]		X[3]				X
A7 Biometric fingerprint scanner	X			X	X			X	X[4]		X		
A8 Increasing IT security at airports´ terminals		X[5]		X[5]		X[5]	X[5]		X[5]		X		
A9 Finalization for the creation of the training consular module and training consular workplace	X			X	X			X			X	X	
A10 Providing for an education process of the Alien Police Service staff on travel documents by laboratory technical means	X		X[6]		X			X			X	X	
A11 Training of the liaison officers		X[7]		X[7]		X[7]		X[7]	X[7]			X	

X[1] - final beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) withdrawal the grant agreement

X[2] – some consular posts were not equipped

X3 – final beneficiary (Police of the Czech Republic) withdrawal the grant agreement due to the lack of time for project implementation
X4 – some equipment was additionally ineligible for funding
X5 – final beneficiary (Police of the Czech Republic) withdrawal the grant agreement
X6 – due to the exchange rate between CZK and EUR
X7 – potential beneficiary (Police College in Holešov) did not submit the project proposal

Legend	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
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?													
	Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2010 (after revision)													
A1 Reconstruction of the consular section Manila	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A2 Extended camera surveillance in consulate waiting rooms	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A3 Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices		X[1]		X		X[1]	X[1]		X[1]		X		
A4 Replacement of consulate windows		X[1]		X		X[1]	X[1]		X[1]		X		
A5 Connecting to CS-VIS including related services	X			X	X			X		X			X
A6 Transfer of passenger details by air carriers of Police of the Czech Republic	X			X	X			X		X	X		
A7 Realization and next development of the training consular module and training consular workplace	X			X	X			X		X	X		

X[1] - final beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) withdrawal the grant agreement