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

**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 State[1])

AUSTRIA

Date:

……………………………

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

………………………………………………………………
Mag. Beate-Mathilde Wolf

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

Mag. Alexander Teutsch, Federal Ministry of the Interior, unit II/3/d, alexander.teutsch@bmi.gv.at

<table>
<tr><td>

<u>Important remark</u>

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.

</td></tr>
</table>

---

[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~~/ **<u>No</u>**

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

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

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

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)
_____

<u>Important remark</u>
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

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?

Objectives and indicators are set out in the annual programmes and in the contracts with executing bodies. In any progress reports, during discussions and when their final report is presented, executing bodies report on the achievement of the defined objectives.

The Responsible Authority is in contact with the executing bodies and should be kept informed of the implementation of projects. In addition, visits are made to project sites to check on the substantive implementation, organisation and funding of projects.

As a result of close cooperation with the executing bodies, any problems during the implementation of projects can be identified at an early stage. The Responsible Authority is thus in a position to react to any changes as quickly as possible. This can be seen, for instance, in the regular revision of annual programmes. As a result, a high level of utilisation of the EU funds allocated can always be achieved.

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

As part of the evaluation process, the relevant specialist departments and executing bodies were contacted directly and asked to forward any additional data that were required for evaluation purposes.

The Responsible Authority had to find a compromise here between acquisition of the most complete and extensive data and minimised use of resources.

In actual fact, during the implementation of the Fund in previous years, an increasing reluctance could already be identified when it came to the submission of projects. It emerged that the considerable administrative workload involved in implementing a project often overshadowed the added value of the EU funding. Potential executing bodies were therefore deterred from submitting projects by the requirements laid down. Individual executing bodies explicitly stated on this subject that they would no longer be interested in submitting projects in the future.

In view of this sceptical attitude towards the Fund, the Responsible Authority was keen not to place any disproportionate additional burden on executing bodies with the present collection of data for evaluation purposes, so as not to demotivate the executing bodies further. Special care was therefore taken when collecting data to avoid unduly costly and time-consuming administrative operations, particularly where it was evident that not even such input would help to obtain comprehensive answers to specific questions.

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?

Projects supported from the External Borders Fund only receive national co-financing through the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs (BMeiA) or the Federal Ministry of the Interior (BM.I).

Therefore, only federal resources are used for national co-financing. There is no provision for private co-financing under the External Borders Fund.

The federal budget is planned in such a way that annual federal estimates are produced for the next calendar year or the next two calendar years, indicating the amounts of budgetary resources that will be available for each area of activity. When the federal estimates are drawn up, projects that are eligible for support from the External Borders Fund are to be prioritised as far as possible.

Planned projects within the scope of the Fund are subsequently incorporated into the relevant annual programme, and the content of the annual programme is approved by the Federal Minister. Incorporation in the annual programme also serves to secure national co-financing.

From a budgetary point of view, a commitment is made for projects that are approved and are to be implemented to ensure that this money cannot be spent on anything else.

With effect from the 2013 calendar year, a new budgetary structure, known as the global budget, enters into force for the Austrian federal ministries. Whereas a system of cash-based phased budgeting is currently in use, Austria will switch to double-entry budgeting in 2013. This, however, is unlikely to make any fundamental change to national planning, although the practical effects of the switch are unforeseeable at the present time.

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 & Visa Policy

This question cannot be answered for the areas of external border management and visa policy as the figures requested are not available in this form, nor can they be calculated.

This is primarily due to the fact that there is no central unit that is responsible for the tasks in question; instead, these tasks are carried out by various organisational units. Data that is collected by the various organisational units according to the aspects that are relevant for them cannot, however, then be broken down in this form afterwards.

Furthermore, staff costs cannot be indicated for these two areas as a general rule. This is because firstly there is no basis on which they can be calculated, i.e. the number of staff or working hours devoted to the various tasks cannot be calculated or even roughly estimated. Even if the number of 'staff units' were known, it would be impossible to indicate expenditure, because data-protection rules prohibit the central pay office from releasing details of individual staff remuneration.

Another point in the area of external border management is that the border police tasks in Austria are performed by the Federal Police (i.e. there is no separate 'border police force'). There is no budgetary breakdown for the tasks performed by the Federal Police. It is therefore not possible to make any statements about which financial resources were used for external border management.

A breakdown of budget items as stipulated in this section is therefore not possible; the tables cannot be completed accordingly.

IT Systems

National investments for IT Systems excluding EBF national co-financing cannot be indicated. The reasons for this are laid down under 1.1.3.

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?

With regard to the areas of external border management and visa policy, reference is made to the comments under 1.1.2.

As regards the area of IT systems, it should be noted that there is no central unit in Austria that monitors all the expenditure relating to the development of SIS II (or VIS). Nor are there any separate financial items to which payments can be assigned in this connection. Each specialist department spends the money in question as part of its general administrative tasks. There are therefore no records of the total funds expended.

In the electronic record system ELAK, it is possible to find a specific record by searching for keywords. A search for SIS (and one for VIS) in the system returned a large number of hits. However, a problem emerged here, namely that there are no guidelines about which keywords the name of a record should contain. Records can be created under any keyword, for instance specifying the name of a company that was tasked with providing a service, an organizational unit for which the service was provided, or, they may also simply be created in a general form specifying the service provided. The specialist department is responsible for choosing the name, and does so according to its own needs. It is therefore not possible afterwards to identify all the relevant records if the requirement in this respect was not already known at an early stage or taken into account when the record was named.

It should also be borne in mind that while it may now be possible to find an indeterminate part of the relevant record through time-consuming research, the content of the record in question and the size of any payment transactions recorded therein is not yet known. This then necessitates a comprehensive analysis of the record that was found.

In view of the fact that, even with the greatest of efforts, it is not possible to provide meaningful figures, this high level of administrative effort involved appears disproportionate and not in the spirit of efficient and resource-saving administration.

The costs specified in connection with SIS and VIS therefore only relate to costs that were incurred as part of projects funded through the External Borders Fund.

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.

As it is not possible, as specified under 1.1.3, to determine the total costs for any of the three areas, it is not possible to provide a realistic estimate of the contribution from the External Borders Fund either.

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.

-   External border management

As part of a reform, with effect from 1 September 2012 the 9 Provincial Police Commands, 9 Security Directorates and 14 Federal Police Directorates have been merged to create 9 Provincial Police Directorates. As a result, only one police authority is now responsible for each province. Following the start of operations at the new airport terminal (*Check-In 3*) at Vienna Schwechat Airport, the organisation of the airport police (Schwechat Municipal Police Command) was changed on 1 February 2012. As part of the reform, a Border Control Unit was set up to carry out border police work. The unit is divided into three specialist departments: Border Police Measures and Countermeasures, Special Border Service Tasks and Border Control Criminal Services. As a result of the organisational change, 70 additional police officers are now available for border police work.

-   Number of border crossing points under the Schengen Borders Code

In 2007, Austria had an external Schengen border with a total length of 1 348 km. Following the accession of Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic at the end of 2007 and Switzerland at the end of 2008, Austria lost its last external land border at the end of 2011 with the accession of Liechtenstein to the Schengen Agreement.

Owing to the abolition of border checks at the borders with neighbouring countries, there are now only six border crossing points at the six international airports (Vienna Schwechat, Graz Thalerhof, Innsbruck Kranebitten, Klagenfurt Wörthersee, Linz Hörsching and Salzburg Maxglan). In addition, air travel can take place between Austria and third countries at 64 airports and air fields, where the necessary border checks are carried out by the local police inspectorates responsible.

-   Number of consular posts in accordance with the Visa Code

In 2007, Austria had 94 consulates around the world that met the definition in the EU Visa Code. By 2011, this number had fallen to 86 consulates.

- Estimate(s) of number(s) of travellers crossing external borders annually (2007-2011)

The figures are based on the European Commission's guidelines on statistical data for the 'calculation of the final allocations for the relevant Annual Programme's budgetary exercise'. The data were sent to the European Commission by the Responsible Body for the Fund in this form.

This comment is necessary as land borders have actually existed (with a considerable number of border crossings), but these could only be specified to a small extent.

Year	Total	Airports	Land borders	Schengen external border
2007	approx. 8.5 million	approx. 8.5 million		CH, LI, SI, HU, SK, CZ
2008	approx. 19 million	approx. 10 million	approx. 9 million	CH, LI
2009	approx. 18 million	approx. 8 million	approx. 10 million	LI
2010	approx. 8.8 million	approx. 8.8 million		LI
2011	approx. 9.2 million	approx. 9.2 million		LI

- Numbers of visa applications annually (2007-2011)

Year	Visa applications
2007	428 372
2008	395 135
2009	337 941
2010	305 228
2011	302 894

- List of the main services implementing border control and visa policy

Border checks are carried out by 6 border police services of the Federal Police at the six international airports.

The Provincial Police Directorates are responsible for border service matters at a regional level (nine provinces) and the Federal Ministry of the Interior is responsible for border service matters at a central level.

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION

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

Not applicable. All projects under this financial instrument are implemented in the 'executing body' method.

2.1.1   Overview of calls for proposals for the programmes

According to what logic do you organise the launching of calls for proposals?
…..

If you <u>also</u> select projects <u>without</u> a call, what are the reasons for using both such methods?

….

2.1.2.   Overview of project proposals received, selected and funded after calls for proposals under the awarding body method

Table n° 5

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Proposals received					
Projects selected					
Projects funded Including multiannual projects					
Out of which multiannual projects					

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

Annual Programme 2007:

Annual Programme 2008:

Annual Programme 2009:

Annual Programme 2010:

2.1.3.   Overview of projects funded in the "awarding body" method without a call for proposals

12

Table n° 6

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

2.1.4. Total number of projects funded in the "awarding body" method under the programmes 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010

Table n° 7

Number of …	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for proposals (total "projects funded" table 5)					
Projects funded without such calls (total "projects funded" table 6)					
TOTAL Projects funded in the "awarding body" method (including multiannual projects)					

2.1.5. Co-financing

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

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?

Potential executing bodies and partners under the External Borders Fund, namely departments within the Federal Ministry of the Interior (BM.I) and the Federal Ministry of European and International Affairs (BMeiA) are already asked to submit project proposals before the annual programme is compiled by the Responsible Authority.

These project proposals are then analysed and reviewed in an open discussion together with the authorities that submitted them. At these discussions, the priorities from the perspective of national strategy and from the perspective of the ministries concerned are defined. It is on this basis that the projects are ultimately selected and the annual programme is compiled.

If, in the course of revising an annual programme, it becomes necessary to include replacement projects, the potential executing bodies will be contacted again and asked for project proposals. The replacement projects will then be selected using the same method described above.

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

No projects are included in the annual programme without a corresponding call for submission of project proposals.

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	12	2	10	15	39
Project selected	12 (11)*	2	10 (8)*	8 (7)*	32 (28)*
Projects funded	11	2	8	7	28
Out of which multiannual projects	0	0	0	0	0

*The numbers in parentheses relate to the revised annual programmes

It should be pointed out that the method Austria uses when compiling the annual programmes under the External Borders Fund follows a different system from the one that is clearly used as a basis here. According to this method, all potential project partners are first asked to submit project proposals. These proposals form the basis for a discussion and selection process, the outcome of which is the annual programme for the year in question.

It often emerges in the course of this extremely dynamic process that changes are necessary. This is the case, for example, if it is not possible to utilise the funds completely with the project proposals that have initially been submitted. In this case, new projects may be mentioned during the discussions and then submitted subsequently. Another possible scenario is that the feasibility of a project has fallen into doubt in the meantime, and thus it is removed from an annual programme before the first draft is compiled, and replacement projects are submitted.

Finally, where problems arise during the implementation of individual projects and for the purpose of maximum utilisation of the EU funds, regular use is made of the option of revising the annual programme. This results in a renewed call for the submission of project proposals. These were not taken into account in the statistics.

In this respect, the actual process followed during project selection cannot be directly transferred to the table (where the steps allowed for are: proposal – selection – funding).

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

Annual Programme 2007:
All of the projects originally submitted were selected for funding. During the course of implementation, the annual programme was revised. This resulted in one planned project (passport readers) being removed from the annual programme.

Annual Programme 2009:
Initially all 10 projects that were proposed were selected as part of the Annual Programme 2009. During the course of implementation, it became necessary to revise the annual programme. Altogether 3 projects (renovation of the Nairobi, Bangkok and Manila embassies) were removed; in lieu of these, an additional project (Baku embassy) was brought forward from the Annual Programme for 2010 and included in the Annual Programme for 2009.

Annual Programme for 2010:
Initially, a total of 15 possible projects were submitted by the two ministries (BM.I and BMeiA).

During the discussion and selection process, 3 out of the 6 projects submitted were classed by the BM.I as non-priority or not possible to implement in time: In the case of the project *e-borders for Vienna Schwechat Airport*, it was clear that the project was unlikely to be implemented within the eligibility period of the Annual Programme for 2010. This project was therefore moved to the Annual Programme for 2011. The projects *Document advisers* and *Adaptation of VISION* were classed as non-priority and therefore up for negotiation.

The BMeiA proposed a total of 9 projects, which all involved the renovation and adaptation of consular departments for the purpose of improved security during the issuing of visas. Four of these projects were classed as low-priority or able to be postponed to a later date (*Abuja*, *Kuwait*, *Santiago de Chile* and *Cairo* embassies). These were removed from the Annual Programme 2010 and some of them were included in later annual programmes.

Altogether, a satisfactory selection of 8 eligible projects were made for the two ministries concerned.

During the course of implementation, it became necessary to revise the annual programme, partly because projects had been moved forward to the Annual Programme 2009 to make up for shortfalls there, and partly because projects could not be implemented. This affected the SIS project of the BM.I and 2 embassy projects of the BMeiA. In lieu of the projects that had been removed, each of the two ministries subsequently specified one project (BM.I: *Document advisers*, BMeiA: *Abu Dhabi* embassy).

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

No projects are included in the annual programme without a corresponding call for submission of project proposals.

Table n° 9

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	0	0	0	0	0
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)	11	2	8	7	28
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Projects funded in the "executing body" method (including multi-annual)	11	2	8	7	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.

The federal budget is planned in such a way that annual federal estimates are produced for the next calendar year or the next two calendar years, indicating the amounts of budgetary resources that will be available for each area of activity. When the federal estimates are drawn up, projects that are eligible for support from the External Borders Fund are to be prioritised as far as possible.

Planned projects within the scope of the Fund are subsequently incorporated into the relevant annual programme, and the content of the annual programme is approved by the Federal Minister. Incorporation in the annual programme also serves to secure national co-financing.

From a budgetary point of view, a commitment is made for projects that are approved and are to be implemented to ensure that this money cannot be spent on anything else.

2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS

2.3.1. Overview of revisions for 2007-2010 annual programmes

Table n° 11

16

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	1 916 873.21	Y	21.95%
AP 2008	1 242 413.27	N	-
AP 2009	1 286 042.00	Y	17.52%
AP 2010	1 753 755.00	Y	32.68%

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:

In the revised version, the original project 'Purchase of passport readers' (Priority 1) was removed from the programme as the procurement of the passport readers could no longer be achieved within the eligibility period. EUR 98 000.00 of EU funds was planned for this action.

The original SIS project (specific Priority 4/1) was replaced by a new project as the majority of the services of the original project were provided outside the eligibility period. EUR 322 715.84 of EU funds was planned for this action.

The project 'SIS II – SIRENE workflow' was implemented as a replacement. The EU funds made available from the projects that were removed were transferred to the projects implemented in lieu. Altogether, this concerns EUR 420 715.84 of EU funds.

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

Explanation/elaboration:

With regard to Project 1 'Austrian Embassy in Tunis, upgrading of visa handling by improving the infrastructure', the end of the work was simply amended from September 2009 to December 2009.

Project 2 'Austrian Embassy in Nairobi, enhancing security of visa handling through new building' and Project 3 'Austrian Embassy in Bangkok, improving the consular infrastructure' that were planned in the original AP 2009 were removed for budgetary reasons and not replaced, and were then implemented in the course of the Annual Programme 2010. This concerns EU funds of EUR 65 000.00.

In the case of Project 4, 'Austrian Embassy in Jakarta, enhancing security of visa handling through new building', only the costs of the planning work remained in the Annual Programme 2009 due to the national budget situation. The construction work for this project was carried out under the Annual Programme 2010. The EU funds allocated for this project in AP 2009 fell as a result by EUR 29 000.00 from EUR 50 000.00 to EUR 21 000.00.

In the case of Project 5, 'Deployment of document advisers in third countries', the document advisers' travel expenses were budgeted again; in addition, the Implementing Rules amended on 2 March 2011 were applied for the 2009 programme year. The EU funds allocated increased by EUR 50 625.00 from EUR 159 000.00 to EUR 209 625.00.

Project 6, 'CAC – Common Visa Application Centre and improving the infrastructure for the issuing of visas at the Austrian Embassy in Manila', was originally planned as a cooperation project with the Hungarian Embassy. As this project was not pursued any further by Hungary, it did not make sense from Austria's perspective either to carry out an expansion of the consulate. This project was therefore removed from AP 2009 without being replaced. This concerns EU funds of EUR 90 000.00.

Project 7, 'Implementation of the Schengen Information System (SIS II)', was merged with the SIS II project of AP 2010 and extended to include the procurement of hardware relevant for testing. As a result, the EU funds allocated increased by EUR 117 642.48 from EUR 160 000.00 to EUR 277 642.48.

In the case of Project 8, 'Implementation of the Visa Information System (VIS)' (BM.I), changes were made in the 'VISION' area and hardware procurement was reduced. However, as a result of other projects being removed from this annual programme, it was possible for the proportion of EU funds to be increased by EUR 18 033.44 from EUR 223 039.06 to EUR 241 072.50.

In the case of Project 9, 'Equipping the Austrian representative offices with fingerprint scanners and software – VIS implementation' (BMeiA), the number of fingerprint scanners procured was reduced and the overall project costs fell due to the deployment of VIS being postponed. The EU funds allocated fell by EUR 41 300.92 from EUR 268 980.00 to EUR 227 679.08.

Due to Projects 2 and 3 (Austrian Embassy in Nairobi and Austrian Embassy in Bangkok) being completely removed from the Annual Programme 2009, a replacement project (Project 11) 'Opening an embassy in Baku' was specified by the BMeiA and was then moved from the Annual Programme 2010 to the Annual Programme 2009. This concerns EU funds of EUR 39 000.00.

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:

In the case of Action 1, 'Participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory', in addition to the costs for entry to the ICAO PKD the annual fees (Entrust's management fees and other fees) were also included in the revised annual programme. This was not possible originally as it was planned for the annual fees to be co-financed as part of the implementation of the Community Actions 2010. Due to the unexpectedly low participation of other Member States in ICAO PKD, this action was removed from the Annual Work Programme 2010 for Community Actions. This then presented the opportunity to include the annual fees mentioned above in the national Annual Programme 2010. As a result, the EU funds allocated increased by EUR 33 170 from EUR 26 830 to EUR 60 000.00.

With regard to Action 2 'Austrian Embassy in Nairobi, enhancing security of visa handling through new building', the end of the work was amended from June 2011 to August 2011. In addition, there was an inflation-related increase in costs. The EU funds allocated thus increased by EUR 12 500.00 from EUR 175 000.00 to EUR 187 500.00.

There was also an increase in costs in Action 3, 'Austrian Embassy in Jakarta, enhancing security of visa handling through new building'. The total costs increased by EUR 160 000 from the original figure of EUR 500 000 to EUR 660 000 due to changes in the exchange rate. The contract was not awarded until February 2010, instead of in January 2009 as originally planned. The end of the work was amended from June 2011 to August 2011. The EU funds allocated thus increased by EUR 80 000.00 from EUR 250 000.00 to EUR 330 000.00.

Action 4, 'Austrian Embassy in Baku, opening an embassy in Baku', was moved to the Annual Programme 2009. This concerns EU funds of EUR 35 000.00.

In the case of Action 5, 'Austrian Embassy in Algiers, improvement of consular infrastructure', there was a slight increase in costs. Here too, the end of the work was amended, in this case from September 2010 to December 2010. The EU funds allocated increased by EUR 700.00 from EUR 30 000.00 to EUR 30 700.00.

Action 6, 'Austrian Embassy in Bangkok, new building', was moved to the 2012 programme year for budgetary reasons. This concerns EU funds of EUR 200 000.00.

Action 7, 'Implementation of the Schengen Information System (SIS II)', was transferred to the Annual Programme 2009 in its entirety. This concerns EU funds of EUR 225 000.00.

In Action 8, 'VIS reading devices', the number of document reading devices purchased rose by 35 from 245 to 280, the number of fingerprint scanners rose by 25 from 250 to 275 and, furthermore, a piece of middleware software was purchased. In addition to these purchases, it also became necessary to develop a new control application. The end of the work was amended from the middle/end of 2010 to mid-2012 (30 June 2012 at the latest). Despite the increase in quantities, the total expected price fell. The EU funds allocated fell as a result by EUR 113 162.15 from EUR 659 162.15 to EUR 546 000.00.

Owing to the removal of Project 4 (Austrian Embassy in Baku) and Project 6 (Austrian Embassy in Bangkok) from the Annual Programme 2010 in their entirety, the replacement project 'Austrian Embassy in Abu Dhabi, improvement of consular infrastructure' was specified by the BMeiA and was included in the Annual Programme 2010 as Action 9. EUR 44 500.00 of EU funds were allocated to this project.

Owing to the removal of several projects, Action 10, 'Deployment of document advisers in third countries', was subsequently nominated by the BM.I. EUR 402 292.15 of EU funds were allocated to this project.

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?

The revision of the annual programmes was a crucial factor for the high level of consumption of the EU resources from the External Borders Fund. The overall utilisation rate in APs 2007-2010 was 96% on average. This would not have been possible without the ability to revise the annual programmes.

In the majority of cases, the cause of the revision of the annual programme was the removal of individual projects for reasons beyond the control of the Responsible Authority or the project partners. These include, for example, changed budgetary requirements, and the economic crisis of the past few years has also had a particular impact on these. As far as the adaptation of consular offices is concerned, there is also often reliance on the political situation in the third country in question; furthermore a tight timeframe is generally problematic for building projects.

Overall it can be assumed that had the ability to revise the annual programmes not existed a utilisation rate of just 80% (approx.) of EU resources from the External Borders Fund would have been possible.

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	99 622.45	99 622.45
2008	116 968.93	116 968.93
2009	120 022.94	119 993.06
2010	152 762.85	152 762.85*
Total 2007-2010	489 377.17	489 347.29

* Not final.

The amount of disbursed Technical Assistance funds for the 2010 programme is not yet final, since the use of these funds remains possible until 31 March 2013. Accordingly, a precise figure cannot, in principle, be given at this stage.

To enable the aggregate amount for 2007-2010 to be calculated and to avoid excessive distortion of the total utilisation rate, however, an estimated value has been entered in Table 12. Since the allocations for the 2007-2009 programmes were used almost in full, 100% utilisation of the allocation for 2010 has been assumed.

Table n° 13

AP/Use of TA (€)	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°/€)	IT and equipment	Office/ consum ables	Travelling/ events	Monitorin g, project managem ent	Reporting, translation	Total
2007	99 479.82			142.63			99 622.45
2008	83 469.43	9 649.50		330.00		23 520.00	116 968.93
2009	111 243.65			349.41		8 400.00	119 993.06
2010*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

* These data are not yet available, as the account has not yet been cleared.

The Technical Assistance account is not cleared until the end of the eligibility period. In the case of the annual programme for 2010, this period ends on 31 March 2013. For this reason, no data can yet be provided on expenditure arising under the various headings.

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 resources were extremely useful. The Fund programme could not have been implemented without TA. This applies especially to the scope it offered for funding additional staff.

The management of the fund entails a very great deal of administrative input, which is not directly commensurate with the number and size of the projects. Certain general activities have to be performed in any event. For this reason it is vitally important, and will remain so, that Member States are provided with adequate TA resources.

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 no change to the management and control systems at national level.

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?

Approval of the annual programmes is the basis for their implementation by the Member States. For practical reasons, however, the European Commission's initial acknowledgement containing notes and comments on the submitted annual programme is taken as approval (or rejection) in principle,

and the implementation of the projects that are clearly unproblematic is initiated. However, there were also executing bodies which were only allowed to begin the implementation once the annual programme had been approved.

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

	Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5		Total	
Implementation rates by priority												
	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					96%	96%	98%	98%			97%	97%
AP 2008	100%	100%					100%	100%			100%	100%
AP 2009					99%	99%	79%	79%	100%	100%	86%	87%
AP 2010	100%	100%			96%	95%	100%	100%			97%	97%
%	100%	100%			96%	96%	93%	93%	100%	100%	96%	96%

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.:

In the annual programmes for the years from 2007 to 2010, almost all actions and projects were implemented successfully, and the project objectives were achieved. Only 17% of the actions could not be implemented, and this was predominantly due to external factors. Mention should particularly be made in this context of planned building projects at consular offices in third countries which often could not be implemented within the planned timeframe. On several occasions, this resulted in projects that were planned in one annual programme being moved to another.

Another plus point is that the resources from the External Borders Fund were used almost in full, the overall utilisation rate being 96%. In individual projects there were also some cases where budgets were slightly exceeded; however, the additional costs were borne by the executing bodies. This did not have any impact on the financial implementation of the External Borders Fund.

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?

Table n° 15

- **Action: Purchase of a FLIR system for Austrian FRONTEX contribution**

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded			**% of equipment renewed out of the total equipment**		
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	1	0	4	25%	0	100%

- **Action: Participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory for External Border Control**

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded			**% of Border Crossing Points covered with modernised equipment**		
4. Operating equipment for border checks	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
Total	1	0	1	100%	0%	100%
4.1. ABC gates						
4.2. Document verification						
4.3. Other: ICAO PKD	1	0	1	100%	0%	100%

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)

The purchase of a helicopter equipped with the FLIR system for FRONTEX deployments was planned in the multi-annual programme. This purchase was included in the Annual Programme 2008 and implemented successfully.

In addition, actions were planned in the multi-annual programme to provide technical equipment to the border inspection posts to 'enable inspections that comply with EU requirements and, in this way, guarantee efficient entry checks'. The ICAO project implemented in the Annual Programme 2010 serves this objective as it makes it possible to check whether the certificate used for the authenticity check actually originates from the country that issued the passport. Ultimately, this is the only way in which the authenticity of the data in e-Passports can be checked.

With regard to the diverging distribution of funds to priorities across the multi-annual programme and the annual programmes, the following should be stated. The objective of ensuring that the resources (EU resources and national resources) are used as economically and as appropriately as possible has resulted in their allocation being concentrated on Priorities 3 and 4. When the multi-annual programme was compiled, it was not possible to tell at that stage how the economic situation to which this trend is due would develop; in all likelihood, this distribution of priorities will continue over the next few years.

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 equipment required for future FRONTEX deployments was purchased successfully and is already in use. The *Public Key Directory* purchased is available to all of Austria's border inspection posts.

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?

Table n° 16

- **Action: Introducing document advisers in third countries**

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
	Number of ILOs deployed			% of consular posts affected		
9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
	56	80	118	9.09%	30.91%	23.64%

- **Action: Enhancing visa security thanks to improvement of consulate infrastructure**

	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
	Number of visa sections in consular posts new/ renovated			Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises		
10. Consular 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
	11	12	20	714 239	370 037	824 260

- **Action: Purchase of 45 notebooks for document advisers at embassies and airports in third countries**

	OUTPUT				RESULTS
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**Number of destinations (officers) of the equipment acquired or upgraded**	**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	45	45	45	41	100%

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?

One objective of the multi-annual programme was to 'increase the number of document advisers and improve their equipment'.

The number of document advisers has risen from 39 to 41 since 2007. In the annual programmes for 2009 and 2010, document adviser postings were funded through the External Borders Fund; document advisers were employed at just under 10% of Austrian representative offices in third countries. Compared to the baseline period before the Fund, it was possible to increase the number of postings during the period from 2007 to 2011; however, the number of representative offices covered fell slightly. With regard to this situation, the following should be noted: firstly, the number of representative offices has fallen overall since 2007 and, secondly, there was a concentrated deployment of document advisers to consulates where postings have proven particularly valuable.

The above-mentioned objective also relates to the purchase of laptops for document advisers. This action was implemented in the Annual Programme for 2007. The objective of equipping all document advisers with new, high-performance laptops was fully met. It should be noted that this did not result in any increase in relation to the baseline period as the old laptops that no longer represented the state of the art were then scrapped. In contrast, the objective was to improve the quality of the equipment. Furthermore, the number of laptops slightly exceeded the number of document advisers as a total of 4 replacement devices were purchased as well. This is necessary as otherwise it would not possible to compensate for the loss of a laptop.

In the area of visa management, the 'improvement of the consular infrastructure' at representative offices with the authority to issue visas in third countries was a key objective of the multi-annual programme. Relevant projects involved building new consular departments or renovating them. Altogether, 11 projects to improve the consular infrastructure were implemented in the annual programmes for 2007 to 2010. A *Common Application Centre* was set up in Astana together with Hungary as part of a project. In this way, it was possible to achieve the objectives set, namely 'greater speed and efficiency in the processing of visa applications' and 'handling of the increased volume of applicants'.

With regard to the diverging distribution of funds to priorities across the multi-annual programme and the annual programmes, the following should be stated: The objective that the resources (EU resources and national resources) should be used as economically and as appropriately as possible has resulted in the allocation of the resources being concentrated on Priorities 3 and 4. When the multi-annual programme was compiled, it was not possible to tell at that stage how the economic situation to which this trend is due would develop; in all likelihood, this distribution of priorities will continue over the next few years.

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.

As a result of the support from the Fund, it was possible for nearly 25% of Austrian representative offices to be permanently supported by document advisers. These document advisers make a vital contribution to the detection of forged visa applications and forged entry documents at departure airports. This was additionally and particularly enabled by upgrading the equipment and the provision of modern laptops to the document advisers, which was supported by the Fund.

At the consular offices that have been renovated since 2007, altogether over 820 000 visas have already been issued under the new improved conditions, and over 700 000 of these were issued at consular offices where the modification work was supported by the Fund. This represents a significant increase in relation to the baseline period.

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?

Table n° 17

- **Action: Purchase of technical equipment and software for External Border checks under VIS**

4. Operating equipment for border checks	OUTPUT			RESULTS		
	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	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	555	0	555	100%	0%	100%
4.1. ABC gates						
4.2. Document verification	280	0	280	100%	0%	100%
4.3. Other: Fingerprint scanners	275	0	275	100%	0%	100%

- **Action: Implementation of Schengen Information System II**

6. SIS	OUTPUT	RESULTS		
	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS	Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)		
		YES	NO	NA
	54.92%	X		

- **Action: Implementation of VIS**

	OUTPUT	RESULTS	
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**
	31.96%	14	6

- **Action: Re-equipping Austrian consulates with computer work places for visa processing.**

	OUTPUT				RESULTS
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded**	**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	120	0	120	34	61.82%

- **Action: Integration of photos in visa (scanner, equipment for checking passwords, software for photo processing, printer)**

	OUTPUT				RESULTS
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded**	**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	128	0	128	14	25.45

- **Action: Equipping the Austrian representative offices with fingerprint scanners and software - VIS implementation**

	OUTPUT				RESULTS
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded**	**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	6	0	6	6	10.91

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)

All the actions implemented are consistent with the objectives that were set in the multi-annual programme. The implementation of the SIS II and VIS systems, and the 'connection of Austrian representative offices to the central system' were priority objectives of the Austrian multi-annual programme and several projects relating to this subject were implemented successfully in the annual programmes for 2007, 2008 and 2009.

In addition, several actions relating to the purchase of necessary hardware for the implementation and/or use of the new systems were carried out. These actions are in line with the objectives set, in particular the following: the 'provision of the necessary hardware and software to create the technical conditions for visa checking (biometrics, VIS) at borders', the 'implementation of visas with photographs and fingerprints (biometrics) stored on them', the 'purchase of the necessary IT equipment' and the 'purchase and provision of equipment in connection with the new 'Skylink' terminal at the Vienna Schwechat Airport'. Projects have been implemented successfully in all areas

and, as a result, the technical conditions for the operation and intended use of the new IT systems have been created.

With regard to all the actions relating to the purchase of VIS-compliant equipment (equipment for border checks, photo and fingerprint scanners), '0' or no value was entered for the baseline period. In the majority of cases, no VIS-compliant equipment was available prior to the implementation of the Fund. Any workstations available were outdated and did not meet the requirements for new systems in any case. They were therefore not relevant for the provision of VIS-compliant workstations.

With regard to the diverging distribution of funds to priorities across the multi-annual programme and the annual programmes, the following should be stated: The objective that the resources (EU resources and national resources) should be used as economically and as appropriately as possible has resulted in the allocation of the resources being concentrated on Priorities 3 and 4. When the multi-annual programme was compiled, it was not possible to tell at that stage how the economic situation to which this trend is due would develop; in all likelihood, this distribution of priorities will continue over the next few years.

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 far as SIS II is concerned, the national components required were achieved in spite of delays in the area of central implementation, and the necessary compliance tests were completed successfully.

With regard to the implementation of the VIS, 14 consular offices have now been connected to the VIS, of which 12 are located in Regions I, II and III and 2 more are located in Regions IV-VII (Dakar, Abuja). This is 2 more than is currently planned according to the Rollout Plan. Two fingerprint collection points in the autonomous Palestinian territories (Gaza and Ramallah) are also connected. In addition, 3 more consulates in Regions IV-VII are to be connected this year (Addis Ababa, Nairobi, Pretoria).

The 12 consular offices connected according to the Rollout Plan are: Rabat, Tunis, Algiers, Tripoli, Cairo (Region I), Beirut, Amman, Tel Aviv (Region II), Abu Dhabi, Riyadh, Kuwait, Tehran (Region III).

With regard to the equipment purchased, it has been possible for this to be provided to 100% of Austrian border inspection posts and the majority of the consular offices classed as relevant in the Rollout Plan.

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?

Table n° 18

- **Action: Improving language competences in visa field**

12. Training and risk analysis	OUTPUT			RESULTS
	Number of persons trained			Share of staff trained (compared to total)
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010
Total	103	627	791	13.02%

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)

The language training organised for consular staff in the Annual Programme 2009 fulfils the objective of 'greater speed and efficiency in the processing of visa applications' and 'handling of the increased volume of applicants' through the improvement of language skills and the associated improved possibilities for communication with visa applicants and local staff. This was also specified in the multi-annual programme as a key action in Priority 5.

With regard to the diverging distribution of funds to priorities across the multi-annual programme and the annual programmes, the following should be stated. The objective of ensuring that the resources (EU resources and national resources) are used as economically and as appropriately as possible has resulted in the allocation of the resources being concentrated on Priorities 3 and 4. When the multi-annual programme was compiled, it was not possible to tell at that stage how the economic situation to which this trend is due would develop; in all likelihood, this distribution of priorities will continue over the next few years.

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.

The language training helped to improve the level of language skills of staff at consular offices in third countries. Not only did this make communication with local staff easier, it also improved communication with applicants and understanding of documents submitted with the visa application. In addition, local staff were also given the opportunity to further improve their German, which contributed in equal measures to improving cooperation with staff posted from Austria.

The goal was set of training 75 members of staff; in fact, the External Borders Fund enabled language training to be provided for a total of 103 members of staff (+37.33%). As a result of the support from the Fund, there was an increase in participation in the training courses in relation to the baseline period. In total, approx. 13% of the language training sessions held in the period from 2007 to 2012 were funded with resources from the External Borders Fund.

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

Overall list of outputs and results indicators ANNEX 1									
Category	**Indicators**								
	OUTPUT				**RESULTS**				
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**				**% of equipment renewed out of the total equipment**				
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	1	0	4		25%	0	100%		
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		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
Total	556	0	556		100%	0%	100%		
4.1. ABC gates									
4.2. Document verification	280	0	280		100%	0%	100%		
4.3. Other:									
a) Fingerprint scanners	275	0	275		100%	0%	100%		
b) ICAO PKD	1	0	1		100%	0%	100%		
6. SIS	**% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS**				**Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)**				
					YES	NO	NA		
	54.92%				X				
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**	
	31.96%				14			6	
9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	**Number of ILOs deployed**				**% of consular posts affected**				
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level		
	56	80	118		9.09%	30.91%	23.64%		
10. Consular infrastructure	**Number of visa sections in consular posts new/ renovated**				**Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises**				
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		
	11	12	20		714 239	370 037	824 260		
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	**Number of equipment acquired or upgraded**			**Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded**	**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**				
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
	299	45	299	95	49.55%				

12. Training and risk analysis	Number of persons trained				Share of staff trained (compared to total)		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010		Achieved through APs 2007-2010		
Total	103	627	791		13.02%		
12.1. General							
12.2. Specialised							

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.

The implementation of the projects is regarded as highly successful.

A key element is the successful implementation of the SIS II and VIS IT systems. Closely connected with this are actions to purchase the necessary equipment and hardware, whether this is at consulates with the authority to issue visas or at the border inspection posts. As far as the consulates are concerned, the requirements of the rollout plan were exceeded and 2 additional consulates have already been equipped. With regard to the equipment of the border inspection posts, it has been possible to equip all posts across the board.

As regards the consulates, the support from the Fund has made it possible for 75% more consular departments to be modified and adapted to modern requirements than in the baseline period. As part of this, it was also possible for a Common Application Centre (Astana) to be set up for the first time in cooperation with Hungary. In addition, both the number of document advisers and the number of postings of these advisers rose compared to the baseline period. An increase in relation to the period before the implementation of the Fund was also achieved in the area of language training courses at the consulates.

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.

Deployment of document advisers in third countries

The aim of employing document advisers is to reduce illegal entry into Austria by air. In the Annual Programme 2009, document advisers were employed in New Delhi, Cairo, Damascus and Bangkok. Their job was, firstly, to advise staff at EU consular offices, assist them with the inspection of visa applications and inform them about new trends in forging and, secondly, to provide support and training to airline employees at their place of employment with regard to identifying forged entry documents.

In the course of this project, 39 document advisers were trained and posted. This resulted in 4 496 cases where individuals were prevented from flying. In detail, 810 forged documents, 962 instances where visa applications were made on false pretences and 2 051 cases of bad profiles were identified. Other people's ID cards were used 186 times and on 1 876 occasions the conditions for entry were not met.

This project was felt to be particularly worth mentioning as it involved close cooperation and mutual assistance between Austria and other Member States, such as Finland, Belgium, France, Lithuania, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Italy, Germany, United Kingdom and Greece, which all worked smoothly.

Construction of the new office building for the Austrian Embassy in Nairobi

Visa matters were previously dealt with at rented premises in Nairobi. However, these premises did not meet the current security requirements and the application processing that was possible there was slow and not very customer-oriented. There was no possibility for improvement at the previous location, which is why a move was necessary. In view of the uncertain rental situation and rising crime, the decision was made to erect a new building on land within the compound.

This project enabled better application of the visa procedures at a local level, more efficient processing of the issuing of visas, prevention of 'visa shopping', an increase in security with regard to receipt and processing, a reduction in waiting times, optimisation of counter services in terms of security and customer service, better acceptance of the visa policy by applicants and better monitoring of compliance with visa rules.

A total of 11 similar construction projects were implemented in the course of the EBF annual programmes 2007-2010. On the whole, the projects all ran smoothly; in some cases there were delays but these were of a typical length. The building project for the Austrian Embassy in Nairobi described here is therefore considered to be representative of a well-executed project.

Equipping the Austrian representative offices with fingerprint scanners and software – VIS implementation

A fingerprint processing system was purchased that covers the area of collection and verification at the visa issuing authorities abroad and the Austrian representative offices with the authority to issue visas. The system consists of hardware components (fingerprint scanner, hubs and cables) and software components (data capture software and verification software).

This action made it possible for the visa procedure to be performed efficiently and in a traceable way. Furthermore, the common visa rules that are consistently applied at EU level are better communicated to the outside world. Another advantage achieved through this action is that 'visa shopping' can be prevented and the level of security in the issuing of visas can be increased.

One point that is particularly worth mentioning in this case is the excellent cooperation with the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, and also the transparent and traceable processing of the accounts for the project.

Implementation of the Visa Information System (VIS) (comprising three work packages)

With regard to VIS, the VISION software was modified to meet the technical specifications of VIS. In addition, a national VIS database was created, and an administration tool and a testing tool were programmed.

This project enabled coordinated implementation of the common visa policy at a local level. In this way, Austria was able to make a significant contribution to the achievement of the overall VIS strategy. The procedure for visa applicants was also optimised.

Although this project ran across several annual programmes, there were no problems or delays worth mentioning. The cooperation with the department executing the project ran smoothly, which is why this project is being cited as a positive example.

FLIR system

This action involved the purchase of special police equipment, the 'FLIR system' (FLIR = Forward Looking Infra Red). The FLIR system relevant to the project consists of a FLIR camera, a searchlight and a FLIR workstation including accessories and is used to equip a new EC 135 helicopter purchased for FRONTEX deployments in order to secure external borders. This project supports the deployments of the EU border protection agency FRONTEX.

With this equipment, it is possible to detect heat sources in the dark (for example people or vehicles) and direct forces on the ground. This guarantees more efficient monitoring of the external border.

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.

Through the implementation of the External Borders Fund, cooperation between the ministries in Austria, and specifically between the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs and the Federal Ministry of the Interior, was strengthened and improved. Cooperation at an intraministerial level with the Federal Ministry of the Interior was also intensified. In specific terms, there was very close cooperation with four departments within the BM.I. The insight gained into the structure of the departments executing projects made it easier to develop new ideas, problem-solving methods and possible improvements for future projects.

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

Participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory

Austria has been issuing e-Passports since 2006; in addition to the photograph, these also contain personal data and the images of two fingerprints on the data carrier.

These data can be read during a border check using a passport reader. To this end, access authorisation for the data is created from the machine-readable line in accordance with an international standard. However, simply reading the data is not enough to guarantee its authenticity. An additional check is required of whether the certificate used for the authenticity check actually originates from the country that issued the passport.

For a number of years, the ICAO has been promoting the ICAO PKD (Public Key Directory), which enables the computer-assisted exchange of documents at an international level.

It was originally planned for this project to be entirely financed by the Fund. Following the Commission's communication stating that the annual fee and the management fee for ICAO PKD would be included in the Community Action Programme, these costs could not be designated for funding from the annual programme. It was therefore only the one-off joining fee that was earmarked for support from the Fund. The annual programme was revised accordingly in this respect. One month later, a written communication was received stating that the action in question would now not be included in the Community Action Programme after all, which is why the complete costs, i.e. the joining fee, management fee and the annual costs were included in the revised annual programme once again.

The necessary internal coordination work on this subject was extremely labour-intensive and time consuming.

In view of the costs of this project, which were after all rather low, it did not then make sense for this project to be financed through the External Borders Fund.

Implementation of the Schengen Information System (SIS II)

The actions required in Austria for the duration of the Annual Programme 2009 were the following:
- ✓ adaptation of the interface to communicate with the modernised central SIS II system,
- ✓ performance of testing,
- ✓ implementation of new functionalities provided with SIS II in the SIRENE workflow,
- ✓ testing-relevant hardware for SIS II and SIRENE workflow (WF).

These actions represent a continuation of the project that was started in the 2007 programme year for the implementation of SIS II, for which funds were requested from the External Borders Fund for 2007 and 2008.

Due to problems in the central project during the preparation for a test, the performance of testing was moved to the start of 2010. The first test run was then deemed to be invalid and, as a result, had to be repeated in March 2010.

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.

To date there have been very few problems with the implementation of projects. In some cases, implementation within the eligibility period was not possible due to budgetary reasons or external circumstances. In scenarios such as this, regular use was made of the possibility of revising the annual programmes. In this way, we have to date been able to implement the programme successfully and achieve a utilisation rate of nearly 100% of the funds.

In this sense, only a few lessons can be learned from the implementation of the Fund so far. A point worth mentioning might be the need for regular contact with the executing bodies in order to be able to identify delays and problems at an early stage and develop appropriate solutions. This has worked well up until now.

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

Regular contact with the executing bodies will be a key component of the implementation of the programme in the future as well.

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).

The basis for the information is the same as stated in bullet point 4 of section 1.1.5 – (existing) land borders can therefore only be taken into account to a small extent.
The real figures are far higher in some cases.

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	approx. 100 million*	approx. 18 million	approx. 9.2 million
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	total: 514 land: - air: 514	total: 646 land: 203 air: 443	total: 446 land: - air: 446
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	-	5	- **
Visa applications made	428 372***	337 941	302 894
Visas issued	409 825***	317 300	289 607

* Estimated projection as no data available for 2006
** Data not clear from the statistics data sheet sent to the European Commission
*** Data from 2007 (2006 is not available)

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 must first of all be stressed, once again, that the figures correspond to the figures sent to the European Commission by the Responsible Authority for the Fund in relation to the individual annual programmes (budgetary exercise regarding the allocations).

While the statistics do, at first glance, show some changes over the years, it is not possible to attribute these changes in the area of migration to the implementation of the Fund. The gradual accession of neighbouring countries to the Schengen area should be cited as a key factor for the fall in crossings at external borders, and this naturally has an impact on the number of third country nationals refused entry at the external borders and individuals apprehended after having crossed the border illegally as well. In contrast to this, the passenger figures of the international Austrian airports remain constant at between 8 and 9 million.

The number of visa applications is also falling slightly; the influence of external factors cannot be ruled out here either.

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 have any direct impact on the preparation of the annual programmes and did not result in any changes to these.

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?

In the area of border management, the Fund's main contribution was to enable necessary equipment to be purchased. Other costs were not covered by support from the Fund.

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?

In the area of visa policy, the Fund primarily supported actions to improve the consular infrastructure (construction work at consulates), and costs in connection with equipping and posting (travel expenses, accommodation costs, communication) document advisers.

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 assistance from the Fund made a significant contribution to the development and implementation of the SIS and VIS IT systems.

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

This question cannot be answered in concrete terms. Following the loss of the external land borders, the subject of the 'security of the borders' has not been greatly discussed by the Austrian public. The public assume that there is a high level of security at the 6 international airports that remain as the external border due to the general tightening of security requirements over the past few years. However, the Fund's contribution to this cannot be measured.

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?

The added value of the Fund results from the possibility of supporting important investments in the areas of infrastructure, equipment and IT systems. This meant that actions could be implemented for which national financing would have scarcely been possible or would not have been possible at all (particular in light of the general economic crisis over the past few years).

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.

As part of the 'Document advisers in third countries' action, airline employees were also provided with support in relation to identifying forged travel documents. This made it possible for individuals planning to enter Austria illegally to be identified while still in the third country.

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?

During the 2007-2010 annual programmes, no actions could be implemented in connection with this due to a lack of eligibility in Austria.

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.

One way in which improved consular cooperation was achieved was through the posting of document advisers already described above. They were available for deployment to consular offices in other Member States as part of a posting. The Fund also made it possible for a Common Application Centre (Astana) to be set up for the first time together with Hungary.

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).

The support provided from the Fund made it possible to join the ICAO Public Key Directory. A project relating to e-Border gates is to be implemented in the Annual Programme 2011.

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?

No alternative approach would have been possible for the majority of the actions that were financed through the Fund. This applies especially to the investments in IT systems, equipment for issuing visas and entry checks, as well as to improving the consular infrastructure. There would certainly have been delays and some measures would not have been able to be implemented or would not have been able to be implemented in this scope (for example document advisers, language training).

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)

The Fund enabled the equipment for controlling and monitoring individuals entering Austria and for FRONTEX deployments to be extensively upgraded, especially as part of the opening of a new terminal at the key international airport Vienna Schwechat. A new piece of technology was introduced on joining the ICAO Public Key Directory.

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

The actions relate to the posting of document advisers, the renovation of consular offices and the purchase of hardware for the issuing of visas. These actions brought about a significant increase in the capacities in question in relation to the baseline period. It was also possible for a significant proportion of the outdated equipment at the consular offices to be upgraded.

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)

The development of the two IT systems was a key concern of the national programme and was significantly supported and promoted with resources from the Fund.

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.

It was possible for a specially equipped helicopter with a thermal imaging camera to be purchased, which was deployed in the FRONTEX pool.

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.

These are not specific national weaknesses here but it should be mentioned that resources from the Fund enabled the infrastructure for issuing visas at the embassies to be adapted to current standards through renovation and technical equipment. Furthermore, the document advisers contributed to improved issuing of visas and a reduction in illegal migration.

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.

Not applicable.

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

The implementation of the actions would scarcely have been financially viable without the support of the Fund. In the case of many projects there would have been delays, and some would probably not have been able to be implemented or not in the same scope.

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.

The purchasing of modern equipment for checking documents made it possible to improve and speed up processing at airports, in particular Vienna Schwechat Airport, while at the same time enhancing security.

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.

In general, the Fund contributed to the modernisation and improvement of the infrastructure and equipment (including IT systems). This would not have been possible to the same extent and within the same timeframe without the Fund.

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?

As it was already clear when the multi-annual programme was compiled that the external land borders were gradually being lost, the Austrian priorities were predominantly focused on the areas of border checks at international airports, improving the consular infrastructure, developing the SIS and VIS IT systems and purchasing adequate equipment. The objectives and priorities of the Fund have closely matched these national needs from the outset. As a result, neither the situation in general nor the flow of migrants to Austria has undergone any drastic or unexpected changes, and so Austria has been able to implement the programmes successfully over the entire programming period to date.

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?

Foremost among the successes achieved in implementing the programme have been the gradual and successful further development and implementation of the SIS and VIS IT systems, and the purchase of relevant hardware for the issuing of visas and border checks.
With regard to the consular offices, the continuous improvement in the consular infrastructure through construction work and, in particular, through the setting up of a Common Application Centre in Astana should be cited as the main achievement. It was also possible for a continuous increase in the training courses for consular staff and the posting of document advisers to third countries to be achieved.

The key to all of these successes has been consistency between the implementation of the programme and the objectives set out in the strategy.

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	0.00	0.00	**	
2008	28 240.77	0.00	**	
2009	70 516.56	0.00	**	
2010	105 179.74	0.00	**	
2011	101 913.68	0.00	**	
First six months of 2012*	53 180.75	0.00	**	

* The data for the first six months of 2012 are not final and are based on an estimate. At the time of writing, final figures for 2012 have been cleared for the first quarter only, i.e. the months from January to March. Staff costs for the second quarter, from April to June, have been estimated and added to this total, but other costs, such as travel and equipment, could not be taken into account.
** These data could not be quantified.

It is not possible to estimate the national contribution in kind to the management of Fund programmes, because there is no assessment basis at all for this value.

All authorities entrusted with the management of the fund – the responsible authority, the certifying authority and the audit authority – are based at the Federal Ministry of the Interior and are part of the departmental structure there. Each authority looks after several SOLID Funds as well as performing other general administrative duties. All of these duties overlap at several points and are both practically and theoretically inseparable. There is no provision for the use of time sheets within the Ministry, nor are such records kept in practice.

As a general rule of thumb, it may be said that a total of three members of the Ministry staff are employed in the Responsible Authority with a remit covering the External Borders Fund and the European Return Fund. In addition, the same department is responsible for the financial and budgetary processing of other matters and of Aliens Police projects, for returns and reintegration, border control and visa procedures and for the coordination of projects, while the unit hosting the Responsible Authority also attends to any other general administrative tasks, especially those relating to the Aliens Police and border control. A similar situation applies in the cases of the certifying authority and the audit authority.

It is therefore entirely impossible to quantify the management effort for any one fund, such as the European External Borders Fund in the present instance. It is not even possible, moreover, to identify staff remuneration costs, because these are calculated by a central department for personnel within the Ministry, which, for reasons of data protection, is not authorised to release them.

An analogous situation applies to the other expenditure categories. Neither rental costs nor the cost of equipment and office materials can be broken down into individual departments or workplaces.

Accordingly, the total value of national contributions in kind to the management of the programme cannot be estimated, nor can expenditure figures be provided for the individual categories as requested in item 4.4.2 below.

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					
2008					
2009					
2010					
2011					
First six months of 2012					

These data cannot be determined. Please see the comments at item 4.4.1 above.

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

The implementation of the programme requires a great deal of administrative input. This can more or less be covered with the aid of the Technical Assistance resources. In some cases, however, corners have to be cut, particularly with regard to support for executing bodies. The limited financial resources do not allow for detailed and proactive shaping and implementation of the programme. Nevertheless, it has proved possible to achieve utilisation rate of 96% of the allocated funds.

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.

There have been no problems in this respect.

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 complementary funding was available.

* * *

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															
1.1. Motorbikes															
1.2. Cars (including SUVs, vans, trucks, but excluding mobile surveillance units)															
1.3. Planes															
1.4. Helicopters															
1.4. Boats															
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. 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
	1	0	4				25%	0	100%						
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	556	0	556							100%	0%	100%							
4.1. ABC gates																			
4.2. Document verification	280	0	280							100%	0%	100%							
4.3. Other:																			
a) Fingerprint scanners	275	0	275							100%	0%	100%							
b) ICAO PKD	1	0	1							100%	0%	100%							

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 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

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			
	54.92%												X					

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		
	31.96%									14			6					

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						
Total																		
8.1. API																		
8.2. FADO																		
8.3. Other (i.e. national systems)																		

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	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-	Baseline	Overall at national level

						2007-2010		2007-2010				2010		2010		
						56	80	118	9.09%	30.91%	23.64%					
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			
	11	12	20						714 239	370 037	824 260					
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**			**% of consulates / document advisers equipped with:**				
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline						
	299	45	299	95								49.55%				
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	103	627	791									13.02%				
12.1. General																
12.2. Specialised																
13. Info campaigns and promotion	**Number of events organised**			**Number of attendants**					**Number of medias used**							

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).)

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													
1. Enhancing visa security thanks to improvement of infrastructure for the issuing of visas at Austrian general consulate in Shanghai, China	**X** (Owing to the method selected, each action in the External Borders Fund corresponds to one project. Therefore, when an action was implemented, the project planned in this action was always implemented as well.)			X	X			X		X	X		

47

	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%
2. Enhancing security of visa processing thanks to improvement of infrastructure for the issuing of visas in Austrian Embassy in New Delhi, India	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		
3. Enhancing visa security thanks to improvement of infrastructure for the issuing of visas in Austrian Embassy in Moscow, Russia	X			X	X			X		X	X		
4. Enhancing visa security thanks to improvement of infrastructure for the issuing of visas in Austrian general consulate in New York, USA	X			X	X			X		X	X		
5. Purchase of 45 notebooks for document advisers at embassies and airports in third countries	X			X	X			X		X	X		

| | 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%
6. CAC - Common Visa Application Centre in Austrian Embassy Astana/Kazakhstan	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		
7. Re-equipping Austrian consulates with computer work places for visa processing.	X			X	X			X		X	X		
8. Integration of photos in visa (scanner, equipment for checking passwords, software for photo processing, printer)	X			X	X			X		X	X		
9. Introduction of Schengen Information System II	X			X	X			X		X			X
10. Implementation of VIS	X			X	X			X		X	X		
11. Adjusting national visa software in Austrian consulates for the requirements of VIS/SIS II	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		

	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													
1. Purchase of a FLIR system for Austrian FRONTEX contribution	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		
2. Implementation of Schengen Information System II	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		
AP 2009													
1. Enhancing processing of visas in Austrian Embassy in Tunis due to improvement of infrastructure	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	

	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%
4. Enhancing the security of visa processing due to building new Embassy offices in Jakarta	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
5. Introducing document advisers in third countries	X			X	X			X		X		X	
7. Implementation of Schengen Information System II	X			X	X			X		X		X	
8. Implementation of Visa Information System	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
9. Equipping the Austrian representative officers with fingerprint scanners and software - VIS implementation	X			X	X			X		X		X	

	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%
10. Improving language competences in visa field	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X	X		
11. Enhancing visa security due to opening an Embassy in Baku (Azerbaijan)	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
AP 2010													
1. Participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory for External Border Control	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	

	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%
2. Enhancing visa security due to building new Embassy offices in Nairobi	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
3. Enhancing the security of visa processing due to building new Embassy offices in Jakarta	X			X	X			X		X		X	
5. Improvement of consulate infrastructure due to expansion of Embassy offices in Algiers	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
8. Equipping the Austrian representative offices with document reading devices and fingerprint scanners and respective software – VIS implementation	X			X	X			X		X		X	

	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%
9. Improvement of consulate infrastructure in Abu Dhabi	X		X (The budget was slightly exceeded by the executing body; the additional costs were borne by the body)		X			X		X		X	
10. Introducing document advisers in third countries	X			X	X			X		X			X

End of the report

☺