

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

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

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

The Republic of Latvia

Date:

23.11.2012

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

Head of Responsible Authority
State Secretary of the Ministry of the Interior

I. Pētersone-Godmane

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

Marija Samoilenko

Senior Administrative Officer
Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Latvia
International Project Co-ordination Division
European Affairs and International Co-operation Department
Phone: (+371 67219070)
e-mail: marija.samoilenko@iem.gov.lv

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

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

Yes

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

PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED;

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION;

PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS;

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

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

External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

The structure of the Ministry of the Interior does not include any department which is obliged to perform in-house evaluation, therefore external evaluation expertise was assigned and evaluation performed by the independent evaluation expert. The Ex-Post Evaluation report on the results and impacts of actions co-financed by the External Borders Fund (AP 2007-2010) was approved by the External Borders Fund Management Committee.

Important remark

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

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

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

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY	4
PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED	4
1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD	4
PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION	8
2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD (IF APPLICABLE)	8
2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD	9
2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS	11
2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)	14
2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP	15
PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS	17
3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT	17
3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD	18
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS	19
3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT	20
3.5. OVERALL RESULTS ACHIEVED WITH THE FUND'S INTERVENTION	22
3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES	23
3.7. LESSONS LEARNED	26
PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE.....	26
4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS	26
4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT	27
4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION	31
4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME	31
4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME	32
4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY	32

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?

Under the External Borders Funds (hereafter - EBF) implementation framework, evaluation is listed as one of the management functions of the Responsible Authority. The structure of the Ministry of the Interior does not include any department which is obliged to perform in-house evaluation, therefore evaluation is provided by external expertise. Evaluation is provided on ad hoc basis, following requests from EC. Evaluation is largely built on the monitoring system of EBF. The implementation framework of the EBF include regular monitoring (on monthly and quarterly basis) on implementation status of projects financed under each action as well as monitoring of financial progress. After project end final beneficiaries are required to submit final reports presenting summary of final results achieved, overview of financial implementation as well as achievement of planned indicators. The correctness and accuracy of this information is assessed by the Responsible Authority and information presented to the Fund's Management Committee. Assessment is largely based on planned/achieved basis, other (side) effects or impact on a larger scale is not analysed.

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

For preparation of this report following data collection methods were applied: document analysis, expert interviews with representatives from Responsible Authority and structured interviews with final beneficiaries.

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?

Ministry of Interior as Responsible Authority and institution bearing the political responsibility on all areas covered by the EBF interventions in cooperation with involved Authorities – final beneficiaries, ensure the inclusion of necessary national co-financing in the annual state budget. Resources are secured on basis of obligations made by signing Multi-annual program and annual programs on EBF implementation.

- 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).

The data included in following tables do not contain EBF related financing (national and EU co-financing).

Border Management

Table n° 1:

	Infrastructure and equipment	Staff	Other	Total
2007 total	4 706 393	33 217 888	1 744 981	39 669 262
2008 total	6 697 328	39 414 411	1 996 988	48 108 726
2009 total	3 653 533	27 124 496	1 018 552	31 796 581
2010 total	3 783 502	24 954 582	795 976	29 534 062
2011 total	5 422 367	25 865 561	949 143	32 237 070
2012 total (as planned)	6 628 120	27 017 161	1 191 132	34 836 412
2012 total for first half year	3 399 561	12 577 163	522 500	16 499 225

Visa Policy

Table n° 2:

	Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections	Staff at visa sections and headquarters	Other	Total
2007 total	4 600 000	12 300 000	0	16 900 000
2008 total	500 000	13 300 000	0	13 800 000
2009 total	500 000	13 200 000	0	13 700 000
2010 total	45 000	6 500 000	0	6 545 000
2011 total	3 800 000	6 900 000	0	10 700 000
2012 total (as planned)	300 000	7 300 000	0	7 600 000
2012 total for first half year	NA	NA	NA	NA

IT Systems

Table n° 3:

	VIS (total investments/all authorities)	SIS (total investments/all authorities)	Total
2007 total	10 899		10 899
2008 total	108 153	577 060	685 213
2009 total	7 231	348 454	355 685
2010 total	7 231	144 517	151 748
2011 total	32 523		32 523
2012 total (as planned)	52 077		52 077
2012 total for first half year	14 462		14 462

Other, if applicable:

Table n° 4

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

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

The above tables include all expenditure in the field of border management, visa policy and IT systems.

- 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.

Staff costs are creating the most part of national contribution in all areas of intervention, e.g. in area of border management staff costs are on average 81,35% from the whole national expenditures. In Visa policy area staff costs are on average 87,56% from the whole national expenditures.

The average share of contribution from the Fund in relation to the total expenditures in Border Management field varies between 3,33% (2007) to 1,20% (2009). If just investments in infrastructure are compared, Funds contribution reached 26,81% in 2007, 17,34% in 2009 and 12,58% in 2010.

The average share of contribution from the Fund in relation to the total expenditures in Visa policy field varies between 0,70% (2008) to 1,84% (2010). If just investments in infrastructure are compared, Funds contribution was 15,42% in 2008, 23,9% in 2009. In 2010 Fund's contribution almost 3,6 times exceeded national expenditures for Visa policy infrastructure.

Situation in IT systems field differs significantly in terms of national expenditures provided for investments. In 2008 share of Fund's contribution was 35,26% comparing to total expenditures. In 2009 and 2010 Fund's share in relation to the total expenditures reached 62,28% in 2009 and 69,96% in 2010..

Calculation of an average share of contribution from the Fund in relation to the total national expenditures in all areas for years 2007-2010 is not relevant due to the significant differences between areas. It can be concluded that the lowest Fund's contribution is provided in Border Management area, but the highest in IT systems area.

- 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 EBF (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 bcp's or consulates etc.). See also section 4.0 on the flows.

In the period since approval of the multi-annual program there are made changes in national legislation related to the approval of the new Law on State border (12.11.2009), Law On operation of the Schengen Information System (14.06.2007), revision of Law on Immigration (26.05.2011) and a number of related Government regulations, reflecting and specifying in more detail issues covered by above mentioned Laws. Changes mainly cover elaboration of provisions of Schengen acquis, in particular Schengen border Code in national legislation acts, as well as provisions of Visa Code. These developments does not have created significant impact to the implementation of the multi-annual program, but they will impact the multi-annual program for the next financing period.

During the reporting period also a Law on management of funds established within the framework of the General programme “Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows” (29.04.2009) came into force defining more precisely the responsibilities of institutions involved in management, supervision and control of the all three funds covered.

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION

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

2.1.1 Overview of calls for proposals for the programmes

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Table n° 5

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Proposals received	-	-	-	-	-
Projects selected	-	-	-	-	-
Projects funded Including multi-annual projects	-	-	-	-	-
Out of which multi-annual 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: N/A

Annual Programme 2008: N/A

Annual Programme 2009: N/A

Annual Programme 2010: N/A

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

N/A

Table n° 6

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	-	-	-	-	-

Out of which multi-annual	-	-	-	-	-
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

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

N/A

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 3)	-	-	-	-	-
Projects funded without such calls (total "projects funded" table 4)	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL Projects funded in the “awarding body” method (including multi-annual 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.

N/A

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?

All actions are implemented using the executing body implementation method considering the fact that all actions of the EBF can be implemented only by a limited number of the state authorities who have *de jure* monopoly rights on implementation of these actions.

The responsible Authority organises a pre-selection of the actions to be included in the Annual Program (AP) within the limits of the available budget. The amount of financing allocated to each action and the Competent Authority for the implementation of the respective action is determined by the Management Committee during the planning period.

Competent Authorities are responsible for preparation and submission of the project application to the Responsible Authority for the assessment and approval. Responsible Authority send out invitations to the Competent Authorities to submit project applications under the annual program in the 1st quarter of the respective year.

Submitted project applications are evaluated against predefined criteria by the Project applications' Evaluation Commission (established by the Responsible Authority). Evaluation criteria of the submitted project applications are approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia and fully comply with the minimum selection criteria defined in the basic act. Evaluation of the submitted project applications lasts approximately 3 months. Responsible Authority approves all project applications submitted by the Competent Authorities that correspond to the evaluation criteria and signs the implementation agreement with the Competent Authorities (similar to the grant agreement).

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

Under the EBF Annual programmes 2007 to 2010 one project was selected without a call for expression of interest. The aforementioned selection method was used due to unexpected request for extra funding. The Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs in the 1st half of the year 2010 made a request for the extra funding for a new action 1.4. "Preparing for the enhanced control and verification of biometric travel documents through the participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory", which was not planned initially under the Annual Programme 2008. The request was approved during the procedure of reconciliation of funding within the revised Annual Programme 2008.

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, 2008 ¹	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Proposals received	5*	4	5	14
Project selected	5*	4	5	14
Projects funded	5*	4	5	14
Out of which multi-annual projects	3	3	5	11

¹ First call for proposals within the framework of AP 2007 and 2008 was organised jointly. Therefore information provided for AP 2007 and AP 2008 is combined.

* One project under 2008 programme was selected under EBM without call for proposals. See table 2.2.3.

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

Annual Programme 2007: N/A

Annual Programme 2008: N/A

Annual Programme 2009: N/A

Annual Programme 2010: N/A

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

Table n° 9

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	0	1	0	0	1
Out of which multi-annual	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 2007,2008 ¹	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, or similar selection method (see table 8)	5	4	5	14
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	1	0	0	1
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method (including multi-annual)	6	4	5	15

¹ First call for proposals within the framework of AP 2007 and 2008 was organised jointly. Therefore information provided for AP 2007 and AP 2008 is combined

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.

According to the Regulation of Cabinet of Ministers No 676 On management and control funds established under the General programme “Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows” after the EBF Management Committee decision on approval of selected projects, the necessary co-financing is allocated from the state budget. The Project Control Division of the Ministry of Interior is responsible for verifying the presence of co-financing.

2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS

2.3.1. Overview of revisions for 2007-2010 annual programmes

Table n° 11

AP	EU contribution allocated	Was a revision concerning a change of more than 10% of the allocation needed? (Y/N)	Percentage of allocation concerned by the revision, if a revision was needed
AP 2007	1 516 647,15 EUR	N	N/A
AP 2008	1 768 169,71 EUR	Y	15,2%
AP 2009	2 043 260 EUR	Y	49,4%
AP 2010	1 863 916 EUR	Y	12,5%

2.3.2. In case a programme revision was necessary, please provide the main reasons. Please select 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
- ☐ All/part of the above
- ☒ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration:

Savings of funds occurred during implementation of the single multi-annual project because construction contracts were cheaper than initially planned. Savings were used for some measures of the same multi-annual project that were initially planned under the 2008 programme and moved to 2007 programme.

Annual programme 2008

- ☒ 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:

The Annual program 2008 was revised twice following savings under actions 1.1., 5.1. and 5.2. Main part of savings were redistributed to action 4.1. (Development of National VIS) and to the new action 1.4. "Preparing for the enhanced control and verification of biometric travel documents through the participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory", that was introduced following the request of the Office of Migration and Citizenship Affairs.

Annual programme 2009

- ☒ 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:

Initially within the Annual Programme 2009 for the EBF it was planned to implement the action 4.2. supporting integration of the National Biometrics Data processing system with the Schengen Information System II (SIS II) and the Integrated Information System of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Latvia (IIS). Due to delay of elaboration of the SIS II (final version of the specifications of SIS II which applies to the system to be put into operation was not agreed yet) the decision about putting the system into operation was delayed as well. Management Committee of the EBF decided to shift the implementation of action 4.2. "The integration of the national biometrics data processing system with the Integrated Information System of the Ministry of the Interior and SIS II" to the AP 2010 and AP 2011. Savings in the total amount of 1 474 320 EUR were relocated for implementation of Action 1.2 ("Equipping the border checkpoints on the railway between Zilupe, Indra and Karsava and state borders with the video surveillance system") and Action 4.1. ("The development of the National VIS, providing its compliance with the final version of the technical documentation provided by the EC and the provision of the necessary training courses for the personnel of the State Border Guards and Consular officials").

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:

The EBF Annual Programme 2010 was revised due to inability of State Border Guards to organize the procurement process and signature of service agreement for action 1.2. „Equipping the border checkpoints on the railway between Zilupe, Indra and Karsava and state borders with the video surveillance system” within the eligibility period of AP 2010. According to the realistic timetable the process could be started just after the end of the AP 2010 eligibility period (30 June 2012). As a result the action was shifted to the AP 2011. The financing was relocated to actions 4.1. ("The development of the National VIS, providing its compliance with the final version of the technical documentation provided by the EC and the provision of the necessary training courses for the personnel of the State Border Guards and Consular officials"), 4.2. "The Integration of the National Biometric Data Processing System with the Integrated Information System of the Ministry of the Interior and SIS II", 4.4. "Description of NSIS II involving development of national register in compliance with requirements of technical specification's 3.0 version of SIS II Interface Control Document and conformity testing", 4.5 Tieback of National Entry/Exit System to SIS II".

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?

Revisions of annual programmes allowed to use the available financing at full scale within the programme eligibility periods. Revisions in general helped to achieve the expected quantitative and qualitative results of the programmes.

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12 *

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	136 165 EUR	135 232,17 EUR
2008	153 772 EUR	150 323,39 EUR
2009	173 010 EUR	172 346,81EUR
2010	160 474 EUR	46 731,49 EUR**
Total 2007-2010	623 421 EUR	504 633,86 EUR

*approximately 1% difference in the amounts, because the calculations were made by applying a fixed rate (0,702804) of the euro.

**situation on 31.03.2012 (eligibility period deadline – 31.03.2013)

Table n° 13

AP/Use of TA (€)	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°/€)	IT and equipment	Office/ consumables	Travelling/ events	Monitoring, project management	Reporting, translation	Total
2007	97 782,71	0,00	0,00	8 667,04	26 894,41	2 807,77	136 151,93
2008	137 090,24	525,55	26,35	7 349,85	6 490,83	113,22	151 596,04
2009	138 449,09	2 077,28	1 829,71	15 437,85	15 717,92	0,00	173 511,85
2010	58 005,79	0,00	82,54	2 561,91	9 503,23	0,00	70 153,47*

*situation on 30.06.2012 (eligibility period deadline – 31.03.2013)

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?

According to the institutions benefiting from the TA the TA support proved to be useful allowing to carry out the main functions related to programme management, supervision and control. Following activities are considered as the most helpful TA support:

- RA, CA and AA employees' remuneration;
- travel expenses for employees, including costs for travel to perform on-the-spot checks;
- remuneration costs for detailed project application evaluation (evaluation of Project applications under the annual Programmes 2007/2008, 2009 and 2010 were provided by the Project application Evaluation Commission members or outsourced experts who are performing in depth analysis of submitted applications);
- publicity costs for annual publicity campaign, wherewith the potential beneficiaries of financing were presented with the Fund planning documentation, supported priorities and activities, as well as information about the Fund compliance provisions and the Project selection procedure.

According to the RA the existing TA support covers all necessary costs and there is no need for the TA to allow other elements to be funded.

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.

The Ministry of the Interior is responsible for the Implementation of all 3 Funds (External Borders Fund, European Refugee Fund and European Return Fund), therefore the established Management and Control System covers all these 3 Funds. During the reporting period the Management and Control System was changed following approval of "Law on management of funds established within the framework of the General programme "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows"" in 2009 (in force since 29th April 2009). The initial Management and Control System was effective from 28th September 2007 till 1st January 2010. The revised system description was submitted to the European Commission on 14th February 2012.

Changes in the Management and Control System included reference to the new Law which defines rights and responsibilities of the authorities involved in management of the funds and final beneficiaries of the funds, as well as other issues connected to the management of the funds. E.g. according to the Law the Responsible Authority, the Audit Authority, the Certifying Authority and the Payment Authority, and if necessary, the Delegated Authority, as well as duties and rights of the above mentioned authorities are defined by the Cabinet of Ministers. Changes also included editorial changes in the descriptions of authorities, updated information on implementation of technical assistance project for the RA, updated descriptions of "Monitoring of the projects implemented by the final beneficiaries", "Irregularities, corrections and recoveries" and "Information management".

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?

Regarding the EBF fund, the European Return fund and the European Refugee fund under the General Programme "Solidarity and Management of migration flows", the Responsible Authority legally and financially depends on the relevant decisions of the Commission.

At the same time, considering the time needed for formal approval of a programme, the Responsible Authority, after it receives the positive informal response from the EC, provides the selection of the projects and the conclusion of the grant agreements, thus ensuring implementation of the projects.

Regarding the financial aspect, the financing of projects under the General Programme is initially planned in the State budget as grants, thus the availability of financial resources of the Commission at the beginning of the implementation of project doesn't directly affect cash flows.

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

Table n° 14

Implementation rates by priority						
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	Priority 4	Priority 5	Total

	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP7	99,29	99,29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99,29	99,29
AP8	98,43	98,75	0	0	0	0	99,34	99,34	98,66	98,66	98,70	98,91
AP 2009	93,72	93,72	0	0	0	0	98,95	98,95	93,07	93,07	98,08	98,08
AP 2010	0,00	0,00	0	0	0	0	99,89	99,86	82,82	82,82	98,65	98,62
%												

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.:

The implementation of the EBF allocations in Latvia from 2007 to 2010 can be considered as good, taking into consideration that all but one actions were implemented as planned (one action was shifted to the later annual program), planned results achieved at the estimated scale and none of actions exceeded initially set costs. Institutions responsible for management, supervision and control of the EBF in Latvia from 2007 to 2010 also demonstrated good flexibility initiating a number of programme revisions resulting in more effective relocation and use of programme financing within the set eligibility period. No substantial problems related with implementation of the AP 2007 to 2010 were encountered during implementation of programmes.

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

	Common Core Indicators								
	OUTPUT						RESULTS		
2. Border surveillance systems	Number of technical designs elaborated								
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	3	0	3						
12. Training and risk analysis	Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded			No of persons trained			Number of persons regularly using the upgraded infrastructure		
Total	1	0	1	42	0	42	314	174	314

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? (Please detail)

AP 2007

Under the 2007 Annual Programme implementation of just one multi annual project was started therefore no results was achieved.

AP 2008

Under the 2008 Annual Programme implementation of multi-annual project related to the improvement of training infrastructure for State Border Guards was finished. It has increased capacity of the College of the State Border Guard to accommodate and train the personnel, working in the border guard service (e.g. average No of persons regularly using the upgraded infrastructure has increased by 140 persons), thus it is consistent with the objective set in the MAP: “To develop the infrastructure necessary for the qualitative training of the State Border Guards personnel”.

AP 2008 also funded project related to the participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory and covered training of 42 Public Key Directory users thus contributing to the achievement of the MAP objectives related to the increase of administrative capacity and improvement of professional qualifications of personnel.

AP 2009

Under AP 2009 one project was implemented related to the elaboration of 3 technical designs for establishment of video surveillance systems on the railway between 3 border checkpoints and state borders. Elaboration of one of these video surveillance systems are just started under the AP 2011 programme, therefore it can be concluded that AP 2009 partially has contributed to the achievement of MAP objective “To develop the technical equipment necessary for external border control”.

AP 2010

N/a

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.

Results achieved under the above mentioned projects and actions have positively contributed to the improvement of overall border management in Latvia. The highest impact can be observed in relation to the improvement of State Border Guards training infrastructure, which is currently being regularly used and the number of regular users is increasing. However due to the limited scale and specific nature of other supported projects the observable impact on the cut off date of this report is limited, especially in relation to the video surveillance of borders. The full expected impact here can be observed just after the installation of all 3 planned video surveillance systems (planned under 2012 and later AP's).

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

N/A

3.2.2. To what extent are the achievements of the 2007-2010 annual programmes consistent with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme?

AP 2007

N/A

AP 2008

N/A

AP 2009

N/A

AP 2010

N/A

- 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.

N/A

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

Common Core Indicators								
	OUTPUT						RESULTS	
6. SIS	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						% of successful connection tests	
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010					
Total	2	0	2				100%	
7. VIS	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of connected	
							Consulates	BPC's other stakeholders
Total	3	0	3				45	29 32
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded						Number of institutional stakeholders connected	
Total	1	0	1				2	
8.1. API								
8.2. FADO								
8.3. National systems	1	0	1					

- 3.3.2.** To what extent are the achievements of the 2007-2010 annual programmes consistent with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme?

AP 2007

N/A

AP 2008

Under the AP 2008 one multi-annual project is implemented targeting at ensurance of data exchange between NVIS and CVIS. Under this project the National VIS and VIS Mail platform was elaborated. Project has established necessary preconditions for data exchange between NVIS and CVIS thus contributing to the achievement of the MAP objective: “To develop information technologies used for the EU external border control.”

AP 2009

Under the AP 2009 also one project was implemented continuing process for ensurance of compatibility of NVIS with the latest EU defined requirements. Within the project functionality of VISION and VIS Mail was ensured, data exchange provided and VIS testing tool developed. Project has improved the data exchange between NVIS and CVIS and provided new functionality thus contributing to the achievement of the MAP objective: “To develop information technologies used for the EU external border control.”

AP 2010

Under the AP 2010 in total four projects were implemented. One project was continuing improvement of NVIS compliance with latest requirements. In particular, VIS Mail II national technical solution was elaborated and NVIS updated to the latest requirements. Two projects are related with the functionality of Schengen information system and included elaboration of National SIS II system updates according to ICD 3.0 requirements and elaboration of technical design for tieback of National Entry / Exit System to SIS II. The last project was targeted to the integration of the National Biometrics Data Processing System with the Integrated Information System of the Ministry of Interior and SIS II. Last two projects are multi annual projects and under the AP 2010 just the first preparatory works (elaboration of technical design, analysis) were provided. All mentioned projects are contributing to the achievement of the MAP objective: “To develop information technologies used for the EU external border control.”

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.

Results achieved under the above mentioned projects and actions have positively contributed to the improvement of functionality of information technologies used for the EU external border control in Latvia. The highest impact can be observed in relation to the data exchange between NVIS and CVIS, that is fully ensured since October 2011. By the cut-off date of the report activities related to the functionality of SIS are still ongoing, as the multi-annual projects are just started under the AP 2010 and no significant impact can be observed yet (support for these activities are planned under AP2011 and later AP's).

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

Common Core Indicators							
OUTPUT				RESULTS			
10. Consular infrastructure	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Reduction of admitted complaints, %
	Actually achieved through APs	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				

	2007-2010						
Total	1	0	1				50%
7. VIS	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of connected
							Consulates BPC's other stakeholders
Total	1	0	1				45 29 32
12. Training and risk analysis	No of persons trained						Number of institutional collaborations on training developed
Total	509	~300	509				

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?

AP 2007

N/A

AP 2008

Under the AP 2008 two projects related to the capacity building of consular officials by training, exchange of experience and provision of online consular Handbook are implemented. In total 92 officials were trained on latest developments in EU visa legislation, and electronic handbook elaborated including both information on all legislation, procedures and template, and also serving as inner communication tool. Both projects are clearly contributing to the achievement of MAP objectives: “To improve the effectiveness of work of Latvian Consular net abroad”, and “To promote uniform application of provisions of Community law”.

AP 2009

Under the AP 2009 two very similar projects were implemented, including training of consular officials and elaboration of handbook for usage of National VIS. In total 190 consular officials received training on latest developments in EU visa legislation in Schengen area and non-Schengen area. One Handbook for usage of NVIS was compiled and provided in online mode electronically for all OCMA regional units, all BCP and all Latvian Representations abroad. Both projects are contributing to the achievement of more than one MAP objective: “To improve the effectiveness of work of Latvian Consular net abroad”, “To increase administrative capacity of institutions involved in border control and migration flow control”, and “To promote uniform application of provisions of Community law”.

AP 2010

Under the AP 2010 one training project for consular officials was implemented, including training for 185 officials on latest developments in EU visa legislation in Schengen area and non-Schengen area, and discussions on best practice and exchange of experience involving also representatives from other institutions (SBG, OCMA, State Police, Security agencies). Project are clearly contribute to the achievement of MAP objectives: “To improve the effectiveness of work of Latvian Consular net abroad”, and “To promote uniform application of provisions of Community law”.

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 number trained persons under the regular training projects for consular officials do not differ significantly comparing with previous years (2006 and 2007) where approximately the same number of officials were trained under the similar training projects funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The programme funding has allowed to organize training not just in Latvia but also in other countries, allowing for experience exchange and analysis of real cases and situation in various countries. Introduction of two online tools on visa issuance and on use of NVIS also demonstrate positive impact. The number of admitted complaints related to visa issuance is decreasing, showing positive tendency and directly observable impact of programme actions – both training and introduction of online tools.

3.5. Overall results achieved with the Fund's intervention

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

Table n° 19: Overall 2007-2010 EBF results following aggregation by priorities

Common Core Indicators									
	OUTPUT						RESULTS		
2. Border surveillance systems	Number of technical designs elaborated								
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
Total	3	0	3						
6. SIS	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						% of successful connection tests		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
Total	2	0	2				100%		
7. VIS	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of connected		
							Consulates	BPC's	other stakeholders
Total	4	0	4				45	29	32
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded						Number of institutional stakeholders connected		
Total	1	0	1				2		
8.1. API									
8.2. FADO									
8.3. National systems	1	0	1						
10. Consular infrastructure	Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Reduction of admitted complaints, %		
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
Total	1	0	1				50%		

12. Training and risk analysis	No of persons trained			Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded			Number of persons regularly using the upgraded infrastructure		
Total	509	~300	509	1	0	1	314	174	314

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 in relation to your initially set expectations (as presented in Table n° 16)

Achievement level of the overall results is very positive as all planned results are achieved and for some projects/actions clearly observable impacts were identified. A number of projects/actions are multi-annual and have not reached their ultimate goals yet. Therefore it is too early to recognize their impact.

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 multi-annual strategy and your national requirements.

Project name	To develop the infrastructure, necessary for the qualitative training of the State Border Guard personnel
Start and end date	14.11.2008-31.12.2009.
Total budget	1 976 807 EUR
Commission contribution (as a percentage)	75%
Name of the entity managing the project	State Border Guard
Countries involved (<i>if relevant</i>)	N/A

1) What is the project about?

Within the framework of annual programmes 2007 and 2008 the stage I reconstruction works of the State Border Guard College (SBG) training ground “Janapole” was carried out. This infrastructure project included construction of the training fields for practical shooting, construction of firing line’s buildings, creation of artesian well, construction of water pipe systems, construction of sewerage and drainage systems, construction of electrical power network and transformer substation, construction

of training border precincts and training fields, construction of a observation tower, ensuring technical project supervision and author supervision during the construction.

2) What are/were the results and outputs of the project?

Multi-annual project improved the training infrastructure and thus contributed to the improvement of SBG training programme quality. Established training infrastructure is used for SGB officials professional qualification and further education.

3) Who benefited from the project, and how?

Projects direct beneficiary is the State Border Guards College, but indirectly the whole SBG benefited from the project. The SBG College is a state-founded higher education establishment under supervision of the SBG, the main goal of which is the professional preparation of the SBG staff. Therefore, the successful implementation of the project provided the SBG with the necessary number of qualified employees in order to ensure successful involvement of the SBG in operations of common EU border control. After the project implementation there is a growing number of students and cadets in the College, as well as the number of SBG personnel who are participating in various capacity building seminars is growing.

4) What do you like about the project?

Project has been implemented according to initial plans and broadly in line with the programme schedule. No substantial problems were encountered during implementation of the project. Project managers also demonstrated flexibility during the implementation in order to use the financing at the most efficient way.

5) Why would you consider this project to be useful/interesting and what makes it special?

This project is one of the only multi-annual investment project that was started and finished during the 2007 – 2010 programmes. It is a good example of good management. Project has created conditions for SBG training programme quality improvement and professional qualification and further education of SBG officials.

6) Is there something about the project that is particular to your Member State (e.g. issues addressed or approach)?

Project has successfully addressed one specific problem and provided basis for further development (e.g. in the territory of the training ground specific training model for training of escorting situations was built under the Return fund programme).

Project name	Providing the regional training for the consular officials about the common visa policy, in accordance with the requirements of the European Visa Code
Start and end date	14.11.2008 -15.06.2015
Total budget	904 944 EUR
Commission contribution (as a percentage)	75%
Name of the entity managing the project	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Countries involved (<i>if relevant</i>)	N/A
---	-----

1) What is the project about?

The aim of this multi-annual project is to organize regional trainings for the consular officials. Taking into consideration the high level of staff rotation among Latvian diplomatic and consular representations abroad, the trainings are organized under every annual programme (2008-2012).

2) What are/were the results and outputs of the project?

Project has provided the consular officials with training on the following matters:

- a) latest amendments in legal basis regarding the processing of the visa applications and visa issuing and the effective application of the provisions of the legal basis regarding visa issuing;
- b) illegal migration;
- c) the effective use of different information systems concerning visa issuing;
- d) the practical aspects for the application of the provisions of legal basis and the information systems regarding visa issuing – during particular phase of training participants are trained in practice on visa issuing in respective region.

3) Who benefited from the project, and how?

All consular officials are direct beneficiaries of this project and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is the main beneficiary of the project. MFA is competent to issue Schengen visas (which is ensured by the network of the diplomatic and consular missions of Latvia), as well as to ensure the co-ordination of the operation among such diplomatic and consular missions. The successful implementation of the project has regularly provided consular service of the Republic of Latvia with qualitative and full-scale trained staff on matters of issuing Schengen visas.

4) What do you like about the project?

Project is continuation of training projects started already under the Schengen Facility program. In 2006-2007 the MFA has financed similar trainings from its own budget.

Project is implemented using well organized and well tested approach that allows efficiently organize training that is based on practice, exchange of experience and discussions.

5) Why would you consider this project to be useful/interesting and what makes it special?

Under each project guest lecturers from other Schengen member states are invited. As a result consular officials that are regularly participating in training are receiving significant and first hand experience on application of provisions of the Union law regarding issuing of Schengen visas in various countries.

6) Is there something about the project that is particular to your Member State (e.g. issues addressed or approach)?

Projects normally include three training sessions (one in Schengen area, one in non-Schengen area and one in Latvia, involving representatives also from other institutions, which work is related with visa issuing, e.g. OCMA, SBG, State Police etc.). Project is thus serving not only as exchange

of experience with other countries, but also with institutions from Latvia and improves the cooperation ties.

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.

As already mentioned above, training projects, that involve trainers from other countries, have demonstrated added value providing opportunity to get in-depth first-hand experience from other countries. During the training their participants also are establishing important personal contacts with lecturers.

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

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

All projects implemented under the 2007-2010 programme have proven to be successful in achievement of planned results and use of programme funding in efficient way, therefore it is difficult to mention any less successful project. Projects that are implemented mainly under 2007 – 2008 programme are demonstrating higher impact comparing to those which are implemented under 2009 and 2010 programme and have not yet created the expected impact at the full scale.

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.

The high rates of achievement of project results and absorption of financing is evidencing that established Fund's management system is effective and efficient. Project planning is realistic, results are achievable within the given time frame and available resources.

The selected strategy in organizing trainings for consular officials has proven to be successful.

3.7.2.2.

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

N/A

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

4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS

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

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

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	2 133 668 *	3 826 454	4 511 600
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	2 828 *	695	1 209
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	No statistical data available		
Visa applications made	168 965	125 734	170 964
Visas issued	166 102	121 465	163 961

** Number of all passenger crossings is provided, as there are no statistical data available separating No of crossing of external borders at airports and seaports for that time period.*

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.

Projects supported under the 2007-2010 programmes are mainly targeted at capacity building of institutions involved in border management and control of migration flows. The provided support has created an immediate positive effect to the everyday work of institutions, e.g. personnel is better prepared for making decisions, a number of tools are accessible online. However there is no directly observable causal link between Fund intervention and changes in migration trends in Latvia.

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?

Planning of Fund interventions is mainly based on provisions of legislation (both EU and national level) and not on analysis of migration flows. Migration flow is considered by the responsible authorities as an external factor, that is evidently increasing. Therefore more efforts are put for ensuring the necessary capacity of authorities to deal with the increasing migration flow, but no interventions are planned that can directly influence migration flow.

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?

Most direct and significant Fund's intervention in support to the border management was the elaboration of 3 technical designs for video surveillance systems under the AP 2009, as the

elaboration of systems that are planned under later programmes will significantly reduce the risks of illegal border crossing between the border and the BPC's at railway stations of Zilupe, Karsava and Indra.

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

The most significant support for visa issuing was provided by multi annual training projects for consular officials, that have ensured unified approach in provision of EU visa legislation. Electronic online handbook is an important element in ensuring quality of visa issuing process.

- 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 EBF has provided significant support in development of NVIS and ensuring its compliance and data exchange with CVIS as well as supporting development of NSIS. Without the EBF financing none of IT systems would be developed at their current compliance level.

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

It is not possible to evaluate the extent of Funds contribution for improvement of secure borders in society, as there are no comparable data on Funds image in society available. Actions implemented by the EBF in Latvia are mainly targeted to improvement of capacity of institutions and are less visible for general public.

- 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 EBF is the main and in some cases (e.g. IT systems) the only financing source for investments in EBF intervention fields. There are no national investment programmes in areas of EBF intervention. Basic level of financing is provided from state budget covering staff and maintenance costs to ensure main functions.

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.

Under the AP 2009 support for elaboration of 3 technical designs for video surveillance systems on border checkpoint at the railway was provided. The elaboration of one system is started under the AP 2011. There is no observable impact of Funds intervention to the response capacity yet.

- 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?

In the current period no specific support was provided for the introduction of EUROSUR.

- 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.

Multi-annual training projects for consular officials have increased their capacity and improved quality of visa issuing process as evidenced by reduction of number of admitted complaints related to visa issuing (according to MoFA since starting of visa complaints in 2011 the number of admitted complaint is decreasing almost by half).

- 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).

Due to the limited financial envelope Fund's assistance is provided to cover the most urgent needs and just well tested technologies are being purchased.

- 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?

If the Fund would not have been available, the main part of activities (e.g. training, elaboration of online handbooks, reconstruction of training ground) would have been financed from state budget on a limited scale and in the longer time period. Elaboration of IT systems most likely would not have been financed.

- 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)

EBF intervention in the reference period has extended border management capability just on a limited scale as mainly preparatory activities have been financed.

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

EBF intervention have supported introduction of important tools and ensured regular training scheme on visa issues that is having positive effect on visa issuing.

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)

EBF has provided crucial contribution to investment in SIS and VIS in Latvia due to lack of national programmes and limited national budget.

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.

Fund's interence was targeted to address the most urgent deficiencies at external borders (namely high risk of illegal crossings between the border and border checking points on railway). However this weakness will be addressed just after the establishment of video surveillance systems (planned under 2011 and later programs).

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.

Fund's interence has enabled to significantly improve the capacity of personal involved in visa issuing process. Decreasing number of admitted complains can be attributed to the Funds assistance, thus demonstrating direct impact.

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

No specific other effects were identified.

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 development of VIS and SIS, establishment of video surveillance system) 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

Without the Fund's financing training and elaboration of online handbook would be carried out on a limited scale. Development of VIS and SIS, as well as establishment of video surveillance systems would not have been carried out.

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.

No support for improvement of capacity at BCP's was provided under the Fund.

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.

Fund has not made any difference in the overall development of Latvian national border management system and strategies. It is being considered as a good financing source supporting specific areas.

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?

Based on the analysis of achieved results, existing needs and problems it can be concluded, that programme objectives are still relevant to the initially identified problems and needs. The limited financial envelope has allowed to finance the most urgent priorities. As current evaluation is covering just the first part of the EBF multi-annual program it is too early to observe any significant impacts that can require need for reshaping of strategies or significantly change interventions.

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 multi-annual programme) have been attained. Are the effects resulting from the intervention consistent with its objectives?

By the cut-off date of this report the key results of the programme are related to the improvement of the capacity of institutions involved in the border management and visa issuing. Current achievements have contributed to the achievement of desired results and objectives set out in the multi-annual programme. It should be noted that objectives, planned results and their indicators as

set out in MAP and AP's often are generally formulated and can not be aggregated using the indicators proposed by the current report Guidance document. It should be also noted that in some cases (e.g. related to the video surveillance systems, or SIS development) it is too early to observe any impact.

4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME

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

Table n° 21

Calendar year	TA contribution (€)	National contribution (€)	National contribution in-kind (offices, IT tools) – (€ estimate)	Total (€)
2007	0	0	0	0
2008	69 993,06	0	0	69 993,06
2009	115 327,02	0	0	115 327,02
2010	161 240,69	0	0	161 240,69
2011	142 416,79	0	0	142 416,79
First six month 2012	57 433,09	0	0	57 433,09

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	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
2008	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
2009	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
2010	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
2011	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
First six month 2012	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

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

The total programme administration costs are reaching 5,8 % from the total program costs. Such ratio is acceptable and efficient.

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.

In the reconstructed training ground of the SBG College under the EBF AP 2007/2008 a specific training model for delivery of forced return escort training programme was established under the Return Fund AP 2010. No other specific synergies or complementarity with other programmes was identified.

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.)

Under the European Regional Development Fund there is provided financing for development of State Border Guards IT system RAIS in amount of 500 000 EUR. No other financing is available in the Fund's intervention areas.

* * *

Overall list of outputs and results indicators	
ANNEX	

[illegible]

4.3. Other																		
5. Border infrastructure	Number of BCPs 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 bcp's modernised out of the total			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			
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		
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded									Number of institutional stakeholders involved								
	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. 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						Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)		
	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				
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		
	Achieved through APs 2007-	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-				Achieved through APs	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline				

	2010			2010		2010				2007-2010		2007-2010						
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded			Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded						Average waiting time for visa issuing								
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline							
12. Training and risk analysis	No of persons trained			Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of reports issued			Number of institutional collaborations on risk analysis developed			Number of institutional collaborations on training 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	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
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).)

OVERALL MANAGEMENT OF THE ACTIONS IN THE APS 2007-2010

Legend	Questions: 1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?												
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
	Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2007													
A1 To develop the infrastructure, necessary for the qualitative training of the State Border Guard personal	yes			no	yes			no		no		yes	
AP 2008													
A1 To develop the infrastructure, necessary for the qualitative training of the State Border Guard personnel	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
A2 Preparing for the enhanced control and verification of biometric travel documents through the participation in the ICAO Public Key Directory	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
A3 The development of the National VIS, providing its compliance with the final version of the technical documentation provided by the EC and the provision of the necessary training courses for the personnel of the State Border Guard and Consular officials	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
A4 Providing the regional training for the consular officials about the policy of issuing the unified EU visas, in accordance with the requirements of the European Visa	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes

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%
Code													
A5 The update of the consular officials' handbook, creating it in an electronic version and providing access to it in the on-line mode	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
AP 2009													
A1 Equipping the border checkpoints on the railway between Zilupe, Indra and Karsava and state borders with the video surveillance system	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
A2 The development of the National VIS, providing its compliance with the final version of the technical documentation provided by the EC and the provision of the necessary training courses for the personnel of the State Border Guard and Consular officials	yes			no	yes			no		no			yes
A3 Providing the regional training for the consular officials about the policy of issuing the unified EU visas, in accordance with the requirements of the European Visa Code	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		
A4 Elaboration of a handbook for usage of National VIS	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		
AP 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%
A1 Equipping the border checkpoints on the railway between Zilupe, Indra and Karsava and state borders with the video surveillance system		No (action was relocated to later programs)		no		No (it was not possible to organize procurement procedure within the eligibility period of program)		no		no			yes
A2 The development of National VIS, providing its compliance with the final version of the technical documentation provided by the EC	yes			no	yes			no		no	yes		
A3 The integration of the National Biometrics Data Processing System with the Integrated Information System of the Ministry of Interior and SIS II	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		
A4 Description of NSIS II involving development of national register in compliance with requirements of technical specification's 3.0 version of SIS II Interface Control Document and conformity testing	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		
A5 Tieback of National Entry / Exit System to SIS II	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		
A6 Providing the regional training for the consular officials about the	yes			no	yes			no		no	no		

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%
policy of issuing the unified EU visas, in accordance with the requirements of the European Visa Code and the Common Consular Instructions													

--