

Template for preparation by Member States of the

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

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

*Please fill in the enclosed template*

*(preferably in English, French or German)*

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

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Czech Republic

Date:

25<sup>th</sup> June 2010

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

PhDr. Tomas HAISMAN, Director of the Department for Asylum and Migration Policy,  
Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic

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

Ing. Michal Ďuriš, phone No.: +420 974 832 259, e-mail: [solidarita@mvcv.cz](mailto:solidarita@mvcv.cz)  
Bc. Lucie Příplatová, phone No. +420 974 832 469, e-mail: [solidarita@mvcv.cz](mailto:solidarita@mvcv.cz)

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

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

Yes/ No

no

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

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

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

no in-house evaluation expertise

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

no external evaluation expertise

### *Brief description of the methodology used by the evaluation expertise*

To provide an expert evaluation of the results and impact of activities co-financed by the External Borders Fund as listed in the following tables, the methods of monitoring and summarization of data available to the Responsible authority were used, such as respective Annual programmes, lists of projects received, selected and funded.

#### Important remark

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

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

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

**CONTENTS**

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

## **Part I**

### **Summary of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013**

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

## 1. ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS IN THE MEMBER STATE

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

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

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

- The requirements in the Member State in relation to the baseline situation

Requirements of the Czech Republic in relation to the initial situation were directed mainly to the following areas:

- border protection and control,
- information technologies (SIS, VIS),
- visa policy and consular cooperation,
- education of consular staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic and members of the Czech Police, or the Alien Police.

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

There have been set the following operational objectives in the Czech Republic:

### Operational objective 1

Strengthening efficiency of the border control system at international airports.

### Operational objective 2

Increase of ability of border guards to execute border checks and surveillance at international airports via using the most up-to-date technical equipment, means of transport and communication technique.

### Operational objective 3

Improvement of conditions in diplomatic missions as regards security and equipment

### Operational objective 4

Enhancement of functioning of the national part of the Visa Information System and the national part of the Schengen Information System, the API system, building up of backup centre.

#### Operational objective 5

More efficient assessment and management of migration flows through risk analysis and strengthening combating illegal migration.

#### Operational objective 6

Enhancement of performance of tasks related to application of legal instruments of the Community in the field of external border and visas and strengthening capacities and expertise of authorities responsible for management of external borders and consular offices.

## 2. **STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES**

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

*Under each Priority, describe:*

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

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

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

*A maximum length is indicated for each item.*



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

*Maximum length: half a page*

The aim of the strategy within Priority 1 was to achieve an improvement in the security at international airports through the modernisation and procurement of technical equipment for checks of documents, monitoring and camera systems and other external security systems at international airports in compliance with operational objective 1 (i.e. the strengthening of border protection system efficiency at international airports) and objective 2 (increasing border guards' ability to carry out border checks and security at international airports using the latest technical equipment, means of transportation and communications technology).

These objectives are achieved through actions 1-3 within Priority 1 of the EBF multiannual programme. The following projects were implemented within these events:

1. Camera systems at the international airports (in Brno and in Pardubice)
2. Purchase of technical equipment for checks of travel documents
3. Modernizing of the special vehicle with mobile thermovisual means

By implementing these projects,

- the quality of border protection at international airports was improved and quality of surveillance enhanced
- travellers' check-in was sped up, and the efficiency in the search for falsified documents was increased and the process accelerated

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

not applicable

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

The objective of this strategy within Priority 3 is the development of consulate infrastructure. This covers mostly increased security in visa sections of diplomatic missions and their staff by procuring technical resources. These technical resources include camera systems, visa counters equipped with consulate windows and bullet-proof glass with a security pick-up,

security detection frames, safes for the protection of visa stickers and other sensitive documents from misuse, comprehensive building adjustments in selected diplomatic missions improving the overall security of the diplomatic mission in the respective destination.

These objectives were achieved through separate actions and/or the following projects within Priority 3 of the EBF programme lasting several years:

1. Alteration of the consular section in the diplomatic mission in Bangkok
2. Alteration of the consular section in the diplomatic mission in Pretoria
3. Alteration of the consular section in the diplomatic mission in Kiev
4. Alteration of the consular section in the diplomatic mission in Sanaa
5. Extension of camera coverage in the waiting rooms in consular offices
6. Replacement of consular windows
7. Procurement of safes for consular trade unions
8. Procurement of security frames

By implementing these projects, there was a major increase in the security in selected areas of the diplomatic missions and in the protection of consular staff during their working hours thanks to the procurement of security equipment, camera systems and carrying out building modifications in the consular section at the respective diplomatic missions.

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

A total of three objectives were set within Priority 4:

- A. Launch of IT systems at international airports
- B. Launch of IT systems for diplomatic missions
- C. Know-how exchange among SIRENE operators

Within objective A, the following actions/projects are being/were implemented:

1. Construction of back-up centre CIS
2. Terminal solution for airport checks
3. Biometric reading devices for VIS
4. Biometric data reading for handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions
5. Training of SIRENE operators and meeting of SIRENE management

By implementing these actions, the following is being/was achieved:

- elimination of data loss risk within CIS
- acceleration of travellers' check-in at airports and of the information flow from client stations to the terminal solution
- increase in the efficiency of visa granting system security
- increased efficiency and passenger flow on the external Schengen border
- improved methods of collaboration with the police

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

Within Priority 5 two strategic objectives were set:

- A. Establishment and implementation of a training programme for police officers doing tasks related to border checks
- B. Creation and implementation of a training programme for consular staff who are preparing visa applications filed by citizens from third countries

Within objective A, the following actions/projects were implemented:

- 1. Construction of classrooms for CIS and VIS lessons
- 2. Modernization of language laboratories
- 3. Provision of the educational process for teaching the foreign police service by modern didactic technology
- 4. Provision of the educational process for lessons given on travel documents by using laboratory technology
- 5. Construction of a special training centre for check-in on the external Schengen border

Within objective B, the following actions/projects were implemented:

- 1. Training of delegated consular staff
- 2. Preparation, completion and implementation of the consulate training module and consulate training centre

By implementing these actions, the following is/was achieved:

- increased number and scope of police officers training and improvement in training infrastructure
- training of delegated consular staff
- Provision of good quality and efficiency of consular activities in diplomatic missions by improving the educational infrastructure and training quality

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

*Maximum 5 indicators for each Priority*

#### Priority 1

(Main indicators, targets)

##### **Main Target:**

- Improvement in international airport security

This target was to be achieved through the modernization and procurement of technical equipment for checks of documents, monitoring and camera systems and other external security systems at international airports in compliance with operational objectives 1 and 2.

##### **Targets:**

- improvement in the quality of border protection and surveillance at international airports
- acceleration of travellers' check-in and checks of persons, better checks of documents and faster checks and searches for falsified documents

##### **Important indicators:**

- termovision for a special vehicle for security at the perimeter of Ruzyně Airport
- camera systems at international airports (Brno, Pardubice)
- equipment for documents checks at five international airports (Prague, Brno, Ostrava, Pardubice, Karlovy Vary)

#### Priority 2

(Main indicators, targets)

not applicable

#### Priority 3

(Main indicators, targets)

##### **Main Target:**

- development of diplomatic missions infrastructure

One of the main targets for the diplomatic service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic is the increased security in the visa sections of the diplomatic missions and for its staff. Besides that, all requirements stemming from binding recommendations of Schengen evaluations in this area in all diplomatic missions must be met. This is reflected in the need for equipping the consular sections in diplomatic missions with the necessary

technical resources and carrying out required building modifications in some diplomatic missions.

**Important indicators:**

- purchase of safes
- extension of camera coverage in diplomatic mission waiting rooms
- replacement and procurement of consulate windows at consulate and visa counters
- supply of security detection frames
- building modifications in selected diplomatic missions

Priority 4

(Main indicators, targets)

**Main Target:**

The main targets within this priority are the development and construction of data and information systems needed on border crossings for external border protection and support of non-problematic use of the SIS II system by SIRENE operators thanks to improved qualification of SIRENE operators within international information exchange.

**Specific Targets:**

- launch of IT systems at international airports
- launch of IT systems for diplomatic missions
- know-how exchange among SIRENE operators

**Important indicators:**

- VIS server room
- functional back-up centre for CIS
- equipping the terminals at international airports (Prague, Brno, Ostrava, Pardubice, Karlovy Vary)
- Biometric reading devices for foreign police inspectorates
- implemented SIRENE workshop

Priority 5

(Main indicators, targets)

**Main Targets:**

- establishment and implementation of a training programme for police officers doing tasks related to border checks
- creation and implementation of a training programme for consular staff who are preparing visa applications filed by citizens from third countries

**Important indicators:**

- equipping classrooms for better training quality
  - trained Czech police and/or Alien police officers
  - trained consulate staff
  - construction of a special training centre for check-in on the Schengen border
  - modernized language laboratories for lessons within Alien Information system and VIS
  - creation of a specialised training centre for consulate and visa staff
-

## **Part II**

### **SUMMARY OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMMES 2007, 2008 AND 2009**

**(excluding Technical Assistance measures and Information and Publicity)**

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

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

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

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

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

*A maximum length is indicated for each item.*

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

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

***Indicate if relevant: not applicable***

Actions (= projects) to be implemented under the “executing body” method

The objective of the action under Priority 1 within EBF 2007 was to raise the reliability of border checks on external borders by adding a check outside check points, i.e. surveillance of places in front of the actual border check. A specific target was the provision of surveillance by the corresponding technology at the airport Brno Tuřany and Pardubice in the area of problematic places as to prevent illegal entry or exit from the international airport area besides marked entrances. This should be achieved by procuring camera systems for these airports.

The objective of actions under Priority 1 within EBF 2008 was to equip specialised workplaces for checks of document authenticity for the support of information exchange on falsified and/or altered travel documents and to improve professional preparedness in this area, including the development and spread of joint instruments and procedures for the discovery of such documents.

There was no action planned under Priority 1 in EBF 2009.

Projects implemented within Priority 1:

EBF 2007:

“Procurement of camera systems for international airports”.

EBF 2008:

“Modernization and purchase of technical equipment to examine identification documents”,  
“Modernization of a special vehicle with mobile thermovision for the surveillance of airport perimeter”.

FVH 2009:

no action realised under Priority 1.

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

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

***Indicate if relevant: not applicable***

not applicable



Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

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

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

***Indicate if relevant: not applicable***

Actions (= projects) to be implemented under the “executing body” method

EBF 2007:

“Alteration of department for consular tasks section in diplomatic mission Bangkok”,  
“Extension of camera coverage in consular department waiting rooms”,  
“Supply of security frames and X-ray machines for diplomatic missions”,  
“Purchase of safes for diplomatic missions”,  
“Replacement of consular windows”.

EBF 2008:

“Alteration of the consular section at the embassy in Pretoria”,  
“Extension of camera systems in waiting rooms of consular offices”,  
“Delivery of security metal detector frames to consular offices”,  
“Replacement of consulate windows”.

EBF 2009:

“Alteration of consulate section in diplomatic mission Sanaa and Kiev”,  
“Extension of camera coverage in diplomatic missions waiting rooms”,  
“Supply of security frames for diplomatic missions”,  
“Replacement of consulate windows in diplomatic missions”,  
“Procurement of safes for diplomatic missions”.

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

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

***Indicate if relevant: not applicable***

Actions (=projects) to be implemented under the “executing body” method

EBF 2007:

“Reading of biometric features within handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions (Visa Information System of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic)”.

“Construction of CIS back-up centre”.

EBF 2008:

“Reading of biometric features within handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions (Visa Information System of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic)” – planned, partly implemented, but not completed.

“Workshop with the topic Training and Replacement of SIRENE operators – support of SIS II introduction”.

EBF 2009:

“Reading of biometric features within handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions (Visa Information System of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic)” – planned, but there is a question concerning successful realisation in relation to previous the project in EBF 2008”,

“Improvement of IT equipment for the identity verification – biometric reading equipment”,  
“Terminal solution”.

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

Actions to be implemented under the “awarding body” method

***Indicate if relevant: not applicable***

Actions to be implemented under the “executing body” method

EBF 2007 – actions:

“Creation of a consulate training centre”,

“Creation of a consulate training module”.

EBF 2008 – actions:

“Provision of the educational teaching process for the alien police service by modern didactic technology”,

“Construction of classrooms for SIS and VIS lessons”,

“Provision of the educational process for teaching travel documents by laboratory technology”,

FVH 2009–akce:

“Completion of preparation of a consulate training module and consular training centre”,

“Provision of the educational teaching process for the foreign police service by using modern didactic technology”,

“Education of liaison officers”.

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

No significant changes except for those in planned diplomatic missions where some projects had to be implemented, but their implementation was moved due to a deteriorated security situation in certain locations, from the originally planned diplomatic missions to diplomatic missions in these more urgent locations.

The exceptions to this were the non-implementation of some planned projects, e.g. “Creation of consulate training centre” (EBF 2007), cancellation of implementation of project “Education of liaison officers” (EBF 2009) and the like.

-----

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

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

Yes/No : **No**

If Yes, fill in this part.

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

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

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

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

### **III.2      Calls for proposals**

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

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

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

Definitions:

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

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

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

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

Yes/No : .....

- If No, explain why :

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

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

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

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

Projects funded in the “awarding body” method without a call for proposals	<i>Programme 2007</i>	<i>Programme 2008</i>	<i>Programme 2009</i>	<i>TOTAL 2007-2009</i>
Number				

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

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

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

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

Yes/No : Yes

If Yes, fill in this section

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



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

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

- Programme 2007:                      75 % of the EU contribution to the programme (excluding the EU contribution for technical assistance)
- Programme 2008:                      75 %
- Programme 2009:                      75 %

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

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

- Programme 2007:                      1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2008:                      1 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)
- Programme 2009:                      2 (number of calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

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

#### Definitions:

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	13	11	10	34
Projects selected	9	11	10	30
Projects funded	7	11	10*	28

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

Yes/No : No

- If No, explain why :

AP 2007 – action 8:

Not implemented due to non-observance of the obligation by the contracted supplier for the VIS set.

AP 2007 – action 5:

Action approved conditionally, but with conditions not settled by the receiver.

---

\* the legal instrument is prepared for signature

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

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

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

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

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

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method(see table IV.3)	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>28</i>
Projects funded without such calls (see table IV.4)	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method	<i>7</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>28</i>

## **Part V**

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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*  
not applicable

### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Within Priority 1, a total of three projects were implemented from EBF 2007-2009. The implementing entity was the Czech Police and/or Directorate of the Alien Police.

The projects involved:

“Procurement of camera systems for international airports (EBF 2007)”.

Equipment for documents checks (EBF 2008),

Modernization of a special vehicle with mobile thermovision (EBF 2008).

All equipment foreseen in the projects was procured and has been in use in line with the projects and undoubtedly contributes to increased security at international airports, improved and accelerated checks of persons and better security on external borders.

Within EBF 2009, no project applications were filed within Priority 1.

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

*Maximum length: half a page at the maximum*

### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*  
not applicable

### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

not applicable

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*  
not applicable

#### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Within Priority 3, a total of ten projects were implemented from EBF 2007-2009. Their implementing entity was the Security Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

The projects involved:

Alterations of the consular section with the diplomatic mission in Bangkok (EBF 2007),  
Supplies of security frames for diplomatic missions (EBF 2008),  
Replacements of consulate windows for diplomatic missions (EBF 2008),  
Alterations of the consular section with the diplomatic mission in Pretoria (EBF 2008),  
Extension of camera coverage in diplomatic mission waiting rooms (EBF 2008),  
Procurement of safes for consular department (EBF 2009)  
Extension of camera coverage in diplomatic mission waiting rooms (EBF 2009),  
Alteration of consulate office in diplomatic mission in Sanaa, and in Kiev (EBF 2009),  
Provision of security frames for diplomatic mission (EBF 2009),  
Replacement of consular windows in consular section (EBF 2009),  
Preparation completion and implementation of the consulate training module and consulate training centre (EBF 2009).

All equipment foreseen in the projects was procured and the building alterations in consular sections carried out in compliance with the projects (except for projects EBF 2009, whose implementation is only just starting) and are used for the everyday tasks of consulate staff in separate diplomatic missions. It is beyond dispute that through the project implementation the security of visa sections in diplomatic missions, including for their staff, increased. From a security point of view, major risks related to communication with the visa applicant and during the handling of visa stickers and documents with sensitive data were eliminated.

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

#### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*  
not applicable

### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Within Priority 4, a total of six projects were implemented from EBF 2007-2009. Their implementing entity was the Czech Police and/or the Directorate of the Alien Police and Department of Applications and Information Services of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

The projects involved:

Construction of a back-up centre CIS (EBF 2007),

Training of SIRENE operators and meeting of SIRENE management (EBF 2008),

Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas at the embassy (VIS) – (EBF 2008),

Biometric reading devices for VIS (EBF 2009),

Terminal solution for airport checks (EBF 2009),

Capturing biometric features in the handling of applications for Czech visas at the embassy (VIS) – (EBF 2009).

All activities foreseen were implemented and the equipment procured according to the projects (except for EBF 2009 that are only just beginning to be implemented). An exception is the problematic procurement of end stations for VIS within the project Reading of biometric features during the handling of applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions (VIS MZV ČR) – (EBF 2008) – [see point 13 below](#).

What we consider a major success is the construction of the CIS back-up centre that shall eliminate the risk of losing access to data sources for foreign police as part of its job, i.e. mostly as part of border checks. Also the meeting among the management of the SIRENE system at which the participants had the opportunity to exchange practical experience in using SIS and discuss the current condition of SIS, and the training on the functional features of SIS II for participants from 128 member states can be labelled as very valuable, enriching all parties.

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

### In the “awarding body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

not applicable

### In the “executing body” method

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

Within Priority 5, a total of nine projects were implemented from EBF 2007-2009. The implementing entities were the Primary Police Academy and Primary Police Academy of the



Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Holešov and the Department of Consular Concepts and Methodology of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

The projects involved:

Construction of a special training site for check-in on the external Schengen border – terminal of an international airport, including accessories (EBF 2007),  
Modernization of language laboratories (EBF 2007),  
Construction of classrooms for SIS and VIS lessons (EBF 2007),  
Creation of a consulate training module (EBF 2007),  
Creation of a consulate training centre (EBF 2007),  
Construction of classrooms for SIS and VIS lessons (EBF 2008),  
Provision of the educational teaching process for the foreign police service by modern didactic technology (EBF 2008),  
Provision of the educational process for giving lessons on travel documents by using laboratory technology (EBF 2008),  
Preparation, completion and implementation of the consulate training module and consulate training centre (EBF 2009),  
Provision of the educational process for giving lessons on travel documents by using laboratory technology (EBF 2009).

All equipment foreseen in the projects was procured and has been in use in compliance with the projects (except for projects EBF 2009, whose implementation is only just starting). Also the activities foreseen were implemented (except for projects EBF 2009, whose implementation is only just starting). An exception is the entire project “Creation of a consulate training centre (EBF 2007)” which could not be implemented within the required time-frame due to non-compliance with the obligations by the external supplier. For this reason, no resources were used from the EBF. Despite this complication, the projects saw a successful completion and the cost of its implementation was borne by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from its own budget. Thanks to this, a subsequent project could emerge from EBF 2009 called “Preparation, completion and implementation of the consulate training module and consulate training centre”.

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

not applicable

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

*Maximum length: 15 lines*

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

not applicable

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

not applicable

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

We faced difficulties mostly at the beginning of the implementation of this programme EBF 2007, where six projects were not implemented in line with the Annual Programme (one project – see more information in point 5 of this chapter) or their implementation was not commenced at all (five projects).

Out of this, four projects (three projects under Priority 3 and one project under Priority 4) from the above listing were not recommended for implementation by the Selection Commission. The reason was also an incorrect understanding of the need for a revision of this Annual Programme by the responsible authority (RA) when making changes to the Annual Programme, based on which some project applications were rejected. The changes concerned in the first place the embassies to which projects were originally directed according to the Annual Programme, but where, due to deterioration in the security situation in other locations, the projects were implemented following the needs in these more urgent places and objections of the Selection Commission to these projects were not considered. For one project within Priority 3, the beneficiary did not send the updated project application matching the requirements of the Selection Commission. Therefore, no legal act could be concluded, so subsequent implementation started. All four of these projects not implemented within the Annual Programme EBF 2007 could be implemented or their implementation commenced within Annual Programmes EBF 2008 and EBF 2009.

For the Annual Programme EBF 2009 one applicant, the Primary Police Academy and Primary Police Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Holešov, refrained from its intention of implementing the project “Education of liaison officers” under Priority 5 due to disproportionately high administrative burden of the project and under low overall project costs. Having considered the situation, the responsible authority decided to use the amount, still unused, from the non-implemented project of boosting the project budget “Terminal solution for airport checks” within Priority 4 of the Annual Programme EBF 2009.

In the AP 2007 there were planned 14 actions.

In the AP 2008 there were planned 11 actions.

In the AP 2009 there were planned also 11 actions.

Table for compare number of actions within the Priorities:

	AP 2007	AP 2008	AP 2009
Priority 1	1	2	0
Priority 2	0	0	0
Priority 3	5	4	5
Priority 4	2	2	3
Priority 5	6	3	3
Total of actions	14	11	11

Table for compare the volume of financial support of EBF within the Priorities:

	AP 2007	AP 2008	AP 2009
Priority 1	52 500,00 €	670 000,00 €	0,00 €
Priority 2	0,00 €	0,00 €	0,00 €
Priority 3	120 000,00 €	156 000,00 €	173 000,00 €
Priority 4	1 425 000,00 €	659 238,85 €	1 337 892,00 €
Priority 5	207 613,72 €	157 000,00 €	175 000,00 €
Total of actions	1 805 113,72 €	1 642 238,85 €	1 685 892,00 €

Drafts of annual programmes are based on the needs of member state and on the requirements of the potential beneficiaries. All three annual programmes are/were implemented in “executing body method”. Using the specific priorities is only a formal meaning. All actions/projects are funded in the ratio 75/25 %.

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

In the “awarding body” method

not applicable

In the “executing body” method

No other major changes but those named in point 9 and those shown as the example of failed practice in point 13 occurred in the projects of the Annual Programmes EBF 2007-2009.

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

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

### **2007 annual programme**

*Maximum length: half a page per project*

“Construction of a special training site for check-in on the external Schengen border – terminal of an international airport, including accessories” (Priority 5)

The aim of this project was to make the students of the Primary Police Academy and Primary Police Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Holešov, who are making systematic preparations for their service as foreign police staff, familiar with the professional work regarding foreign affairs under conditions truly simulating the everyday reality of protecting the external Schengen border.

Thanks to the construction of the training site, the students had the opportunity to learn the basic skills of the Schengen/Non-Schengen border checks, of checking the indicated locations of stay of arriving travellers in the transit airport area, airport lounge and of performing other tasks resulting both from national legislation and international agreements to which the Czech Republic is bound.

In this project, a training site was built that accurately simulates the airport, i.e. check-in lounge area, split up into the Schengen/Non-Schengen border check with gates for arrival/departure, into the actual airport lounge area with entry to the state territory and the transit area, into the external part representing the fenced security zone of the international airport, including a faux landing area. The border check point consists of a check-in filter (so-called workplace of 1<sup>st</sup> check line), equipped with computer technology with educational information systems CIS, SIS, etc., with travel documents readers, devices for revealing falsified and altered travel documents (Docutest, UV lamp) and of other professional tools. It is in this area that professional tasks, such as initial queries, profiling, check of travel documents and document authenticity and validity are carried out, with the possibility of withdrawing entry to the state territory and travelling out of the Czech territory and/or Schengen area and procedures for the transit, import and export of weapons and ammunition. Furthermore, model situations focused on checking the stay for arrivals/departures, patrol service, tasks related to the identification of a suspect, etc. are all simulated here. The entire premises (airport lounge, transit area and security airport zone) are monitored by a camera system which the students subsequently follow and evaluate on the screens in the operational department area, and control the tasks of the patrols in the model situations in the respective areas. Cry in the dojo. Laugh on the battlefield.

## 2008 annual programme

*Maximum length: half a page per project*

“Alteration of consular section in diplomatic mission in Pretoria”

Thanks to the implementation of this project/action, the security for consular staff in the diplomatic mission in Pretoria during work with visa applicants was improved dramatically. The existing situation in the department for consular tasks was unsatisfactory from the security point of view in the long run, mostly in terms of insufficient space in the waiting room and of the fact that the waiting room entrances were directly passing through the diplomatic mission area etc. Within this action, the external border of the consular section was rebuilt into bricked walls and the overall layout of the consulate areas were redesigned as to better match the security requirements. The areas were protected by an electronic security system and consulate windows with safety doors were installed. Due to construction delays and a change in the diplomatic mission layout, two more consular windows with a parametric system (i.e. mechanical protection systems) could not be installed by the deadline foreseen, which did not however have any major impact on fulfilling the mission of this project. These items were deducted from total project budget and the remaining features were procured additionally from the beneficiary's budget, i.e. they were paid by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

When implemented, the project achieved permanent protection of the diplomatic mission staff, mostly to the consulate staff, against potential undesirable conduct of visa applicants, in compliance with the Schengen Proper Practice catalogue which governs this field in section Security.

## 2009 annual programme

*Maximum length: half a page per project*

“Preparation, completion and implementation of the consulate training module and consulate training centre”

The implementation of this project started only several months ago. The project appears to be very desirable for consular practice of delegated consular staff and for those who are just being prepared for being sent to the respective diplomatic missions when considering the pilot project implemented last year.

The training is divided into three types. One of them is initial training prior to being delegated, which last 15 days. These trainings are given in a special training centre in the head office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Prague and are designed for the staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who shall be sent in 2010 to the respective diplomatic missions to perform their consular agenda. The training centre is divided into a lecture room and a simulation room in which, among others, the simulator is located for practical training of controlling the visa programme and a set for practical training of collecting applications for travel documents, as well as technical instruments for reading biometric data (fingerprint reader, scanner, digital camera). The simulation room is designed in a similar way to the real areas of consular offices (i.e. including the waiting room, counters for collecting applications, workrooms and interview rooms) and is covered by the camera system which transmits the

picture of the real training into the lecture room where it can be commented on and evaluated. The theoretical part of the training makes the consular staff familiar with the respective regulations (Schengen acquis, law on the stay of foreigners in Czech territory, Visa Code, internal regulations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, etc.), the knowledge of which is vital for work in the consular office of diplomatic missions.

The second type are continuous 4-day trainings performed mostly outside the territory of the Czech Republic and always in one place common for the respective region (e.g. Asian region, African region and Middle East, American region, Australian and Pacific region, regional countries EU/Schengen, etc.). The trainings are designated for delegated consular staff. Continuous trainings are focused on how the Visa Code implementation and visa application collection and decision-making can be optimized. Also, these trainings reflect new trends and knowledge in consular issues and changes to legislation which occur over a 4-year period for which consular staff are sent to a specific location.

The third type is extraordinary trainings designed for staff that is sent out beyond the regular rotation plan in case of urgencies.

Consular trainings are mostly provided by professional consular staff from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs section and/or other professional staff from other resorts and institutions, including external lecturers, mostly psychologists specialised in crisis communication, stress management and negotiations with problematic clients.

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

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

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

The project Czech Police and/or Directorate of the alien police service involved equipment for documents checks and/or equipment specialised in detection and identification of altered and/or falsified travel documents. This is an action under Priority 1. In the context of protection of the Schengen area and external border at an international airport, technical equipment had to be modernized and procured for checks of documents used by travellers crossing the external border.

In this project the equipment for document checks, e.g. mobile devices for documents checks, digital microphone, polarizing table lamps, lamps with built-in UV filters, and multifunctional devices for documenting falsified documents.

For the check-in of Community citizens a random check focused on document authentication was performed according to the Schengen border code and a thorough check was done with citizens from countries. Within these checks seven Chinese citizens were detained in June 2010 where travel documents with modified Visa stickers were discovered thanks to the modern equipment procured from this project. These stickers were most probably stolen from the German embassy in China. This is a practice-tested example showing how the success rate in the discovery of falsified and altered documents was increased and hence illegal migration prevented thanks to the implementation of the project/action from the Fund for external borders.

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

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

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

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

*Maximum length: half a page*

Reading of biometric features within handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic mission (Visa Information System of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic)

This is an action under Priority 4. Based on the Protocol on the incorporation of Schengen acquis into the EU framework, under Article 8, the Czech Republic is obliged, like other newly accepted member states, to take over Schengen acquis and other measures. Part of Schengen collaboration is a joint visa policy of the member states. One of the features of the joint visa policy is the issuance of uniform Schengen visas. The Visa Information System (VIS) will become an important instrument of the joint visa policy. To implement the Schengen acquis in the Czech Republic, a fully functional National Visa Information System (NS-VIS) must be in place, with follow-up VIS-MZV. The new visa system VIS-MZV has been built up over the long run in the anticipated period between 2008-2011, but must be shaped in coordination with the development and implementation of the EU visa system (VIS EU), the launch date of which is continuously being postponed despite the fact that VIS EU, NS-VIS, along with the Schengen Information System (SIS), are the fundamental instruments for the creation of a space of freedom, security and law. This situation is making the creation and the subsequent application of national VIS systems somewhat difficult.

Another adverse development that made the implementation of the project under the given time schedule first difficult and then impossible was the selection of the contractor for the entire VIS-MZV system. The company selected in a proper tender supplied part of the hardware (server room), but the remaining part of the hardware (end workstations) has not been taken over yet due to the low quality of contractor's work whose, in the majority of cases, software system did not correspond to the investor's requirements.

A withdrawal from the contract for work with the supplying company is therefore highly probable, hence cancelling the whole project. Subsequently, also the finances provided for the project within EBF 2008 will be returned. This will also impact the follow-up project to be implemented within EBF 2009. Signing the contract for this project is suspended until it is clear whether another company will be able to implement the project as to meet the requirements of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

<b>Part VI</b>
----------------



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

*Reference documents to be used for this part:*

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

## **1. Technical assistance**

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

*15 lines maximum*

- salaries of officials of the responsible authority (RO), auditing authority (AO) and Certification Authority (CO) in 2009 from EBF 2008 and in 2010 from EBF 2009
- translations of documents related to fund execution and implementation
- purchase of promotional materials (stickers with EU flag, pens and pencils, etc.)
- travel expenses, accommodation and allowances for trips abroad
- travel expenses, accommodation and allowances within the Czech Republic from EBF 2009
- participant's fee for the seminar on EBF in Berlin
- stamps for marking verified documents
- food and drinks provided within the monitoring mission of the European Commission

## **2. Information and Publicity**

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

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

*As part of the information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority, please specify the yearly information activities which you have organised up to now, as of 2008, the launch*

*of the multiannual programme or the achievements of the annual programme(s), as set out in Article 33 (2)( a) of the EBF Implementing Rules.*

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

#### **- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority**

*Maximum 15 lines*

The calls to submit project applications to the individual annual programmes, respective EU documents for fund implementation, list of projects selected for implementation (also stating the final beneficiary and amount of resources allocated from the fund), etc. are published on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.

The body responsible prepared a publicity manual for the recipient and a guide for applicants for funding from EBF.

The body responsible organises an information meeting with every annual programme for potential applicants for funding from EBF.

In 2007 a training on EBF 2007 was organised for potential applicants for funding from EBF.

#### **- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries**

*Maximum 15 lines*

The beneficiaries are providing information about the implementation of specific projects through their own web.

The output related to EBF projects are marked by the beneficiaries with the EU flag and fund name or abbreviated name.

The beneficiaries are making promotional objects from the EU logo and/or fund name or abbreviated name.

The participants in trainings and educational activities are informed about EBF and the funding method of these activities from this fund.

## **Part VII**

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

*Based on:*

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

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

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

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

The Annual Programme EBF 2007 was implemented from April 2009 to 31 December 2009. A total of 14 actions were planned in this Annual Programme EBF 2007. A total of 13 project applications were delivered within this call. The Selection Commission rejected four project applications for low quality and/or for non-compliance with the Annual Programme. Nine projects were recommended for completion. Finally, only seven projects were implemented.

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

*15 lines maximum*

There were no major problems during the implementation of the projects. One project could not be implemented for its relation to the procurement of VIS sets (see VII.2.). The name of this project was "Creation of a consulate training centre". The related project "Creation of consulate training module" lost its usefulness and a change proposal was submitted.

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

*15 lines maximum*

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

There was no need to make an official revision by EC according to information provided by contact person of EC.

The project "Training of delegated consulate staff" replaced the previous project. In the previous project, there were planned a theoretical and practical part of project. Theoretical part should include a detailed insight into the relevant regulations (the Schengen acquis, the Act on the Stay of Aliens in the Czech Republic, CCI (Common Consular Instruction), the internal regulations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, etc.), the knowledge of which is essential for work in the Consular Section of an embassy.

Practical part should include a simulated training of the work of a visa and consular officer behind a counter, a psychological preparation, including how to communicate with people in difficult situation and a language conversation course specializing in legal and consular terminology. The duration of the training module (training course) should be at ten working days. It was assumed the holding of at 5 consular training courses during the year.

Before signing a Memorandum of Understanding the final beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) delegated another department for implementation of the project. The new department informed responsible authority in October, that the project is not possible to implement till the end of the year 2009, when the eligibility period finished.

At the same time the final beneficiary asked the European Commission via responsible body to permit the modification of the former action to the "Training of delegated consular staff". The permission was approved by the contact person of EC.

The content of the project "Training of delegated consular staff" focused on new trends in visa field, on updated legislative changes relevant to all areas of consular works, in particular on the recently adopted Visa Code, as well as on best practices and current problems related to migration. The training last four days. A total 21 consular staff from the Czech consular offices in Asia were trained. These consular staff became multipliers and they provided information to 150 staff at their consular offices.

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

*15 lines maximum*

The Annual Programme 2007 was not fulfilled to a large extent and only little resources were used. Six out of seven projects had a total project value of up to € 100,000. The main cause was that the Selection Commission did not recommend the project "Reading of biometric features – VIS" because of low quality. Even if another call had been announced for this action, the resources still would not have been used for reasons stated in part VII.2.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Most expected qualitative and quantitative results have been achieved in the actions implemented and/or are being achieved in 2010 (e.g. projects focused on trained persons within Priority 5 actions).

Total six actions were implemented and paid by the final beneficiaries from the national resources. Only the action "Creation of the training consular module" was not implemented. (see Part VII.1.3)

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

*15 lines maximum*

The distribution of funding among the actions was appropriate. Only one large action out of two actions planned was implemented. Since this was the first Annual Programme of the fund, the implementation of seven projects is deemed a strong result.

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

The Annual Programme EBF 2008 was implemented from April 2009 to 31 December 2009. A total of 11 actions were planned in this Annual Programme EBF 2007. One project was implemented for every action.

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

*15 lines maximum*

There were no major problems during the implementation of the projects. Only in the project "Reading of biometric features within handling applications for Czech visas in diplomatic missions" the applicant (final beneficiary) did not accept the work delivery which did not correspond to specifications. For this reason, only one server worth 1/3 of total expected project costs was purchased.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Revisions were necessary only for consular offices, as these differed from the consular offices reported in the Annual Programme actions. The beneficiary responded to the current needs of the consular offices and to changed security situations in respective locations.

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

*15 lines maximum*

All actions approved by the Commission were always implemented within the specific project. All projects were duly completed according to the 31 December 2009 schedule. None of the final beneficiaries asked the responsible authority for an extension on any project. The main problem occurred when concluding legal acts on the provision of financial support from the fund with final beneficiaries. Even though only three beneficiaries of financial support exist, three types of legal acts (Agreement, Binding rules and not typical Memorandum of

Understanding) had to be used, which slowed down the entire Annual Programme implementation process and had an impact on the implementation start date of some projects. Particularly the beneficiary Ministry of Foreign Affairs signed the legal acts on the provision of financial support only by the end of 2009. With respect to the structures of the Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, signing such documents is a very time-consuming process. On average, this process takes two months.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Most of these expected quantitative and qualitative results were achieved by the Annual Programme 2008 and/or are being achieved in 2010 (e.g. the number of persons trained within projects belonging to actions under Priority 5). An exception is the project “Reading of biometric features – VIS” where the originally planned 22 end workstations, including accessories (see the reasons above) were not purchased.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Since every Annual Programme action was implemented through a specific project, we regard the number of actions and the amount of financial support from the fund for the actions and projects to be at the optimum level. Should VIS sets be purchased and put into operation, the implementation of the Annual Programme EBF 2008 would be evaluated as very positive.

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

Implementation of the actions was delayed against the original plan. The actions were to start on 1 January 2010, but their real implementation was only during 2010, since February 2010 at the earliest. The majority of these actions will be commenced only in the second half of 2010.

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

*15 lines maximum*

A problem is the time-consuming approval procedure since call announcement and/or postponement of project application after the respective legal acts on the provision of financial support from the fund have been signed, which dramatically shortens the project implementation period.

Also, a major time loss with the actual implementation is usually caused by tender demands. Another problem is the incoherent form of legal acts for beneficiaries.

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

*15 lines maximum*

Minor changes were made within the Annual Programme (e.g. cancellation of an action and transfer of these resources to another action from the Annual Programme). These changes had no impact on the budget and/or did not exceed the 10% change permitted for the entire Annual Programme. Therefore, the European Commission approved that no revision be needed.

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

*15 lines maximum*

All actions set out and approved by the European Commission will finish by the end of the Annual Programme EBF 2009, i.e. by 30 June 2011.

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

*15 lines maximum*

We expect the quantitative and qualitative indicators to be achieved by the end of the programme period of the Annual Programme EBF 2009.

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

*15 lines maximum*



The funding was distributed among actions in line with national interests and with respect to the requirements of potential beneficiaries. If the total of these demands exceeded the amount of resources allocated from the fund Annual Programme, such demands were reduced evenly for all potential beneficiaries.

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

*Based on :*

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

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

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

*Half a page maximum*

The Management and Control System is not set efficiently in light of the fact that we still have not received the guidelines from the European Commission for “minimum certification requirements”. This is why the certification body processes are set, for the sake of prevention, in a more stringent way than what will probably be required.

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

*Half a page maximum*

The Management and Control System corresponds to the revised proposal submitted to the European Commission for approval on 6 May 2009, but the organizational structure of the responsible authority and/or Department for Asylum and Migration Policy (OAMP) changed. In the original proposal the activities of the responsible authority were done by the staff from the Department for EU and International Law within the Department for Asylum and Migration Policy (OAMP). This department was however cancelled as of 31 January 2009

and split up in two new departments, whereby the job of the responsible authority is done by the Department for Community Funds within the Department for Asylum and Migration Policy (OAMP) effective 1 January 2009.

## **Part VIII**

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

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

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

*1 page maximum*

Despite initial trouble and gradual adoption of the rules and the regulative framework of fund implementation by the responsible authority and applicants/beneficiaries, we can say that the administrative processes, communication methods (towards representatives of EC and other member states) are becoming better with every new project/action and every other step of fund implementation. Also, the projects themselves show improving quality. It is logical that the parties involved can learn from their possible mistakes and imperfections and avoid repeating them.

From the point of view of the responsible authority, we assess on the whole the implementation of the Annual Programmes EBF 2007, 2008 and 2009 very positively. Should EBF 2007 be used as a benchmark against 2008, then EBF 2008 would be more successful, as 11 projects out of 11 were successfully implemented (each under a different action). For Annual Programmes EBF 2009 and other, the responsible authority is trying to eliminate risks and problems that might prevent the project's successful implementation. The biggest problem continues to be the start of VIS on the pan-European level. The perpetual postponement of this start is, beyond dispute, the major obstacle of a successful implementation of Annual Programmes in other member states, as well. Another problem continues to be the form of the legal act on the provision of financial support from the fund to the individual beneficiaries and the relatively long period needed for signing the legal act between the Ministry of the Interior (as the responsible authority) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (as the financial support beneficiary).

The largest portion of allocated resources was used within Priority 4. Most projects were focused on the purchase and/or procurement of equipment.

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

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

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

*15 lines maximum*

Since the programme targets are set within collaboration with experts in the given field on one hand and consulted with the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Czech Police and/or Directorship of foreign police service who are responsible for laying down the needs and performing the policy of protecting external borders and the visa policy on the other hand, the national interests in these areas are fully respected.

**2. Effectiveness of the programme**

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

*15 lines maximum*

The targets set in the Annual Programmes and achieved by the projects/actions comply with the multiannual programme strategy. Expected results and project outputs are successfully achieved. An exception is the start-up of the Visa Information System of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – see detailed information on the project in V.13. All of the projects we consider effective and useful. It is difficult to say which projects are considered more effective, because most of them are focused on purchase of equipment. Only one project was focused on training of consular staff.

**3. Efficiency of the programme**

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

*15 lines maximum*

Three persons from the responsible authority, two persons from the certification body and three persons from the auditing body are participating in the EBF management. Most of them however are spending most of their time managing and implementing the remaining funds within the general programme “Solidarity and migration flow management”, i.e. in terms of positions, we can speak about four full-time jobs. We consider the costs of four full-time jobs within a single fund as adequate with respect to the volume of the fund resources.

The cost of achieving targets within the projects is adequate and the price of instruments and equipment procured are not overvalued. This is emphasised already when the Selection Commission approves project applications.

The determination of costs of transporting security equipment to the embassies in remote destinations is usually problematic. This amount varies significantly in time and depends on the selected forwarding company and transportation method (sometimes the material/equipment can be dispatched within a single delivery together with other equipment, not related to the project, sent to the embassy and the costs can then be reduced to a proportionate amount). This is something that can hardly ever be specified in advance, i.e. in the project application, so the final beneficiary rather does not include the transportation costs, though they are an integral part of the project, into the project and covers them by its own resources.

Management of the EBF consists of two coordinators and several persons participating in the General Programme “Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows”. They are the leader, controller and secretary of the unit for the European Community Funds and persons from auditing body and certification body. Other costs are translation services and coordinator’s foreign trips.

The total annual cost of fund management: 2 141 000 CZK = 85 640 € (exchange rate 25 CZK/EUR)

Total budget for AP 2007 (EU contribution + public allocation) 1 973 113 € (4,34 % = 85 640 €).

Total budget for AP 2008 (EU contribution + public allocation) 1 813 238 € (4,72 % = 85 640 €).

Total budget for AP 2009 (EU contribution + public allocation) 1 844 892 € (4,64 % = 85 640 €).

#### **4. Complementarity**

**Please indicate any issues you have had with establishing the complementarity and/or synergies with other programmes and/or EC financial instruments such as the other Funds of the General Programme, the Thematic Programme on Asylum and Migration and/or the Structural Funds.**

*15 lines maximum*

As the Selection Commission is choosing projects submitted within EBF, the possible overlaps with other EU funds, mostly the structural funds or EEC/Norway, are assessed.

In order to prevent overlaps between projects within EBF and their duplicate funding within EU funds, the Ministry of the Interior adopted certain administrative measures (e.g. the project application within a call includes a question whether no EU resources will be used for the same project and asks for information regarding all similar projects implemented by the

applicant in the given period). If so, the project will be immediately excluded at the early stage of selection.

The responsible authority also takes other legal, organizational and control measures to rule out any duplicate funding – the obligation of using resources only from a single EU source is part of the legal act concluded with the project entity implementing the project.

## **5. Added value**

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

*15 lines maximum*

The projects implemented within EBF comply with the National Plan of Czech Border Protection Management and with the multiannual and annual EBF programmes. Also, they supplement and extend activities implemented by the beneficiaries from their own sources.

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

*Half a page maximum*

The EC requirement regarding the revision of annual programmes in the event of re-distribution of allocations over 10% increased the administrative burden of programming and also the relocation of resources to another project(s) if a large project cannot be implemented. Our suggestion is to keep this in the competence of the member states.

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

*Half a page maximum*

The projects were difficult to implement, as appendix No. 11 of cost eligibility did not offer a uniform interpretation. The EC has already presented us with a 3<sup>rd</sup> version of how this appendix shall be interpreted, but not even this one is final. We assume that these rules should be changed, because it is the rules, not a guide, and it is legally binding. The interpretation of these guidelines is usually rather vague and e.g. a so-called “operating grant” requires special detailed clarification. So far we have not received any information from the EC whether indirect costs of the beneficiary who is paying its operating costs from the state budget will be accepted, so we cannot finish some projects until then, as we would expose ourselves to the risk of a dispute with the final beneficiary.

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

*Half a page maximum*

What would certainly help implement the Annual Programmes EBF would be if the EC published a new appendix No. 11 to the implementation rules and the guidance for minimum certification requirements, as the EC promised but has not yet presented, as the deadline for sending the Final Report on the implementation of this Annual Programme EBF 2007 (end September 2011) is approaching.

*End of the report*

