

# DENMARK

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

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

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of: (Member State<sup>1</sup>)

**DENMARK**

Date:

12 December 2012 (amended version dated 19 December 2012 taking into account preliminary suggestions and remarks by the Commission)

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

**Dorit Hørlyck, Head of Division, Duly Authorised Person, Responsible Authority**

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

**Jesper Egevang, [jeg@jm.dk](mailto:jeg@jm.dk), +45 – 7226 8674 / +45 – 2257 7094**

Important remark

This evaluation is to be performed by

1. staff with evaluation expertise within the Responsible or Delegated Authorities, dedicated to this task and not involved in programming/implementation
2. a dedicated evaluation department within the national administration
3. external evaluation expert

We strongly recommend either option 2 or 3.

All options can be supported by the TA.

---

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

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

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

~~Yes~~/ No

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

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

The responsible authority possesses evaluation expertise which has been used in elaborating the report. The responsible authority has applied a participatory evaluation approach involving all stakeholders and beneficiaries, where appropriate. And the final report has been approved by the national EBF Steering Committee

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

\* External evaluation expertise: (please describe) N/A

\_\_\_\_\_

Important remark

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

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

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

**CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD .....	5
<b>PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD ( <u>IF APPLICABLE</u> ) .....	10
2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD .....	12
2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS .....	14
2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA) .....	16
2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP .....	17
<b>PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT .....	19
3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD .....	21
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS .....	24
3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT .....	26
3.5. OVERALL RESULTS ACHIEVED WITH THE FUND'S INTERVENTION .....	27
3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES .....	30
3.7. LESSONS LEARNED .....	32
<b>PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE.....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS .....	34
4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT .....	35
4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION .....	39
4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME .....	40
4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME .....	41
4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY .....	43

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

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

All beneficiaries sign grant agreements with the responsible authority in which references are made to the approved project document. Where deemed relevant, the project documents entail performance indicators. The beneficiaries are obliged to submit progress and/or final implementation reports. The responsible authority can at any point in time undertake project visits and convene meetings with final beneficiaries. The responsible authority is assessing the implementation of the project as well as the progress made at project level through:

- Progress/final reports
- Project visits/Meetings with beneficiaries
- E-mail correspondence
- Steering Committee meetings.

The responsible authority draws up the draft final report. It is then discussed in the Steering Committee. In parallel, EBF authorities are involved in terms of written and oral consultation on issues related to them.

Authorities involved in elaborating the evaluation report are:

- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Ministry of Finance
- National Police
- Danish Immigration Service
- Danish Prison and Probation Service (IT Division)

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

Written consultations and meetings with key national authorities represented in the EBF Steering Committee as well as with final beneficiaries, where relevant.

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

### 1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD

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

All actions under the Fund are co-financed with national resources only. No private co-financing. It is the responsibility of each project owner to secure the national co-financing. Both sources of financing – EU and national – are clearly mentioned in grant agreements. It has been the approach from the 2007 annual programme until now. No changes are envisaged in the future.

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

#### Border Management \*

Table n° 1:

<b>EURO</b> 1EUR=7,44DKK	<b>Infrastructure and equipment</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2007 total</b>				20.994.624
<b>2008 total</b>				20.147.849
<b>2009 total</b>				21.330.645
<b>2010 total</b>				21.787.634
<b>2011 total</b>				22.809.140
<b>2012 total (as planned)</b>				22.190.860
<b>2012 total for first half year</b>				11.102.151
<b>Total</b>				140.362.903
EBF (national and EU) co-financing (0 %)				0
Total national funding				140.362.903

\* Note: The figures in table 1 are provided by the Danish National Police and covers all expenses in the area of border management, visa policy and IT systems, including passport and immigration as well as VIS and SIS-related IT systems. All amounts are in current prices and include depreciation costs and interests. It has not been possible to split the expenses on individual cost categories as foreseen in the evaluation template. However, it should be noted that the National Police has not received any allocation under the 2007-2009 programmes.

## Visa Policy \*

Table n° 2:

<b>EURO</b> 1EUR=7,44DKK	<b>Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections</b>	<b>Staff at visa sections and headquarters *</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total *</b>
<b>2007 total</b>	779.570	2.620.968	282.258	3.682.796
<b>2008 total</b>	940.860	2.244.624	241.935	3.427.419
<b>2009 total</b>	403.226	2.244.624	241.935	2.889.785
<b>2010 total</b>	967.742	1.868.280	201.613	3.037.634
<b>2011 total</b>	1.384.409	1.787.634	188.172	3.360.215
<b>2012 total (as planned)</b>	1.612.903	1.908.602	201.613	3.723.118
<b>2012 total for first half year</b>	1.344.086	954.301	107.527	3.467.742
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	23.588.710
EBF (national and EU) co-financing (4,1 %)				969.419
Total national funding (excluding EBF co-financing)				22.619.291

Note: Figures are based on overall estimates.

\* Please refer to the note under table 1.

\*\* Figures related to staff at visa sections at CPs are not available.

## IT Systems

Table n° 3:

<b>EURO</b> 1EUR=7,44DKK	<b>VIS (total investments/all authorities) **</b>	<b>SIS (total investments/all authorities) **</b>	<b>Total **</b>
<b>2007 total</b>	6.854.839		6.854.839
<b>2008 total</b>	3.967.742		3.967.742
<b>2009 total</b>	4.380.376		4.380.376
<b>2010 total</b>	2.587.366		2.587.366
<b>2011 total</b>	2.338.710		2.338.710
<b>2012 total (as planned)</b>	2.096.774		2.096.774
<b>2012 total for first half year</b>	591.398		591.398
<b>Total</b>	22.817.204		22.817.204
EBF (national and EU) co-financing (8,3 %)			1.898.251
Total national funding (excluding EBF co-financing)			20.918.953

\* Does not include depreciation costs and interests. US: Danish Immigration Service; UM: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). Figures from the MFA do not include maintenance, staff etc. costs. Only investment costs are included.

\*\* Please refer to the note under table 1.

Other, if applicable: N/A

Table n° 4

	....	...	<b>Total</b>
<b>2007 total</b>			
<b>2008 total</b>			

<b>2009 total</b>			
<b>2010 total</b>			
<b>2011 total</b>			
<b>2012 total (as planned)</b>			
<b>2012 total for first half year</b>			

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

The evaluation template's division of expenditures on areas of interventions in the area of borders and visa does not reflect the budgetary structure of all the final beneficiaries. Consequently, the tables constitute a qualified though solely indicative overall estimate. Please do consult the notes under each table for more detailed information.

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

The below information is based on the tables in section 1.1.2 and the following table 4a showing EU co-financing by priority.

Table 4a EU co-financing by priority

EURO	According to annual programmes	Prioritet 3 Visa policy	Prioritet 4 IT systems
2007	VIS operational centre		428.000
	Vision protocol		50.000
	Test assistance		108.601
2008	C-VIS adjustment		528.138
	VIS statistics		-
2009	C-VIS adjustment (IVR-VIS)		283.512
	C-VIS adjustment (UM-VIS)		500.000
2010	ILO	134.000	
	Best practice	391.124	
	Visa Code 1	283.876	
	Visa Code 2	160.419	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>969.419</b>	<b>1.898.251</b>

#### Border management\*

- Total national expenditure: DKK 1.044,3 million, approx. € 140.362.903 \*
- EBF co-financing: 0
- EBF co-financing rate: 0%

### Visa policy\*

- Total national expenditure: DKK 175,5 million, approx. € 23.588.710 \*
- EBF co-financing: € 969.419
- EBF co-financing rate: 4,1 %

### IT systems\*/\*\*

- Total national expenditure: DKK 169.760.000 million, approx. € 22.817.204 \*
- EBF co-financing: € 1.898.251
- EBF co-financing rate: 8,3 %

### Total national expenditure in border management, visa policy, and related IT systems\*

- Total national expenditure: € 186.768.817
- EBF co-financing: € 2.867.644
- EBF co-financing rate: 1,5 %

\* Please consult all notes under the above tables.

\*\* Please note that IT systems expenditures carried by the national police is covered under border management.

### Concluding comments:

Apart from the figures on the EBF co-financing, which are derived from the annual programmes, the figures and calculations above are, due to the Danish budget structure, solely indicative estimates and do not provide a complete picture of the total expenditures in the area of border management, visa policy and related IT systems. The total expenditure is likely to be higher than the figures in the tables. Furthermore, the figures under each specific area of intervention do not reflect the actual expenditures under each of the areas of intervention due to budgetary structures.

In conclusion, it seems likely that the indicative EBF co-financing rate of 1,54 % of the total costs may be too high considering the costs not included in the calculations.

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

When describing the above, please provide the following data:

- Number of border crossing points under the Schengen Borders Code

171 BCPs



- Number of consular posts in accordance with the Visa Code

68 Visa issuing CPs.

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

2007\*: 6,4

2008\*: 6,6

2009\*: 6,7

2010\*/\*\*: 7,4

2011\*: 6,5

\* Indicative estimates in millions provided by the National Police.

\*\* Difference from 2009-2010 is due, mainly, to significant increases at main airports.

- Numbers of visa applications annually (2007-2011)

2007: 89.459

2008: 83.735

2009: 86.479

2010: 87.073

2011: 100.450

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

- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- National Police
- Danish Immigration Service
- Danish Prison and Probation Service (IT Division)

It is the assessment that there has not been any important national developments in border and visa management since the approval of the multiannual programme, which are having an impact on the operations undertaken by authorities receiving funding under the Fund. The great majority of the EU co-financing under the Fund has gone into the national VIS programme and related activities.

**PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION**

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

N/A

**2.1.1. Overview of calls for proposals for the programmes**

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

.....

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

....

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

Table n° 5

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

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

Annual programme 2007:

Annual Programme 2008:

Annual Programme 2009:

Annual Programme 2010:

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

Table n° 6

Number of	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	TOTAL
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2007-2010
Projects funded					
Out of which multiannual					

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

~~Table n° 7~~

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for proposals (total "projects funded" table 3)					
Projects funded without such calls (total "projects funded" table 4)					
TOTAL Projects funded in the “awarding body” method (including multiannual projects)					

**2.1.5. Co-financing**

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

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

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

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

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

On the basis of the multiannual programme and relevant communications from the Commission the members of the EBF Steering Committee composes the annual programmes' project portfolio. All relevant authorities in the area of border and visa management are members of the Steering Committee. Thus, the “executing body” method without a call for expression of interest or similar selection method has been applied.

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

Table n° 8

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

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

~~Annual Programme 2007: N/A~~

~~Annual Programme 2008: N/A~~

~~Annual Programme 2009: N/A~~

~~Annual Programme 2010: N/A~~

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

Table n° 9

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	3	2	2	4	11
Out of which multiannual	0	0	0	0	0

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

Table n° 10

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, or similar selection method (see table 5)	0	0	0	0	0
Projects funded without such calls (see table 6)	3	2	2	4	11
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method (including multi-annual)	3	4	2	4	11

#### 2.2.5. Co-financing

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

When selected for EU co-financing the responsible authority and the final beneficiary sign a grant agreement. In the grant agreement, the national co-financing amount is indicated. At the end of implementation, the responsible authority controls that the agreed share of national co-financing has been applied by the beneficiary. If less than planned the EU co-financing percentage is being reduced accordingly.

## 2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS

### 2.3.1. Overview of revisions for 2007-2010 annual programmes

Table n° 11

AP	EU contribution allocated	Was a revision concerning a change of more than 10% of the allocation needed? (Y/N)	Percentage of allocation concerned by the revision, if a revision was needed
AP 2007	662.600,58	N	N/A
AP 2008	600.138,34	N	N/A
AP 2009	874.512	N	N/A
AP 2010	1.074.644	N	N/A

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

N/A

#### Annual programme 2007

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

Explanation/elaboration:

#### Annual programme 2008

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

Explanation/elaboration:

#### Annual programme 2009

- Financial change beyond 10%

- Changes in the substance/nature of the actions
- New action(s) needed
- All/part of the above
- Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration:

**Annual programme 2010**

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

Explanation/elaboration:

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

N/A

## 2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

### 2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	76.000	76.000
2008	72.000	72.000
2009	91.000	91.000
2010*	105.225	25.465
Total 2007-2010	344.225	264.465

\* All figures regarding 2010 TA are indicative and covers expenditures until 30 September 2012 only.

Table n° 13

AP/Use of TA (€)	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°/€)	IT and equipment	Office/ consumables	Travelling/ events	Monitoring, project management	Reporting, translation	Total **
2007	48.069,84	0	0	6.499,63	17.167,88	4.832,99	76.570,34
2008	47.177,26	0	0	4.550,00	20.557,65	0	72.284,91
2009	71.152,68	0	0	6.431,20	13.754,15	0	91.338,03
2010*	16.584,37	0	0	1.794,74	7.085,92	0	25.465,03

\* All figures regarding 2010 TA are indicative and cover expenditures until 30 September 2012 only.

\*\* Amounts beyond the TA allocation have been covered by the national budget.

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

The main purpose of TA under the SOLID Funds is to cover expenses associated with the EU co-financing, including preparatory measures, management, monitoring, evaluation, external audit, information and control measures for the reinforcement of the administrative capacity for the implementation of the Fund (basic act, Article 18) and most of the cost categories attached to these activities. The TA may be financed up to 100 % by the Fund (implementing rules, Article 13).

The amount which has been available for TA under the national programmes in Denmark has far from covered the additional actual expenses associated with the management of the Fund in accordance with the regulatory framework. By consequence, the managing authorities have invested significant additional resources with the aim of assuring a proportional management and control system.

See also section 4.4 below.



## 2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP

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

Denmark has reviewed and revised its description of the management and control systems (MCS) twice.

The MCS were revised in 2010 with the aim to reflect changes in personnel and correct descriptions of the management and control systems in place. In connection with the revision of the MCS a number of ambiguous or unclear clauses of the MCS were revised to provide a clearer description of the management and control processes, responsibilities and tasks.

The closing of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs in 2011 necessitated a second revision of the MCS description as the responsible authority and the other Fund authorities were transferred to the Ministry of Justice. As in 2010, the responsible authority took advantage of the revision by further streamlining the description of the MCS. The second revised version of the MCS is currently under review by the Commission.

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

Until today it has been the practice at some projects to launch implementation prior to the Commission's decision. This has mainly been possible where co-financed projects have been sub-projects to major national programmes such as the national VIS programme.

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

Table n° 14

Implementation rates by priority												
	Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5		Total	
EURO	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP 2007							49	842.088			49	842.088
AP 2008							47	1.134.300			47	1.134.300
AP 2009							75	1.576.059			75	1.576.059
AP 2010*					Final report not yet completed							

\* Preliminary figures

- 2.5.4. Please fill in Annex 2 to this report.

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

- Not satisfactory
- Satisfactory
- Good
- Very good

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

In view of the implementation rate, it is the assessment that the implementation of the EBF allocation has been “good”.

It is likely that the implementation rating would have been even higher if the EBF regulatory framework and the Danish multiannual programme and annual programmes as well as the management and control systems had been in place at the inception of the Fund in January 2007.

Thus, the regulatory framework was only complete and adopted by 5. March 2008 (Basic Act by 23 May 2007, Strategic Guidelines by 27 August 2007 and Implementing Rules by 5 March 2008), and the Danish programmes and management and control systems approved in December 2008.

The very late adoption of the regulatory framework and the programmes and management and control systems caused initial uncertainty at implementation level and resulted in a non-optimal implementation of the Fund in terms of retrospective programming and reporting.

## PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS

### 3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT

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

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

N/A - Please notice that the Fund has not yet co-financed any projects under these two priorities. Under the 2011 programme projects are being co-financed under priority 1 with the aim to roll-out the VIS in accordance with national strategy for the control of persons crossing the external borders and in accordance with the requirements related to the implementation of the VIS in Region 23. These achievements will be reported upon in the ex-post evaluation in 2016.

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

Table n° 15

~~(Please choose the outputs and results applicable, transfer to this page and complete the relevant categories listed in the table in annex 1)~~

*Example:*

	Common Core Indicators									
	OUTPUT			RESULTS						
1. Means of transport	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded			Number of patrol missions performed			Average intervention time			
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	
Total	156	200	300	3500	1500	5000	15'	25'	13'	

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

~~AP 2007~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2008~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2009~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2010~~

...

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

### 3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD

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

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

Table n° 16

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

9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	Number of joint consular practices developed			Number of Member States with whom such practices were developed			Number of ILOs deployed			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)		Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	
	N/A			-				1				

Table 16a: Waiting time

Year	Category	# of cases	Average waiting time	Year	Category	# of cases	Average waiting time
2001	Submitted	27709	52	2007	Submitted	18459	38
	Bonafide				Bonafide		
2002	Submitted	23266	35	2008	Submitted	13735	73
	Bonafide				Bonafide		
2003	Submitted	19700	38	2009	Submitted	14251	90
	Bonafide				Bonafide	72228	10
2004	Submitted	21126	29	2010	Submitted	11811	30
	Bonafide				Bonafide	75262	8
2005	Submitted	20018	44	2011	Submitted	11147	26
	Bonafide				Bonafide	89303	7
2006	Submitted	17166	49	2012*	Submitted	4995	29
	Bonafide				Bonafide	50026	6

Note: No figures on waiting time at representations are available for the period 2001-2008. 2012 figures comprise all cases until 6 October 2012. Figures for 2001-2008 are drawn from the Common Visa System (FVS), and the figures for 2009-2012 are drawn from IVR-VIS.

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

## **AP 2007**

None of the projects under the 2007 programme have addressed any of the above indicators. All projects co-financed under the 2007 programme have contributed to the VIS system development only. Thus, the achievements are completely in line with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme. In addition, the actions have contributed to numerous adjustments of the VIS system based on new requirements issued by the Commission.

## **AP 2008**

None of the projects under the 2008 programme have addressed any of the above indicators. All projects co-financed under the 2008 programme have contributed to the VIS system development only. Thus, the achievements are completely in line with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme. In addition, the actions have contributed to numerous adjustments of the VIS system based on new requirements issued by the Commission.

## **AP 2009**

None of the projects under the 2009 programme have addressed any of the above indicators. All projects co-financed under the 2009 programme have contributed to the VIS system development only. Thus, the achievements are completely in line with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme. In addition, the actions have contributed to numerous adjustments of the VIS system based on new requirements issued by the Commission.

## **AP 2010**

The project “Visa code II” supported the objective “average waiting time for visa issuance (days) by boosting the effectiveness of visa case handling via IT support.

The “Visa Code I” project has contributed to the development and streamlining of the IT-systems supporting visa case handling, both with regards to the applicants with the development of the digital self-service online applications and in relation to the exchange of data between the consular posts and the Danish Immigration Services. In addition visa case handling in relation to representation agreements has become more effective as the IT-systems have become better tuned towards supporting these workflows.

The Best Practice project initiated in 2010 aims at developing the competences of visa personnel. The Best Practice catalogue and related best practice activities such as regional meetings, training etc. addresses subjects such as efficient work processes, correct usage of IT systems all with a view to not only reducing the time spent on handling visa case applications but certainly also improving the quality of the visa case handling.

Please refer to the inserted table 16a for detailed figures on the improvements attained.

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

The handling of visa applications has become more efficient. The organisation of the visa sections ensures that the regular cases are handled more effectively and, thus, more time is available to closely scrutinize more complicated applications.

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

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

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

Table n° 17

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

7. VIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of VIS					Number of consulates connected to VIS	Number of border crossing points connected to VIS	Number of other stakeholders connected
	8%*					Following the VIS roll-out**	12 ***	Approx. 100 persons at the Danish Immigration Agency

\* Please refer to section 1.1.4.

\*\* Denmark is following the VIS roll-out schedule. VIS is expected to be fully rolled-out not later than November 2014.

\*\*\* 12 border crossing points (BCPs) are connected to the VIS. Among the 12 BCPs are all main entry points at the external borders. It should be noted that the VIS connectivity is work in progress.

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

#### **AP 2007**

Projects co-financed by the EBF under the 2007 programme in relation to the VIS have contributed to the overall national VIS system development and implementation. The % referred to in the above table indicates the scope of the EBF contribution to the VIS system development in Denmark.

#### **AP 2008**

Projects co-financed by the EBF under the 2008 programme in relation to the VIS have contributed to the overall national VIS system development and implementation. The % referred to in the above table indicates the scope of the EBF contribution to the VIS system development in Denmark.

#### **AP 2009**

Projects co-financed by the EBF under the 2009 programme in relation to the VIS have contributed to the overall national VIS system development and implementation. The % referred to in the above table indicates the scope of the EBF contribution to the VIS system development in Denmark.

#### **AP 2010**



The “Visa Code I” project has contributed to the development and streamlining of the IT systems supporting visa case handling, both with regards to the applicants with the development of the digital self-service online applications and in relation to the exchange of data between the consular posts and the Danish Immigration Services. In addition visa case handling in relation to representation agreements has become more effective as the IT systems have become better tuned towards supporting these workflows.

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

The development of the IT systems (in case of EBF Denmark mainly the VIS) has to a large extent been driven by the responsible authorities and the national VIS coordination. The EBF has contributed financially to the implementation of the systems. Please refer to section 1.1.4.

### 3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT

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

N/A - Please notice that the Fund has not co-financed any projects under this priority.

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

~~Table n° 18~~

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

~~3.4.2. To what extent are the achievements of the 2007-2010 annual programmes consistent with the initially set objectives in the multi-annual programme?~~

~~AP 2007~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2008~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2009~~

~~...~~

~~AP 2010~~

~~...~~

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

### **3.5. Overall results achieved with the Fund's intervention**

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

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

(Please transfer to this page and complete all indicators listed in the table at the annex by aggregating the results listed by priority). Please see example above.

**23 N° of actions, projects and allocations implemented by priority (at programme closure) and implementation method**

Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5	
N° actions	0	N° actions	0	N° actions	4	N° actions	7	N° actions	0
N° projects	0	N° projects	0	N° projects	4	N° projects	7	N° projects	0
EU contribution (€)	0	EU contribution (€)	0	EU contribution (€)	969.419	EU contribution (€)	1.898.251	EU contribution (€)	0
Implementation method		Implementation method		Implementation method		Implementation method		Implementation method	
N° of projects in awarding B M	N° of projects in executing B M	N° of projects in awarding B M	N° of projects in executing B M	N° of projects in awarding B M	N° of projects in executing B M	N° of projects in awarding B M	N° of projects in executing B M	N° of projects in awarding B M	N° of projects in executing B M
0	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	0	0
Total EU amount for projects in ABM	Total EU amount for projects in EBM	Total EU amount for projects in ABM	Total EU amount for projects in EBM	Total EU amount for projects in ABM	Total EU amount for projects in EBM	Total EU amount for projects in ABM	Total EU amount for projects in EBM	Total EU amount for projects in ABM	Total EU amount for projects in EBM
0	0	0	0	0	969.419	0	1.898.251	0	0

**24 Overview of total n° of actions programmed against implemented**

Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3		Priority 4		Priority 5	
N° of actions programmed	N° of actions actually implemented	N° of actions programmed	N° of actions actually implemented	N° of actions programmed	N° of actions actually implemented	N° of actions programmed	N° of actions actually implemented	N° of actions programmed	N° of actions actually implemented
0	0	0	0	4	4	7	6	0	0

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

- Neutral
- Positive
- Very positive
- Excellent

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

The answer above is based on the achieved outcomes and attained results under all relevant priorities, that is, priority 3 and priority 4.

In line with the answers provided in section 2.5.5, 3.2.2 and 3.3.2, it is the overall assessment that the results achieved in relation to the VIS system development and training of consular staff in application of the VIS in visa case handling have been successful (“very positive”).

The VIS go-live in October 2011 was successful, and according to information provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the result of the provided training of consular staff has been successful as well. The latter is supported by the information contained in the inserted table 16a.

### 3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES

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

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

Denmark has had a very limited number of projects under the 2007-2010 annual programmes. The majority of projects have been within the framework of the national VIS programmes. They have not been innovative, nor have they represented best practices. The projects have solely constituted components of a much larger project.

However, one project under the 2010 annual programme may be of interest for a broader EBF audience:

##### *Best Practice project (2010)*

The Best Practice project is about handling change: Handling the introduction of the Visa Code, new IT systems and new demands for the organising of the visa sections. The method used was a close involvement of the visa case workers concerned and via workshops, training and the Best Practice Catalogue to achieve a maximum qualitative improvement in visa case handling, reduce case processing times and greater job satisfaction on behalf of the visa case workers and satisfied applicants and their hosts.

The Best Practice catalogue is a living document regularly updated and used for inspiration in the visa sections. The IT systems are used to full potential and case processing times are continuously improving.

There is a much better understanding of the visa process, of the Visa Code and handbooks leading to efficient case handling.

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

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

In view of the small size of the Danish EBF programme and the nature of the projects the administrative burden of managing the EBF funds have been significant. In an effort to minimise the administrative burden of managing the funds it has been very useful that all three authorities have been within the same governmental institution, first within the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, and later on the Ministry of Justice. The Coordination Committee of the three authorities has been a useful tool in coordinating the responsibilities and providing the Commission with the requested information and reports.

The national EBF Steering Committee has also been a useful tool for the coordination of the Fund implementation and for information sharing.

In relation to other Member States the so-called “Nordic Group” has been a very useful tool in terms of sharing information and experiences in managing the Fund. The Group started as a group of Nordic countries. Over the years more countries have joined the group. In 2012 thirteen countries are participating in the two meetings annually.

## **3.7. LESSONS LEARNED**

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

One project experienced serious problems related to the eligibility period.

As already mentioned in the mid-term review the project “VIS Operational Centre” under the 2007 programme suffered from an unfortunate lack of attention when designing the 2007 annual programme and the unresolved EBF regulatory framework at the time of establishing the centre and the inception of a fund administration, which was only approved by the Commission in December 2008.

The project achieved all expected outcomes and attained expected results, however, to a large extent outside the eligibility period of the 2007 programme.

This experience calls for a timely adoption of regulatory frameworks and programmes in the future.

### **3.7.2. Lessons learned**

#### **3.7.2.1.**

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

Due to the heavy administrative burden associated with managing the Fund, one lesson learned is that one should support as few and as large projects as possible in an attempt to minimize the administrative burden.

Final beneficiaries/project owners find that the additional administrative requirements associated with the EBF co-financing makes participation in the EBF programme less attractive than similar activities funded through the state budget. The main difficulty associated with EBF funding is the necessary establishment of parallel administrative structures and accounting procedures.

See also section 3.6.2 and 4.4.

Issues regarding timing and longer term planning have proven difficult to manage in terms of scoping and carrying out planned activities associated with EBF co-financed projects. Also the organisational capacity to absorb EBF funds and putting them to use can be challenging in terms of coordinating with other planned or on-going activities.

#### **3.7.2.2.**

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



No, not really. However the ambition is certainly to integrate lesson learned in future projects.

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

### 4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS

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

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

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	7.552.811**	6.233.435**	6.887.621**
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	211	54	79
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	0	0	0
Visa applications made	79.166*	86.479*	100.450*
Visas issued	74.076*	81.850*	95.457*

\* Figures are from the official publication "Tal & Fakta på Udlændingeområdet", 2012.

\*\* Figures are from the annual EBF border statistics reporting to the Commission

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

No changes in migration trends identified due to interventions through the Fund.

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

Apart from the ILO project under the 2010/2012 programmes, migration flows have not influenced decisions on the intervention of the Fund.

## 4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT

### *Volume effects:*

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

In 2007-2010, the Fund has not co-financed activities in relation to border management (checks and surveillance).

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

The Fund has to some extent (see table 17) contributed to the implementation of the national VIS programme, the Visa Code, VIS Mail, and in terms of training of consular staff in third countries in connection with the roll-out of the VIS.

The Fund has made a significant contribution to the implementation of the national visa code in terms of innovative IT solutions, which has boosted the effectiveness of visa case handling in a way that would not have been possible without the Fund contribution.

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

The Fund has not contributed to the development of the SIS system.

Regarding the VIS system, the Fund has, as indicated in table 17, contributed financially with approx. 8% of the total budget for the national VIS programme. Please note that the co-financing rate is a very rough estimate.

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

Not identified. It is the assessment that the Fund did not contribute directly to strengthening the image of having secure borders. However, the Fund has indirectly contributed to existing interventions which have made the visa case handling smoother and supported the implementation of the VIS.

- 4.1.5. How do you perceive the programmes' added value in comparison with existing national programmes/policies at national, regional and local level, and in relation to the national budget in the area of intervention of the External Borders Fund?

The Visa Code project has improved the functionalities of the IT systems which would not have been possible without the contribution from the Fund.

**Scope effects:**

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

N/A – The actions under the 2007-2010 programmes did not entail projects addressing challenges of detecting irregular crossings and apprehending irregularly entering third-country nationals.

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

N/A

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

The ILO project has to a certain extent contributed to consular cooperation and exchange of information among consular offices in China during an 18 months period. The Best Practice project has made a significant contribution to the efficiency at CP.

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

In general N/A, however, please refer to 4.1.5.

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

The overall strategy in the Danish programming is to support existing national interventions and programmes responding to EU legislation in the area of borders, visa and related IT systems. Thus, the large majority of interventions supported by the Fund would have been implemented anyway through national funding.

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

**Border management** N/A

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

**Visa**

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

**IT systems**

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

***Role effects:***

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

N/A

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

The Fund has contributed to streamline and further develop the visa-related services being provided at consular posts in third countries, both directly in terms of training and ILO and indirectly in terms of having contributed to the development and implementation of new IT systems.

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

N/A

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

- they could not have been carried out
- they could have been carried out to a limited extent
- they could have been carried out to a significant extent
- part of the activities carried out by public authorities could not have been carried out
- the co-financing of the Fund, activities by other organisations could not have been carried out (namely, if applicable)
- other

***Process effects:***

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

N/A

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

N/A – The Fund as such did not make a difference in the overall development of the national border management system and strategies. However, the Fund has to a certain extent (see for example table 17) contributed to the implementation of EU policies in the area of border and visa.

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

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

The overall objectives of the Danish multiannual programme have been relevant throughout the programming phase. The only evolution which has required some adjustments in the intervention portfolio has been associated with the development of the VIS IT systems and in particular adjustments to the C-VIS.

It is important to note that the proposed actions in the MAP were relevant examples only. Based on the received EU co-financing the annual programmes have reflected national priorities within the overall EBF framework.

- 4.3.1. Building on the results in the excel sheets and on the analysis under PART III of this questionnaire, please highlight the key results of the programme overall and the extent to which the desired results and objectives (as set out in the multiannual programme) have been attained. Are the effects resulting from the intervention consistent with its objectives?

It is the assessment that the Danish EBF programme has two main results:

Firstly, the Fund has as planned contributed financially to the implementation of the national VIS programme in terms of small, but targeted component projects within the larger national programming framework. The result corresponds directly to Denmark's action area C in the multiannual programme: "[...] It is also wanted to bolster the level of service and control vis-à-vis individuals applying for visas and residence permits via continued digitalisation of operations."

Secondly, the Fund has contributed financially to interventions aiming at strengthening the visa case handling processes, including at consular posts in third countries. The result corresponds directly to Denmark's action area B in the multiannual programme: "Denmark wants to strengthen frontline monitoring in connection with visa applications and applications for residence permits by strengthening management of consular activities."



#### 4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME

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

Table n° 21

Calendar year	TA contribution (€)	National contribution (€)	National contribution in-kind (offices, IT tools) – (€ estimate)		Total
			DKK	€**	
2007	76.000	0	2.014.492	270.402	346.402
2008	72.000	0	2.088.403	280.323	352.323
2009	91.000	0	2.152.000	288.859	379.886
2010	105.225	0	2.198.409	295.088	400.313
2011	74.140	0	2.227.630	299.011	373.123
First six month 2012	45.844*	0	1.128.425	151.466	197.310
<b>Total</b>	<b>464.209</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11.809.359</b>	<b>1.585.149</b>	<b>2.049.357</b>

\* 50% of annual programme allocation.

\*\* €1 = DKK7,45

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

Table n° 22

Calendar year	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n°& €)		IT and equipment (€)	Office/ consumables (€)	Travelling/ events	Total (€)
	No.	€				
2007	2,75	214.167	14.521	41.713	-	270.402
2008	2,75	222.025	15.054	43.244	-	280.323
2009	2,75	228.786	15.513	44.560	-	288.859
2010	2,75	233.720	15.847	45.521	-	295.088
2011	2,75	236.826	16.058	46.126	-	299.011
First six month 2012	2,75	119.966	8.134	23.366	-	151.466
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>1.255.490</b>	<b>85.127</b>	<b>244.530</b>	-	<b>1.585.149</b>

€1 = DKK7,45

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

The totals above constitute a relatively conservative estimate of the total management costs 2007-2012 (6 months) uniquely associated with the management of the Fund in accordance with the Fund regulations.

For the first 5,5 years of implementation, the programme management costs, including the national contribution in-kind, constitute approximately 40% of the total allocation for the same period. The % should, however, be considered as an indicative estimate.

These figures do not even include comparable project management costs at the level of final beneficiaries, costs uniquely associated with receiving and managing Fund contributions.

The above tables and calculations do indicate that the regulatory framework of the Fund is not suitable for countries with small allocations.

#### **4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY**

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

N/A

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

N/A

\* \* \*



	achieved through APs 2007-2010		national level 2007-2010							ed through h-APs 2007-2010	ne	at national level 2007-2010	through APs 2007-2010	ne	at national level 2007-2010			
Total																		
4.1. ABC-gates																		
4.2. Documents verification																		
4.3. Other																		
<b>5. Border infrastructure</b>	<b>Number of BCPs developed or upgraded</b>			<b>Number of places in detention facilities at external borders</b>			<b>Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded</b>			<b>Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures</b>			<b>% of bcp's modernised out of the total</b>			<b>Average waiting time for travellers at borders</b>		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through h-APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
<b>6. SIS</b>	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of SIS									% of successful connection tests			Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)			Number of institutional stakeholders involved		
													YES	NO	NA			
<b>7. VIS</b>	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of VIS									Number of consulates connected to VIS			Number of border crossing points connected to VIS			Number of other stakeholders connected		
	8%									Following the VIS roll-out			12			Approx. 100 at the Danish Immigration Agency		
<b>8. Other ICT systems</b>	<b>Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded</b>									<b>Number of institutional stakeholders involved</b>								
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through h-APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010						
Total																		
8.1. API																		

8.2. FADO																		
8.3. National systems																		
9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	Number of joint consular practices developed			Number of Member States with whom such practices were developed			Number of ILOs deployed						Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline				
	N/A			-			1									See inserted 16a. Note that it is not possible to distinguish between cases affected/not-affected by the annual programmes.		
10. Consular infrastructure	Number of visa sections in consular posts new/renovated			Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality of the consular service (security doors, bulletproof windows)						Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			Reduction of incidents		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline				
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	Number of equipment acquired or upgraded			Number of destinations of the equipment acquired or upgraded						Average waiting time for visa issuing								
	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010							Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline							
12. Training and risk analysis	No. of persons trained			Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)						Number of reports issued			Number of institutional collaborations on risk analysis developed			Number of institutional collaborations on training developed		
	Actually	Baseline	Overall at	Actually	Baseline	Overall at				Actually	Baseline	Overall	Achieved	Baseline	Overall	Achieved	Baseline	Overall

	achieved through APs 2007-2010		national level 2007-2010	achieved through APs 2007-2010	ne	national level 2007-2010				y achieved through APs 2007-2010	ne	at national level 2007-2010	through APs 2007-2010	ne	at national level 2007-2010	through APs 2007-2010		at national level 2007-2010	
<b>13. Info campaigns and promotion</b>	<b>Number of events organised</b>			<b>Number of attendants</b>						<b>Number of medias used</b>									

*Legend:*

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

## Annex 2

Legend <sup>2</sup>	Questions:												
	1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?												
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes <10%	Yes >10%	
<b>2007</b>													
Establishing the VIS operational centre	Y			N	Y & N The project was fully implemented and achieved expected results. However, due to the difficult inception of the Fund at European as well as at national level some expenses were declared ineligible due to the time they occurred (outside the eligibility period).		Y		Y		N		
Change of the VISION protocol	Y			N	Y			N		N		Y	
Testing of the new electronic visa processing system	Y			N	Y			N		N		Y	

<sup>2</sup> Please notice that under the Danish 2007-2010 annual programmes each action consisted of only one project.



Legend <sup>2</sup>	Questions:												
	1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?												
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes <10%	Yes >10%	
<b>2008</b>													
C-VIS adjustment	Y			N	Y		N		N		Y		
VIS statistics		N Cancelled under EBF co-financing		N		N However, activities have been implemented outside the EBF framework.	N		N		Y		
<b>2009</b>													
VIS adjustment (“N-VIS/IVR-VIS part”)	Y			N	Y		N		N	N			
C-VIS adjustment (“UM-VIS part”)	Y			N	Y		N		N	N			
<b>2010</b>													
ILO	Y			N	Too early to assess		N		N	N			
Best practice	Y			N	Too early to assess		N	Y (eligibility concerns)		N			
Visa code 1	Y			N	Y		N		N	N			

Legend <sup>2</sup>	Questions:											
	1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?											
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6	
Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes <10%	Yes >10%
Visa code 2	Y			N	Y		N		N	N		

*End of the report*

