

# Public Consultation on the Schengen Facility for Croatia

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

This consultation aims to collect opinions on the functioning of the Schengen Facility in Croatia and more specifically the successes and the obstacles in the implementation of the measures/actions implemented under this programme.

The general objectives of the Schengen Facility for Croatia was (a) to assist the country in order to enable taking of responsibility for controlling the flow of people across what would be the new external borders of the Schengen Area on behalf of other Schengen countries and (b) to ensure the preparedness of the country for accession to the Schengen Area.

The 9 operational objectives adopted by Croatia for the implementation of the Schengen Facility are the following:

1. Acquisition of new technical equipment for border control of the external borders
2. Modernisation and development of radio communication system necessary for surveillance and control of external borders
3. Development and upgrading of information systems and computer networks related to the implementation of the Schengen acquis
4. Construction of new and renovation and modernisation of the existing border infrastructure
5. Increase of the qualification of the border police
6. Development of the Croatian Visa Information System and connection to the EU Visa Information System (VIS)
7. Improvement of Schengen related knowledge and skills of the consular staff
8. Investment in the security equipment at diplomatic missions/consular posts according to the Schengen standards
9. Support costs for logistic and operations for managing the Schengen Facility for Croatia

The results of the public consultation will be taken into consideration for the preparation of the ex-post evaluation report on the implementation of the Schengen Facility for Croatia.

The evaluation is an important instrument to inform the European Parliament and the Council, the Member States, the research community, the general public and other stakeholders about the achievements of the measures/actions under the Schengen Facility for Croatia. It will also contribute to the design of the future similar EU-funded interventions.

## About you

---

\* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* First name

\* Surname

\* Email (this won't be published)

\* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra        | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar    | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola         | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea  | <input type="radio"/> Malawi        | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla       | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea            | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia      | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                           |

- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau

- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- North Korea
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Martin
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

**\* Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- Anonymous**  
Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.
- Public**  
Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

\* I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## QUESTIONS

---

### **RELEVANCE**

In this part of the questionnaire, we would like to know whether the objectives and activities of the Schengen Facility for Croatia responded to existing needs.

#### **To what extent have objectives of the Schengen Facility for Croatia corresponded to actual needs?**

- To a large extent - please explain
- To some extent - please explain
- Not at all - please explain
- Don't know

#### **Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

In this section, we would like to know your opinion on the extent to which the Schengen Facility for Croatia has achieved its objectives and delivered results

#### **To what extent has the Schengen Facility for Croatia contributed to the achievement of assisting the country in order to enable taking of responsibility for controlling the flow of people across what would be the new external borders of the Schengen Area on behalf of other Schengen countries?**

- To a large extent - please explain
- To some extent - please explain
- Not at all - please explain
- Don't know

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**To what extent has the Schengen Facility for Croatia contributed to the achievement of ensuring the preparedness of the country for accession to the Schengen Area?**

- To a large extent - please explain
- To some extent - please explain
- Not at all - please explain
- Don't know

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**There were 9 operational objectives adopted by Croatia for the implementation of the Schengen Facility. On a scale from 1 to 5 please rate the extent to which each of the following operational objectives were achieved under the Schengen Facility in Croatia.**

(1 = fully achieved; 2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings; 3 = only partially achieved, shortcomings finely balanced; 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings; 5 = not achieved)

	1	2	3	4	5
Acquisition of new technical equipment for border control of the external borders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Modernisation and development of radio communication system necessary for surveillance and control of external borders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development and upgrading of information systems and computer networks related to the implementation of the Schengen acquis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Construction of new and renovation and modernisation of the existing border infrastructure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase of the qualification of the border police	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development of the Croatian Visa Information System and connection to the EU Visa Information System (VIS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Improvement of Schengen related knowledge and skills of the consular staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Investment in the security equipment at diplomatic missions/consular posts according to the Schengen standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support costs for logistic and operations for managing the Schengen Facility for Croatia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## **EFFICIENCY**

In this section, we would like to know your opinion about the efficiency of the Schengen Facility

### **To what extent were the results of the Schengen Facility in Croatia achieved at reasonable cost?**

- To a large extent - please explain
- To some extent - please explain
- Not at all - please explain
- Don't know

### **Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

## **COHERENCE**

In this section, we would like to know your opinion on the extent to which the activities of the Schengen Facility programme are coherent with other policy and/or programme related interventions

### **To what extent were funded activities of the Schengen Facility in Croatia complementary to border control activities financed from national resources?**

- To a large extent - please explain
- To some extent - please explain
- Not at all - please explain
- Don't know

### **Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*



**To what extent were funded activities of the Schengen Facility in Croatia complementary to other EU financial instruments in the field of border control, the Schengen acquis implementation and related policy areas:**

	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	Don't know
PHARE	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
External Borders Fund	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Regional Development Fund	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Connecting Europe Facility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Activities financed by another EU or National financial instrument (please specify)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**ADDED VALUE**

In this section, we would like to know your opinion about the EU added value of the activities of the Schengen Facility programme

**Would you say the positive effects achieved in Croatia through the Schengen Facility could have been achieved without the EU financial support?**

- Yes
- Generally yes, although with some problems
- Generally no
- No
- Don't know.

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**Would you say the actions achieved in Croatia through the Schengen Facility will continue without EU financial support?**

- Yes
- Generally yes, although with some problems
- Generally no

- No
- Don't know.

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**IMPACT**

In this section, we would like to know your opinion about the impact of the activities of the Schengen Facility programme

**To what extent have funded activities of the Schengen Facility in Croatia positively contributed to the work of national authorities responsible for the management of borders and visas?**

- Yes to a great extent
- yes to some extent
- Generally no, the implementation had poor impact on these authorities
- No, it was an obstacle to the implementation of the national policies on borders and visas
- Don't know

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**To what extent have funded activities of the Schengen Facility in Croatia positively contributed to the work of national authorities responsible for the management of borders and visas?**

- Yes to a great extent
- yes to some extent
- Generally no, the implementation had poor impact on these authorities
- No, it was an obstacle to the implementation of the national policies on borders and visas
- Don't know

**Please describe briefly your reasons.**

*600 character(s) maximum*

**Please describe some of the positive effects created by the activities funded from the Schengen Facility in Croatia?**

600 character(s) maximum

**Have there been any negative effects of the activities funded by the Schengen Facility in Croatia? Please describe these in the text box below.**

600 character(s) maximum

## Other Issues

---

**Do you have any other views which have not been covered in this consultation?**

800 character(s) maximum

**Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as a position paper. The maximal file size is 1MB.**

**Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.**

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed