



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

SOLID/2011/24
final

**Committee
General programme
Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows**

Subject: Template for the ex-post evaluation report for the External Borders Fund

Summary

The documentation for the preparation of the national ex-post evaluation report consists of a guidance document, an excel workbook to be filled in and a narrative report to be completed.

The final version takes into account the many useful comments received from Member States and the results of further informal consultations. The updated documents provide for more information on how to deal with the output and result indicators, on who should perform the evaluation tasks and how to achieve an independent judgment as part of the evaluation exercise.

The deadline for submission of the reports remains unchanged. Member States should report on the data available by 31 October 2012.

Action to be taken by the Commission

By mid-November, the Commission shall send to each Member State an individualised Excel work book completed with the country-specific data available from the mid-term evaluation. Please use those sheets to start the exercise and not the mock template provided in this package.

Action to be taken by the Member State

Complete the narrative report and the excel document and return them by 31 October 2012 to the email addresses home-solid-committee@ec.europa.eu and luciana.sandu@ec.europa.eu.

For any questions please contact Luciana Sandu (Luciana.Sandu@ec.europa.eu).

Background

According to Article 52(2), point b) of Decision 574/2007/EC, Member States shall submit by 30 June 2012 an evaluation report on the implementation of actions co-financed by the Fund. On the basis of the reports from the Member States, the Commission shall submit to the EP, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions, by 31 December 2012 an ex-post report on the results achieved and qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the Fund.

In light of the fact that the eligibility period for actions for the 2010 annual programme ends at the end of June 2012, and in order to allow for the integration of the results of this annual programme in the report, it is proposed that Member States send their contributions by 31 October 2012.

Template for preparation by Member States of the

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

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

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

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

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

The Netherlands.....

Date:

21 January 2013.....

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

H.P. Heida.....

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

Hein Koller
Delegated Responsible Authority
.....

Important remark

This evaluation is to be performed by

1. staff with evaluation expertise within the Responsible or Delegated Authorities
2. a dedicated evaluation department within the national administration
3. external evaluation expert
4. or a combination thereof.

OR

This evaluation is to be carried out by the Responsible or Delegated Authority and then reviewed by

1. a dedicated evaluation department within the national administration
2. external evaluation expert
3. or a combination thereof.

All options can be supported by the technical assistance.

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

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

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

Yes

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

All parts of this review have been done by the evaluator

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

External evaluation expertise:

The evaluation was carried out by an external consultancy hired by the Responsible Authority. This consultancy, Ordina Public Management Consulting, provided a senior advisor to perform the work. The advisor has broad experience of public sector activities and extensive expertise in financial matters. In addition, he has carried out several assessments including evaluation of both the achievement of the targets of the privatisation of the organisation charged with student finance and also of the quality of guidance provided by the Ministry of Transport, Waterways and Public Works with regard to the macro-maintenance of the main waterways in the Netherlands.

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

* External evaluation expertise: (please describe)

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

INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY.....	7
PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED	8
1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD	8
PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION	12
2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD (IF APPLICABLE)	12
2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD	14
2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS	17
2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)	19
2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP	20
PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS	22
3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT	22
3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD	26
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS	27
3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT	30
3.5. OVERALL RESULTS ACHIEVED WITH THE FUND'S INTERVENTION	31
3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES	33
3.7. LESSONS LEARNED	37
PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE.....	38
4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS	38
4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT	40
4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION	44
4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME.....	44
4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME	44
4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY	46

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?

The beneficiaries of the Fund must submit a report at regular intervals on how their project is progressing. The report must include information on the degree to which the goals have already been achieved, as well as a prediction of the final results. This information will be compared with the goals agreed in the grant agreement. Employees of the Delegated Authority will visit the project after having read the progress report, and will talk to people there about the results.

After completion of the project, the beneficiary must submit a report on the goals realised in comparison with the results aimed at in the grant agreement. Additionally, physical evidence will be shown insofar as possible. A separate financial account, with specifications of all costs, will form a supplement to this report. The Delegated Authority will assess these costs. In most cases the beneficiary will include an audit opinion in the financial report.

Upon completion, employees of the Delegated Authority can visit the project.

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

The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the methodology of first collecting the basic information. The information used for this purpose was included in the grant agreement, the funding decision and the reports on the individual projects on the one hand and the information in the annual programmes and annual reports on the other hand.

In addition, supplementary interviews were held with and supplementary information was collected from the policy workers of the Responsible Authority and from the employees of the Delegated Authority who are charged with monitoring the implementation of the projects and drawing up the funding decisions.

The financial data referring to 2009, insofar as they had to be extracted from the annual report for 2009, were not yet approved by the Audit and Certifying Authority at the time. The financial data referring to 2010 are derived from the financial data that was available by the end of November. This means, among other things, that the final reports of the executing organisations have been used, and that these final reports have not yet been assessed by the Certifying Authority. The concept annual report 2010 is not yet approved by the Audit and Certifying Authority.

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?

No national resources will be made available for NGOs. The organisations with a monopoly, such as the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee (part of the Ministry of Defence) and the Seaport Police (the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations), do get funds from the national government. These funds are made available by way of the National Budget. This way, the funds are guaranteed, among other things.

No changes for the future are envisaged.

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:

	Infrastructure and equipment	Staff	Other	Total
2007 total	SPP: 26.536 RDM: 0 Total: 26.536	SPP: 0 RDM: 0 Total:	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 26.536 RDM: 0 Total: 26.536
2008 total	SPP: 13.719 RDM: 0 Total: 13.719	SPP: 0 RDM: 226.908 Total: 226.908	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 13.719 RDM: 226.908 Total: 240.627
2009 total	SPP: 154.123 RDM: 0 Total: 154.123	SPP: 0 RDM: 547.718 Total: 547.718	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 154.123 RDM: 547.718 Total: 701.841
2010 total	SPP: RDM: 2.414 Total: 2.414	SPP: RDM: 1.386.385 Total: 1.386.385	SPP: RDM: 0	SPP: RDM: 1.388.799 Total: 1.388.799
2011 total	SPP: RDM: 740.318 Total: 740.318	SPP: RDM: 561.221 Total: 561.221	SPP: RDM: 30.150 Total: 30.150	SPP: RDM: 1.331.689 Total: 1.331.689
2012 total (as planned)	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 0 RDM: 519.080 Total: 519.080	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 0 RDM: 519.080 Total: 519.080
2012 total for first half year	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 0 RDM: 269.950 Total: 269.950	SPP: 0 RDM: 0	SPP: 0 RDM: 269.950 Total: 269.950

SPP: Sea Port Police
 RNM: Royal Netherlands Marechaussee

Visa Policy

Table n° 2:

	Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections	Staff at visa sections and headquarters	Other	Total
2007 total				
2008 total				
2009 total				
2010 total				
2011 total	IDMI: 220.714	IDMI: 1.200.000		IDMI: 1.420.714
2012 total (as planned)	IDMI: 561.696	IDMI: 1.200.000		IDMI: 1.761.696
2012 total for first half year				

IT Systems

Table n° 3:

	VIS (total investments/all authorities)	SIS (total investments/all authorities)	Total
2007 total			
2008 total			
2009 total			
2010 total			
2011 total	220.714		
2012 total (as planned)	561.696		
2012 total for first half year			

Other, if applicable:

Table n° 4

	Total
2007 total			
2008 total			
2009 total			

2010 total			
2011 total			
2012 total (as planned)			
2012 total for first half year			

The organisations involved in the implementation of border management and visa policy were asked to deliver the information for the evaluation. They were only partially able to deliver this information, because they are not able to extract the information out of their administration. On the one hand because they are never asked to do so. It is never asked by the Commission, nor is it a requirement for the subsidy. On the other hand these organisations use a cash based administrations in which there is no separate information about investments and deprecation on the investments.

Two organisations are involved in border management: the Sea Port Police and the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee. The Sea Port Police could only give information over the years 2007, 2008 and 2009.

IDMI is the governmental organisation for the implementation of EU-VIS. They exist since 2011. Over the years before 2011 there is no reliable information available.

- 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?

See the explanation on question 1.1.2

- 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.

See the explanation on question 1.1.2

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

When describing the above, please provide the following data:

- Number of border crossing points under the Schengen Borders Code

The Netherlands has 21 border crossing points under the Schengen Border Code. In total 9 airport and 12 sea port crossing points.

- Number of consular posts in accordance with the Visa Code

Number consular posts (cfm. Visa Code)

End 2007	130
End 2008	127
End 2009	124
End 2010	119
End 2011	119

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

Refer question 4.01. There are no numbers of travellers available after 2009.

- Numbers of visa applications annually (2007-2011)

Number visa applications

End 2007	412.886
End 2008	369.893
End 2009	337.200
End 2010	388.946
End 2011	429.246

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

Main services are Sea Port police, Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION

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

2.1.1 Overview of calls for proposals for the programmes

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

Not Applicable

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 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 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 5)					
Projects funded without such calls (total "projects funded" table 6)					
TOTAL Projects funded in the “awarding body” method (including multiannual projects)					

2.1.5. Co-financing

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

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

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

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

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

The Netherlands apply the 'executing body method' and projects will be implemented by government bodies in conjunction with the Responsible Authority (RA). This situation arises from the *de jure* monopoly situation of the relevant government bodies with responsibilities in the fields of border surveillance and visas. For security reasons, it is frequently not desirable for certain initiatives to be undertaken by parties other than these government bodies.

The RA consult the agencies responsible for border surveillance and visas about the activities planned and the priorities for the next few years in the fields of border surveillance and visas. This involves consultation with the Ministry of Defence (Royal Netherlands Marechaussee), the Ministry of Finance (Customs), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Movement of Persons Department), the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (Seaport Police Service) and the Immigration and Naturalisation Service as well as several other departments involved of the ministries of Justice and Interior and Kingdom Relations. Based on these consultations, national priorities are set and a decision is taken on the projects to be financed. As indicated in the Multi-Annual Programme, the use of EBF resources will primarily focus on implementation of European legislation and rules.

In the light of the above, the Immigration Coordination Group (CGV), the Steering Group, involving the Ministry of Justice (Immigration and Naturalisation Service, Repatriation and Departure Service, Migration Policy Department), the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee, the Seaport Police Service and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Movement of Persons Department) advised the Responsible Authority (RA).

The Netherlands always uses the method of call of interest. In August, the year before the annual programme the calls of interest are sent to the above-mentioned organisations.

The grant applicants have to complete an application form, including a detailed budget, and submit them to the Delegated Authority, which is the European Funds Programme Secretariat (EFPS). A grant decision based on the information on the application forms approved will be sent to the grant applicant on behalf of the Responsible Authority. This constitutes the official decision on the award of a grant. This decision also sets out the requirements to be met by the project organisation. Once the application forms have been submitted and the (financial) rules of the EBF have been complied with, the EFPS will draw up the grant decisions. It is also important that the European Commission approve the annual programme in question.

During implementation of a project, the grant recipient is required to submit a progress report to the EFPS within 4 weeks of the end of each quarter and more frequently in exceptional circumstances. The EFPS assesses the progress reports and, if necessary, asks additional questions about the material and financial progress of the project. Once it has received the first progress report, the EFPS pays a monitoring visit to the grant recipient to check the material and financial progress of the project. An opinion is also formed on the quality of administration. Once the project has been completed, the grant recipient submits a settlement report, which will be used as the basis for determining the final amount of the grant.

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	2	3	2	2	9
Project selected	2	3	2	1	8
Projects funded	2	3	2	2	9
Out of which multiannual projects	2	3	2	2	9

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

Annual Programme 2007: Not applicable

Annual Programme 2008: Not applicable

Annual Programme 2009: Not applicable

Annual Programme 2010:

Only one project is selected because the budget was not sufficient for both proposals received. The project selected is part of the Multi Annual Programme Innovation Border Management. This project supports the European development on border management. Afterwards this project is split up into 2 projects.

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

Table n° 9

Number of	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded	0	0	0	0	0
Out of which multiannual	0	0	0	0	0

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

Table n° 10

Number of ...	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, or similar selection method (see table 8)	2	3	2	2	9
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Projects funded in the “executing body” method (including multi-annual)	2	3	2	2	9

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.

For organisations with a monopoly, part of the funding is financed with funds from the EBF and another part with own funds of the monopoly organisation. The Director of the monopoly organisation signs the decision. This is considered sufficient for verifying and ensuring the co-financing.

2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS

2.3.1. Overview of revisions for 2007-2010 annual programmes

Table n° 11

AP	EU contribution allocated	Was a revision concerning a change of more than 10% of the allocation needed? (Y/N)	Percentage of allocation concerned by the revision, if a revision was needed
AP 2007	2.557.449,31	N	
AP 2008	3.045.628,53	N	
AP 2009	4.111.562,00	N	
AP 2010	4.599.130,00	N	

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

Annual programme 2007

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

Explanation/elaboration:

Annual programme 2008

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

Explanation/elaboration:

Annual programme 2009

- Financial change beyond 10%
- Changes in the substance/nature of the actions

- New action(s) needed
- 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?

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	€ 209.021,45	€ 204.314,15
2008	€ 246.723,03	€ 138.180,96
2009	€ 317.562,00	€ 249.107,60
2010	€ 351.939,10	€ 168.735,43
Total 2007-2010	€ 1.125.245,55	€ 760.338,14

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	198.651,70		499.,97	4.310,17	852,31		207.314,15
2008	136.133,09		897,97	1.149,90			138.180,96
2009	240.879,51	213,12	3.549,74	4.465,23			249.107,60
2010*	142.451,58		5.355,12	2.579,45		18.349,28	168.735,43

* The sums of money mentioned for 2010 are based on the accounting records until December the 19^h. A considerable sum of costs is not part of these sums of money, because they are not yet known or part of forthcoming cost for the settlement of activities for the Return Fund 2010 (until March 2013). This applied especially for the costs of staff, IT, monitoring and reporting are not all included.

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

The TA has facilitated the establishment of a separate programme secretariat, the European Funds Programme Secretariat (PEF). This Delegated Authority takes work off the Responsible Authority, which has really no capacity for executing the work involved in granting, assessing, monitoring and handling subsidies. Furthermore, the institution of the Delegated Authority makes it possible to work with professional and expert employees who are specifically dealing with the present activities.

The involvement of the Certifying Authority and the Audit Authority is also paid by the TA funds. Also, funds are used for participating in the SOLID committee, international working parties and monitoring visits to projects.

The involvement of TA is not needed for any other activities.

2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP

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

The Management and Control System for the EBF is the same for the European Refugee Fund and the Return Fund. It has been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far, although the Audit Authority and the Certifying Authority did not perform too much activity as yet.

The result of the audit on the Management and Control System of these three funds carried out in spring 2009 by Unit A4 of DG JLS proves that the system works. A similar audit carried out in late 2009 by the Audit Authority had the same result.

In October 2010 a new Dutch government was installed. With this new government came a shift in the responsibilities of, among other bodies, the Ministry of Security and Justice and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations. The Responsible Authority and the Delegated Authority were both originally placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Security and Justice. Under the new government, the Responsible Authority and the delegated authority fall under the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations and under the Minister for Immigration and Asylum.

The description of the Management and Control System (MSC) is revised in order to address the new situation adequately. The changes in the MSC have been revised in the second half of 2011. In 2011, the delegated authority was having some issues regarding the capacity of its team, and there followed a period of discussion on the exact location of the secretariat within the Ministry of the Interior. These issues have been tackled and the MSC has been revised and signed by the Responsible Authorities.

- 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?

After receiving the results on the call for interest a proposal for the annual programme is made. Base for the annual programme is the selection of projects through the Steering Committee. After the approval of the annual programme by the EC the agreements for granting projects is sign by the Responsible Authority.

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

Table n° 14

	Priority 1		Priority 4		Total	
	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP 2007	33	33	4	4	11	14
AP 2008	73	62	18	18	31	32

AP 2009	89	85	78	78	81	82
AP 2010	68	65			68	65
%	66	61	33	33	48	48

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.:

Despite the fact that the aimed goals of the projects always have been reached and that these projects have been beneficial for the border management in the Netherlands the overall assessment is only satisfactory because:

- The demands for the project administrations are too complicated and differ too much from the demands from the national perspective. This results in ineligibility of costs. The ineligibility was caused mainly by not completely or correctly following the administrative tender procedures at the purchase of equipment and assets, by entering costs of the project organization and by arranging project administrations in accordance with the methods that are usually followed. These do not connect by definition with the appropriate implementing rules of the EBF.
- The delayed availability of the implementing rules also plays a part with this.
- Therefore, the extra effort for submitting the European demands is too much for the project organisations. Organisations are hesitating to bring in projects.
- For that reason, the financial benefits from the EBF are relatively marginal, although a lot of time is invested in contact through email and telephone to discuss progress and answering questions about administrative requirements.

PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS

In The Netherlands most of the projects carried out are of a different aim and nature than those in mind referring to the output and result indicators mentioned in the excel sheets. Therefore other indicators are used. For a more comprehensive description of the projects refer to part 3.6.

The Netherlands does not have registrations of necessary data for the output and result indicators for the baseline and for most of the indicators for the actually years.

For other indicators then mentioned in the annex 1 we refer to the excel sheet Reporting on projects.

3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

Table n° 15

2. Border surveillance systems	Number of systems acquired or upgraded			Number of stakeholders connected			Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	12											

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

The results of the projects under priority 1 are consistent with the set of objectives in the MAP and the AP's in question during the years 2007-2010.

AP 2007 and 2008

Under priority 1 (the project Setting-up of Central Control Room for Seaport police) the objectives 4, 5, 6, 7, 20, 21 22 and 22 of the Multi Annual Programme (MAP) are implemented in the years 2007 and 2008.

Purpose and scope of the action is setting up of the control room for the Seaport Police. The goal was achieved in 2008.

The new control room contributes to a common integrated border management system. In order to be able to execute an effective and efficient border control at the Seaport it is important for the Sea Port Police to have a good information position and to have information exchange. The setting up of the control room, the purchase of new information systems, the basic provisions to make future camera surveillance possible, the requirements for such an information position and information exchange all are met.

Information systems are improved so they are able to contribute to risk analysis of traffic elements in the port.

The corporation between operational partners in the port is improved.

AP 2008

Beside the setting up of the control room for the Seaport Police the project Programme office for sustained border management is carried out. This project refers to the objectives 2, 3, 10, 12 and 13 of the Multi Annual Programme.

Sound regulation of migration, smoothing the way for passengers and – as an integral part of this process – facilitating border surveillance are in the interests of travellers and therefore in the interests of the Dutch (and European) economy. Purpose and scope of the project is the right balance between the need for security and economic interests must also be sought. This balance is what the Programme Sustained border management seeks to achieve. The project aimed at the setting up the Programme for sustained border management. The goals for 2008 were met.

A program manager for the Programme for sustained border management was appointed.

Two conferences for various organizations involved with border management were organised. Aim of the conferences was to obtain commitment for innovation of border management at Schiphol, to define a mutual objective and scope of the programme and to initiate projects. The Accelerated Solution Environment (ASE) method was used for setting up the conferences. This method has proved useful to obtain insight in complex governmental matters with a large number of interested parties, in a short period of time. The government parties involved are the Ministry of Justice (Migration policy department), the Immigration and Naturalization Service (IND) , NCTb, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Seaport Police Service, the Ministry of Defence (royal Marechaussee), the Ministry of Finance (Customs) and the Ministry of Transport (Directory Aviation). The private parties involved are the Schiphol Group and KLM.

A business case was developed, including a roadmap with concrete projects

These activities led to the already mentioned results (to obtain commitment for innovation of border management at Schiphol, to define a mutual objective and scope of the programme and to initiate projects). The programme for Sustained Border Management was later renamed Program Innovation Border Management and is currently part of the Program Directorate Identity Management and Immigration (IDMI) of the ministry of Security and Justice. For the execution of the defined projects (Pardex, pilot API, No-Q and for the Program Office) the Program successfully applied for EBF funding for the tranches 2009, 2010 and 2012.

AP 2009

As a result of the project Programme office for sustained border management 2008 two projects have been started in 2009 and are (part wise) continued in 2010. These projects refers to the objectives 2, 3, 10, 12 and 13 of the Multi Annual Programme.

- Pardex

This project starts in 2009 with the definition of a vision and the development of scenario's for the future border surveillance. Based on the selected scenario for intelligence-led management of border surveillance, the concept, the processes, the organization and the use of so called 'passenger related data', were described in detail. Also the impact for the associated organizations, a business case for this project and a roadmap to implement the scenario were defined and proposed to the Executive Steering Committee by the end of 2010.

- API

The aim of this pilot was to gain hands on experience in collecting, collating, analysing and sharing passengers data and to ensure the added value of the use of passenger data in managing border surveillance. During the pilot questions regarding the use and limits of passengers, data were answered. One of the main questions of the pilot was: 'what extra information is necessary for an intelligence led border management system'. The pilot was conducted in the timeframe 2009 – 2010. The results, based on the use of real passengers data of a predefined number of flights and destinations, are used by the project Pardex to complete the concept, the business case and the roadmap for the implementation of the new intelligence-led management of border surveillance.

The goals for both projects were met.

Two projects which were foreseen in the AP 2009 (project No-Q and project RT) are started in 2010.

AP 2010

The 2009 project Programme office for sustained border management is changed in the AP 2010 in Programme Innovation Border Management. As part of this programme the project Pardex, API and Trusted Traveller Programme was defined. This initial project is later divided into 2 projects: Pardex / RT and No-Q / PKI.

The aims for PARDEX/API in the AP 2010 were:

- The requirements for a tender for a modular information system will be written.
- A presentation to other Member States of the results of the pilot project on API data and an an exchange of information regarding standards, templates, best practices, risk profiles, trends, and so on.

These aims were met, except the requirements for a tender is not yet finished..

For Registered Travellers (RT) the aims were:

- An evaluation of the Flux pilot with the United States is conducted
- A presentation is given to the other Member States of the evaluation of the Flux pilot.
- Launching initiatives to develop together with other Member States a European approach on Registered Travellers Programmes with a view to ensuring interoperability in the mid to long term.
- Purchase / development of the vetting information system.

- An increased number of passengers served by the multinational RT programme/. Estimated target: for 2011 2,5% of the border passages by third-country nationals could be facilitated with a registered travellers programme.
- The average time for vetting will be reduced from 5 weeks to two working days when the vettingsystem is operational.
- New registered travellers programmes for specific focus groups.

These aims were completely met in 2010.

In the AP 2010 for PKI as part of No-Q the following aims were defined:

- Introduction of a national Public Key Infrastructure for automated border control.
- Development of a set of requirements for equipment and software for automated gate controls, derived from the testing of existing solutions for automated gate controls.
- Selection and acquisition of equipment and software for automated gate controls.
- Start of the implementation of the gates.

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.

With the new control room combined with a risk approach, a more efficient sea border control is possible. The risk approach made it possible to focus on the most risky group of persons or goods crossing the border.

Sustained border management likewise contribute to a more efficient border control.

For Pardex the requirements for a tender for a modular information system are written. API was a pilot for hands-on experience on data processing. The results are made available for other member states.

PKI make it possible to process many travellers in a short time. For the implementation requirements are set up and selection and acquisition of a system is done. The systems is functioning at the border at Schiphol.

RT: launching of initiatives tot develop RT with member states. A vetting system is developed.

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?

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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.

Not applicable

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

2. Border surveillance systems	Number of systems acquired or upgraded			Number of stakeholders connected						Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)					
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010			
	18																	

10. Consular infrastructure	Number of visa sections in consular posts new/renovated			Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality of the consular service (security doors, bulletproof windows)						Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)		Reduction of incidents (Yes/No)
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010				Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	
	18														

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			
	204													

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

The results of the projects under priority 4 are consistent with the set of objectives in the MAP and the AP's in question during the years 2007-2010.

AP 2007, 2008 and 2009

During the years 2007 – 2009 the implementation of the VIS in the Netherlands is undertaken under priority 4. For that reason the discussion of the years 2007-2010 are put together.

The actions under priority 4 implements the objectives 8, 9 and 29 of of the Multi Annual Programme. Implementation of the EU VIS in the Netherlands primarily involves technical connection of the Dutch authorities to the EU VIS.

The implementation of EU VIS in the Netherlands involves three projects:

- The first project is the "connection to EU VIS" project. One of the aims of this is to link the Immigrants Basic Service (BVV) to EU VIS and to coordinate the installation of EU VIS by the various chain partners.
- The second project involves the acquisition of the peripherals. The purpose of this project is to guarantee the quality of biometric data entry and to promote the increased use of equipment for non-immigration processes.
- The third project involves connecting the chain partners. The purpose of this project is to implement EU VIS within the chain partners.

In 2007 the emphasis has been put on realising the pre-conditions and the connections of all chain partners. The results as mentioned in the AP 2007 overall have been reached. For those who were not reached yet in 2007, a start was made and the projected aims were reached in 2008.

In 2008 the focus was on putting in place the system adaptations (instalment of software and hardware) and preparing the infrastructural adaptations with a view to the implementation of the system (design). In particular, the following activities were undertaken:

- the construction of new physical locations for border control and visa issuing;
- the development of the applications for border control and visa issuing
- the installation and configuration of servers for these applications
- launch of the training of officials for the use of the equipment
- Renovation of 18 visa sections in consular posts (not subsidiary).

A rescheduling took place for the EU-VIS that has led to postponement of the implementation to 24 June 2011. As a consequence the national schedule was adjusted. Project partner Ministry of Foreign Affairs realised fewer (9 instead of 13) consular departments adapted for the use of VIS.

In the 2009 tranche particular activities that were received:

- The construction of physical locations for border control and visa issuing; 13 border crossing points (a.o. Schiphol, Rotterdam Harbour and airport, IJmuiden, Den Helder etc)
- The development of the applications for border control and visa issuing; applications that inter-connect with CS-VIS infrastructure.
- The installation and configuration of servers at every RA for these applications;
The training of border en consular officers to use the equipment was delayed due of the rescheduling for EU-VIS. This will be done under EBF 2011.

AP 2010

Not applicable

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.

All refer to VIS

The actions under priority 4 made it possible to meet the requirements of the EU VIS project. In 2007 the emphasis has been put on realising the pre-conditions/parameters and the connections of all chain partners. For 2008 the focus was putting in place the system adaptations (instalment of software and hardware) and preparing the infrastructural adaptations with a view to the implementation of the system (design). This includes the construction of new physical locations for border control and visas issuing; the development of the applications for border control and visa issuing; the installation and configuration of servers for these applications and the launch of the training of officials for the use of the equipment. For 2009 the focus was on the implementation of the biometric hardware.

Under this action also the renovation is done of visa counters for consular stations, the Royal Marechaussee and the Seaport police. Additional hardware and software is acquired, all for the purpose to commit the requirements for EU-VIS. Risk approach is used for guardian activities. VIS is audit and got the IAOT – mark, so the system could into production.

3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT

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

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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.

Not applicable

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

2. Border surveillance systems	Number of systems acquired or upgraded			Number of stakeholders connected			Length of the external borders covered (km)			Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot)		
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	30											

10. Consular infrastructure	Number of visa sections in consular posts new/renovated			Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality of the consular service (security doors, bulletproof windows)			Number of visas issued at new or renovated premises			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)		Reduction of incidents (Yes/No)
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	
	18											

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	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	204						

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

- Neutral
- Positive
- Very positive
- Excellent

3.5.3. Please comment on the overall results achieved (as presented in Table n° 19) in relation to your initially set expectations as stated in the annual programmes.

It should be clear that EBF contribute to better border management. Only that is not all clear visible in the indicators.

The projects done in the Netherlands differ in many respects from the type of projects on which the indicators refer. Nevertheless, EBF made it possible to introduce new approaches and techniques for border management, such as the risk approach and the use of biometric capture stations. Through these new techniques and approaches it is possible to handle a greater amount of travellers and goods at border crossing points in the same time as before. Also it is possible to be more efficient in the checking of passengers in such a way that more risky groups are better controlled.

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.

Because in The Netherlands only eight projects have been carried out we describe the three best projects. All these projects reached the goals and are more or less in time. The importance of the projects 1 and 2 is the new way of border management in which new techniques and risk analysis are combined.

1. Setting-up of Central Control Room for Seaport Police/Maritime External Border.

This action was inspired by three developments: the growth of the Port of Rotterdam, the intensification of border surveillance and the port security plan for the Port of Rotterdam. This calls for a close multi-disciplinary cooperation with the Seaport Police playing a major directing role. In order to enable it to fulfil its tasks and responsibilities, it is essential for the Seaport Police Service to be properly prepared for this. An excellent position as regards optimum risk analysis and tight control are essential requirements for the surveillance of the external borders and security within the port.

Within this project the Rotterdam Rijnmond Seaport Police intends to carry out the following activities:

- Set up a central control room.
The current Seaport Police "incident room" is converted into a central control room where high-quality data will be applied instantly for border surveillance, enforcement and tracing.
- Improve information system and continue to develop existing technologies (risk analysis system/ ZUIS).
The central control room will supply bespoke risk analysis for management of internal processes initially. The existing premises are extended and provided with a working environment for a Large-Scale and Special Operations Department (DGBO) or disaster operation centre.
- Application of new technologies.
The use of camera surveillance and other technologies (such as ANPR/biometrics) in management.
- Developments concerning the setting-up of a Mainport Monitor Center Rotterdam, cooperation between operational partners in the port, security of vital objects and connection of cameras and radar.

This project is particularly interesting because of the integration of risk analysis on 'big data'. In this way it is possible to control a great amount of travel movements in such a way that the most risky are 'in the picture'.

2. Sustained Border Management Innovation

The objective of the Programme is to create an effective and efficient border monitoring process leveraging automated monitoring and risk-driven action based on information received in advance (passengers and goods) to the greatest extent possible. This requires a good balance between maximum security, optimal mobility and high (passenger) service.

It was stated in the Annual programmes that with globalisation and the consequent growth in international travel, the number of passengers presenting themselves at the Dutch external borders is rising every year. It is generally accepted that the number of passengers will increase significantly in the next ten to fifteen years. The majority of passengers travel through Schiphol airport.

Pursuing current practices would mean that the border surveillance process would take an increasing amount of time, particularly at airports. The prospect of added checks, longer waiting times and queues could induce passengers to no longer travel to the Schengen area via the Dutch border and could make the Netherlands less attractive as a transit country. Sound regulation of migration, smoothing the way for passengers and – as an integral part of this process – facilitating border surveillance are in the interests of travellers and therefore in the interests of the Dutch (and European) economy. The right balance between the need for security and economic must also be sought. Clearly, initiatives to foster the economic interests of the Netherlands can never be to the detriment of national and international security.

The Programme leverages the use of new technology (biometry, e-passport, e-visa, electronic gateways, etc), use of (pre-arrival) passenger information and sharing information among the authorities involved, to increase the number of low risk passengers to cross the border in a controlled, smart and smooth way and to prevent the access to the Schengen area of high risk passengers in their country of origin or subject these passengers to physical checks at the ports. Proper application of these processes in the border patrol process is also very valuable from the point of view of combating terrorism, crime and for public order and national security.

The appointed programme manager has set up the programme in 2008. The programme started with four projects and a programme office. The parties involved in this programme are the Ministry of Justice, The Immigration and Nationalisation Services, The Royal Marechaussee, Customs, National Coordinator of Counterterrorism, Seaport Police, Schiphol Group and KLM. The programme is governed by an Executive Steering Committee, composed of senior management representatives of the parties involved.

With respect to this project the following activities were undertaken by the Programme Office for Sustained Border Management Innovation:

- The acquisition, testing and introduction of equipment and programming for automated border controls that make increasing use of biometric identifiers.
- The development and implementation of a new border-management concept and the related border-management system (*in the MAP called "infohouse*
- The project includes a pilot project in which passenger data that are collected, collated, analysed and shared is tested.

In 2010 the programme included 4 projects:

- Pardex.

This project implemented a new, intelligence-led border-management concept and a related border-management system. The new border management concept is based on so-called information-driven action. This means that passenger information is collected, collated, analysed and shared in advance of the actual journey. During analysis, not only are watch lists and risk profiles drawn up but advanced analysis tools are used to identify trends, etc., to build up a full picture of the risk. The quick and timely separation of low risk travellers from high-risk passengers is thus made possible. Low risk passengers (whose information has been checked) are then permitted to pass through rapidly (without queuing and without the stress of a control) by the automated system (linked to project No-Q, see below). Based on the information analysed, high-risk passengers are already denied access to the Netherlands in their country of origin or are subjected to physical controls at Schiphol airport. This project will last for at least five years.

In order to start-up this project, the project team started in 2009 with the definition of a vision and the development of scenario's for the future border surveillance. Based on the selected scenario for intelligence-led management of border surveillance, the concept, the processes, the organization and the use of so called 'passenger related data', will be described in detail.

Also the impact for the associated organizations, a business case for this project and a roadmap to implement the scenario were defined and proposed to the Executive Steering Committee by the end of 2010.

- Parallel to the preparation of Pardex, a pilot project was conducted to test the collection collating, analysing and sharing of passenger data based on the EU API² Directive. The aim of this pilot was to gain hands on experience in collecting, collating, analysing and sharing passengers data and to ensure the added value of the use of passenger data in managing border surveillance. The results, based on the use of real passengers data of a predefined number of flights and destinations, was used by the project Pardex to complete the concept, the business case and the roadmap for the implementation of the new intelligence-led management of border surveillance.
- Project No-Q. This project is a public private partnership between the airport and the authorities. This project entails the testing, acquisition and introduction of equipment and programming for automated border controls that would make increasing use of biometric identifiers. The use of equipment and software together with passengers' willingness to go through automated border controls will be tested before the phased widespread introduction of the equipment and software. The automatic border control will be based on facial recognition. Parallel a national PKI will be developed, for a optimal automatic border control process. The national PKI is necessary in addition to the PKD of the ICAO. The Netherlands will develop a PKI structure to use the PKD of ICAO. The timeframe for this project is 2009 – 2011.
- Project RT. This project will develop and implement Registered Travel programmes. In 2009 the project was start-up by means of well defined project plan, project structure and project organisation, and by establishing the project team. Part of the programme was the evaluation of the FLUX pilot with the USA and the development of a national alternative Orange Lane.

3. VIS

The purpose of VIS projects is to facilitate the prompt and thorough implementation of the VIS in the Netherlands. Proper implementation is even more important where these processes are implemented at the border as passenger flows have to be taken into account. This should be facilitated as much as possible. Proper application of these processes in the border patrol process is also very valuable from the point of view of combating terrorism, crime and for public order and national security. Implementation of the EU VIS in the Netherlands primarily involves technical connection of the Dutch authorities to the EU VIS.

The implementation of the EU VIS in the Netherlands involved three projects:

- The first project is the "connection to the EU VIS" project. One of the aims of this is to link the Immigrants Basic Service to the EU VIS and to coordinate the installation of the EU VIS at the various partners in the chain.
- The second project involves the acquisition of the peripheral equipment. The purpose of this project is to guarantee the quality of biometric data entry and to promote the increased use of equipment for non-immigration processes.
- The third project involves connecting the partners in the chain. The purpose of this project is to implement the EU VIS at the partners in the chain.

Together, the projects and sub-projects are intended to lead to the implementation of the EU VIS in accordance with the Regulation and the other related provisions in the Common Consular Instructions (CCI) and the Schengen Borders Code. The activities begun in 2007 and were finished in 2009.

The projects concerned involved changes to work processes, training staff and modifying, testing, securing and managing the provision of information within the Seaport Police Service, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

² API: Advanced Passenger Information)

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.

- Due to the projects under EBF there is more coordination between the chain partners such as the Seaport Police and the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee. As a result the partners are more familiar with each other and so they work more together.
- The co-operators of the Delegated Authority work tight together on the administrative management on the four migration funds. They experiences a advantage of working together because of the coherence between the funds.

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

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

Because all projects meet their aims there are no less successful projects.

The fact that at the start of the EBF there was under depletion of the fund is not a responsibility of the projects funded. It is due to the late availability of the requirements for projects funded by the fund.

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.

It is preferable to fill in the administrative requirements for the project administration in an early state. Because it is often not possible to fulfil these requirements afterwards. The consequence is that less eligible costs are subsidized.

For a complete contributing in all eligible costs of a project it is preferable to have a complete insight of all costs before the fix of the AP.

As a result of the troubles with the administrative difficulties, as mentioned above, and the under-capacity by the Delegated Authority, the cooperation between chain partners and the Delegated Authority is not so smoothly as it could be. In addition, there is a restraint by the chain partners against funding by EBF, because of the (changing) requirements for a grant.

3.7.2.2.

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

In order to reduce the restraint by the chain partners the Delegated Authority has started a consultation with the chain partners. So in an early state the Delegated Authority advice them over the requirements for funding by the EBF.

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).

In 2008 the immigration reached an all time high of almost 144.000 people.. The main motive for immigration is the reunification of families.

The amount of people refused at the external borders is over the years relatively constant., so round the 3.000 till 3.500 people. Most reason for refusing access is that people do not have the right travel documents or the right visa or permit to stay.

The migration system in place will change in short time. The procedures for applications will be changed in such a way that the restrictive policy will be changed to a policy in which people needed in the Netherlands will receive their permit to stay quickly and easily. This Modern Migration Policy will be supported by an advantage computer system.

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
Passenger crossings at external borders	2.833.410 (seaport) 21.361.038 (airport)	27.500.000 (airport) 3.689.446 (seaport)	Not available
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	4.346 (2007)	2.500	3.500
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	11.634 (2007)	6.588	11
Visa applications made	412.886 (end 2007)	337.200	429.246
Visas issued	Not available	Not available	Not available

*)n June 29th 2011 the Commission is informed by email that the figures 2006 and 2009 are based on a different interpretation. 2006 and 2009 represent the amount third country nationals illegal in the Netherlands found and put in custody. The 2011 figure is conform the right interpretation.

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.

The projects financed through the Fund have contributed to strengthening our borders via concrete results such as the setting-up of a central control room for the Seaport Police and the implementation of the VIS in the Netherlands. Through the setting-up of the central control room we are able to cope with the growth of the Port of Rotterdam, to intensify the border surveillance and enhance the security of the Port. Furthermore, the projects regarding Pardex, API and the Trusted Traveller Programme have positively contributed to the Dutch Sustained Border Management Innovation.

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?

No, we have not since no particular migration flows have stood out sufficiently to influence decisions to the extent that it would have changed 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?

The implementation of VIS in the Netherlands has been and still is an important project through which a significant contribution to the overall range of activities in support of border management will be realised.

- 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?

See the answer to question 4.1.1.

- 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?

See the answer to question 4.1.1.

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

Concrete and visible results such as a central control room for Seaport Police or a Trusted Traveller Program have contributed to strengthening the image of secure Dutch borders.

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

The added value of the programmes lies in the European character of the projects, thus automatically adding an extra level to the programmes/policies at national, regional and local level.

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.

The setting up of a central control room for Seaport Police has led to a 100% control of persons in the highest risk category. The implementation of the VIS in the Netherlands

has led to simplifying of visa applications, control of borders and the identification of persons.

- 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?

Projects focussing on the introduction of EUROSUR will be put forward under the next tranches of the EBF. However, in general, all projects focussing on fighting irregular immigration are preparing the Netherlands for the introduction of EUROSUR.

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

The Netherlands has not focussed on this type of consular projects under this Fund.

- 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).

PARDEX and RT projects – selection and acquisition of hardware and software - as part of the Dutch Programme Innovation Border Management have been financed through this Fund.

- 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?

National funds would have been used. It is not possible to say to what extent and in what timeframe these problems would then have been addressed since this is highly dependant on the political priorities at the time.

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

Border management

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

See Central Control Room, VIS and Pardex/RT projects.

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

See VIS projects

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)

See VIS projects.

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.

See added value of the RT project.

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.

See added value of the VIS project.

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.

Start of an international cooperation on Trusted Traveller programs through the RT/TT project.

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 **depending on political priorities at the time**
- part of the activities carried out by public authorities (namely...) could not have been carried out
- the co-financing of the Fund, activities by other organisations could not have been carried out (namely, if applicable)
- other

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.

See added value of the Pardex and RT/TT projects,

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.

See added value of the VIS project.

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?

No

4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME

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

Yes, as can be derived from the indicators in the excel sheets.

4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME

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

Table n° 21

Calendar year	TA contribution (€)	National contribution (€)	National contribution in-kind (offices, IT tools) – (€ estimate)	Total (€)
2007	€ 204.314,15			
2008	€ 138.180,96			
2009	€ 249.107,60			
2010	€ 351.939,10*			
2011	€ 265.991,36*			
First six month 2012	€ 163.060,82*			

*) the expected figures

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

Not applicable

Table n° 22

Calendar year	Staff within the RA, CA, AA (n° & €)	IT and equipment (€)	Office/ consumables(€)	Travelling/events	Total (€)
2007					
2008					
2009					
2010					
2011					
First six month 2012					

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

The Fund was not much used at the beginning of the evaluation period, approximately 10 %. At the end of the period the use of the fund was approximately 66%. The years after 2010 show a considerable increase of the available amount, as well as of its use. Nearly 100% of the available contribution of the EC.

During the evaluation years, the professional management of the Fund has improved and, equally so, the efficiency of its implementation, primarily because of a better performance by PEF (the programme secretariat for the execution of the Fund). This is shown by the following:

- More and better knowledge of applicable rules and regulations
- More and better contacts with desk officers in Brussels
- More and better knowledge of the implementing organisations in the Netherlands and, as a result, a better ability to indicate bottlenecks in advance.
- Ability to handle more applications or, as the case may be, projects with the same number of employees
- Anticipation of future rules and regulations

The result of the increasing professional approach of PEF is:

- PEF's increased experience
- Better understanding of which costs may or may not be subsidised
- Ability to establish at an earlier stage whether the fund is not being used to its full extent, and to take appropriate measures.

When you raise the question if the management costs are proportionate to the results achieved, the answer is some what mixed.

Some people find the requirements to fulfil high, especially in the organisation who benefit from the fund. The efforts it takes to fulfil these requirements are mostly not a part of the costs. So the amount of management cost does not reflect the complete effort.

From an overall perspective you could say that the financial costs are not so high, in relation to the financial benefits. But this depends also on the fact what is your point of reference.

All in all a mixed opinion, but in the end a little positive.

4.5. COMPLEMENTARITY

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

In the execution of projects within the framework of the ERF there are no instances of any relations or interrelations with other European funds other than the migration funds.

In the selection forms for new projects, possible overlap with other European subsidies is a standard issue requiring attention.

- 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.)

There was no complementary funding available.

* * *

OVERALL MANAGEMENT OF THE ACTIONS IN THE APS 2007-2010

Legend	Questions: 1. Was the expected number of projects initially set finally achieved through the action? 2. Did you spend a higher amount than you initially programmed for this action? 3. Did you achieve the expected results for the projects? 4. Did you encounter issues with the management of this action? 5. Did you encounter issues with individual projects implementation? 6. Was this action subject to AP revision?												
	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		
	Yes	No (pls explain)	Yes (why ?)	No	Yes	No (Why)	Yes (what?)	No	Yes (what kind?)	No	No	Yes, <10%	Yes, >10%
AP 2009													
A1 Pardex / API as part of Sustained Border Management	Y			N	Y			N		N	N		
A2 Implementation VIS	Y			N	Y			N	Y*		N		
AP 2010													
A1 Programme Innovation Border management	Y			N	Y			N			N		

*) High demands on project administration and questions on subsidized costs causes issues between the secretariate and project organisations.

End of the report

