**EVALUATION REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS
co-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND
BY THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA**

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

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

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

Report submitted by the Responsible Authority of:

Republic of Slovenia
Ministry of Interior

Date: 30.6.2010

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

Matej UREK
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND
PURCHASING OFFICE
SECRETARY

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

Zlatko Grubar, +386 1 4284529, zlatko.grubar@gov.si

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

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

No. Evaluation was prepared by the responsible authority with close cooperation with intermediate bodies.

- If yes, for what part(s) of this report?
N/A
- Please explain what kind of evaluation expertise you had recourse to:
N/A
* In-house evaluation expertise (for instance, Evaluation department of the Ministry, etc.) : (please describe)
N/A

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

Important remark

Any evaluation expertise must be obliged by the Responsible Authority to:
- use this template, exclusively
- fully comply with any instruction, methodological note, maximum length, etc. set out in this template.

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

CONTENTS

Part I

Summary of the Multiannual Programme 2007-2013

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

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

1.   ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS IN THE MEMBER STATE

The total length of the Slovenian state border is 1382 km, which possesses 57 border crossing points (BCPs) on land, 3 air and 3 sea border crossings (BCs). In the north, the Republic of Slovenia borders with the Republic of Austria (330 km), in the west with the Republic of Italy (232 km land border and 48 km sea border), in the east with the Republic of Hungary (102 km land and partially river border) and in the south with the Republic of Croatia (approximately 670 km land and river border with a not yet specified sea border).

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

Main areas of requirements in the Republic of Slovenia as outlined in the MAP are: **Infrastructure**, **equipment**, **ITC projects** and **training**. After the border crossings at the Slovenian southern border have become the EU external border, constant and quality management, arrangement and improvement of these border crossings must have be ensured. Their facilities, devices and infrastructure must have been supplemented in order to fulfil not only Schengen criteria but also to ensure suitable working conditions for personnel and appropriate handling of passengers and traffic on the border. Slovenia also identified the trend of increasing passenger traffic at the Jože Pučnik Airport that has necessitated the expansion of capacities to satisfy the increased need, meaning the expansion of the passenger terminal which at the same time represents an increase in the scope of border control and additional facilities for this purpose. In order to improve detection of illegal crossings of the state border, the equipment for border control and surveillance must always be updated and of high quality. Constant improvements are necessary as regards to the mobility of border controls and border surveillance, as well as border surveillance from the air (especially at night) and on the sea, and communication and co-ordination between police patrols. The development and adaptation of the national systems (VIZIS, SI.VIS) for connection to VIS and their proper functioning was necessary. Constant training of police officers is also important in the field of regulations, new means of work and instruments, as well as in the manner the work is carried out.

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

Investments into the infrastructure. Construction of BCPs or their upgrades - e.g. notice boards for border traffic directions at BCPs; expansion of airport and port infrastructure; construction of a trilateral centre; central call centre for visa operations,...

Investments into technical equipment and transport means. Introduction of stationary and mobile biometric passport and fingerprint scanners; issuance of entry visas at border crossings and fingerprint verification of passengers with visas at airports and at sea and land BCs; video surveillance of BCs; upgrade and replacement of thermo imaging systems and hand-held thermal imagers; purchase of new and upgrade of old equipment for state border control and equipment for preventing the smuggling of illicit substances and weapons in EU; Equipment for image documentation and transmission; Vehicles with improved mobility for police units (10 personal and 11 combined vehicles in 2008–2009, remaining vehicles based on needs for replacing worn-out vehicles – approximately 20 to 30 a year; Police boat – 10 m in 2009; Equipment for automatic control of vehicles on the border by using automatic number plate recognition scanners, in the period 2010 – 2013...

Investments in ICT equipment. Upgrade of the Tetra infrastructure, establishment of a broadband communication network; replacement of depreciated terminal information equipment at the border; upgrade of single sign-on into the Police information system; establishment of the VTMIS system in 2008; Server for SISone4all; purchase of passport scanners for diplomatic consular representations; mobile solutions for border control...

Implementing training for personnel performing border control and protection tasks. Border protection (8 programmes); Document inspection (3 programmes); Vehicle inspection

(2 programmes); Correct and safe use of work instruments and devices (4 programmes); Specialised training (6 programmes).

2. <u>STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES</u>

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

General objective under priority 1 is to increase the effectiveness of the supervision and control of the State border (EU external border) by ensuring modern technical equipment and suitable working conditions for personnel and appropriate handling of passengers and traffic on the border.

Key actions carried out in order to pursue the following main objectives are: **Investments into the infrastructure of border crossings (BCs)** – *e.g. new constructions of BCPs Dobovec, Podplanina, Rigonce, Babno polje, Petrina, Vinica,...; upgrades/necessary improvements of BCPs; introduction of notice boards; expansion of airport and port infrastructure)*; **Investments into technical equipment and transport means** *(e.g. introduction of biometric passport and fingerprint scanners; video surveillance of BCPs, purchase of small police boat; purchase of equipment for automatic control of vehicles using number plate recognition (ANPR); upgrade and replacement of thermal imaging systems and hand held thermal imagers; upgrade of police helicopters for border surveillance; purchase of heartbeat detectors; RALEN system; purchase of vehicles with improved mobility for police units)*; **Upgrade of national communication systems to make them interoperable with the systems of other MS (special priority)** *(e.g. upgrade of TETRA infrastructure - purchase of radio station; increase of signal coverage of the external border belt, establishment of a broadband communication network - purchase of more capable cryptographic mechanisms; purchase of microwave links)*; **Investments in ICT equipment** *(e.g. introduction of single sign-on system with smart cards, introduction of surveillance management system, replacement of depreciated terminal information equipment).* .

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

Under priority 2 Republic of Slovenia implements two special priorities: **Investments in the establishment or upgrade of a single common national co-ordination centre that constantly (24 hours a day, 7 days a week) co-ordinates activities of all national authorities implementing external border control duties (detection, identification and intervention) and being able to exchange information with national co-ordination centres in other Member States** and **Investments in the establishment or upgrade of a single common national control system covering all or some selected parts of the external border and enabling constant (24/7) distribution of information between all authorities participating in the external border control.**

The general objective of the first special priority is to increase the effectiveness of the supervision of the State border through the exchange of information among national coordination centres in Hungary, Austria and Slovenia in preventing and disclosing cross-border crime and illegal migration. Therefore, establishment of Dolga vas trilateral centre has been envisaged. The trilateral centre enhanced police co-operation between MS Austria, Hungary and Slovenia, whereby enabling quick exchange of information between border services of these MS and facilitate cross-border crime prevention efficiency.

The general objective of the second special priority is to increase the effectiveness of the supervision of the State border by supervising larger vessels at the external sea border. Republic of Slovenia envisaged establishment of the VTMIS system. The VTMIS system would allow Slovenian police officers to monitor the route of each vessel and determine any irregularities (illegal entry) and thus take prompt action. The VTMIS is a recommendation arising from the Schengen Catalogue for External Border Control. The Slovenian portion of the sea is relatively small with a large number of bigger vessels travelling into the Ports of Koper and Trieste and during the summer tourist season, also a considerable number of tourist sailboats and motorboats. An effective system for providing supervision over vessels in Slovenian territorial waters is required to monitor all the aforementioned vessels, with the aim of disclosing illegal landing outside of officially specified landing points which could result in illegal entry over the border and the smuggling of illicit goods (drugs, protected animal species, etc.).

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

Within priority 3 we implemented also special priority: **Initiatives for the development and establishment of the limited representation, co-location or common centres for receiving visa applications, initially for receiving and later for processing of visa applications.** The special priority includes *the common reception centre for cooperation in the visa procedure* was established on in the premises of the Embassy of the Republic of Slovenia in Podgorica. The centre will fulfil the requirements of a few MS. Other participants in the centre besides Slovenia include Austria, Hungary and Poland, and some other countries have also displayed interest in participating in the centre, such as the Czech Republic, Germany, Slovakia, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Luxembourg, Lithuania and Cyprus.

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

Within priority 4 we implemented a special priority: **Investments related to Schengen Information System (SIS).**The general objective of the priority is to ensure a successful transition to the 2nd generation Schengen Information System – SIS II inclusive of all new functionalities of this system. Special attention will be focused on the possibility of remote data access, thus additionally increasing the effectiveness of border control while observing all security standards. Relevant actions include for ex. establishment of connection between central and national SIS system - *Server for SISone4all; Mobile solutions for border control (special laptops, mobile hand-held devices for verifying persons, documents and vehicles against records.); Implementation of conformity testing of the SIS II environment with ITSP.*

The general objective of a second action **Investments into infrastructure and equipment** is to improve administrative procedures connected to consular activities, thus increasing "pre-border" activities by introducing new technological solutions and equipment for quicker treatment of visa applications. Purchase of passport scanners for diplomatic consular representations is therefore the main objective under this special priority.

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

The general objective of this priority (special priority **Implementation at the national level of the common core curriculum for border guards' training**) is to improve the competence of police officers in implementing regulations and use of work support devices. Within this priority, training and development of advisers for documents have been planned, as well as Exercising Focal Point Offices (FPO) and implementation of courses and training. The action provides continuous training for acquiring theoretical knowledge and practical skills for safe use of various material-technical devices or instruments. It shall be carried out on the basis of programme evaluation, analysis of the situation and requirements, preparation and implementation of training or according to a verified programme. Programmes will include the following areas of training: *Border protection, Document inspection, Vehicle inspection, Correct and safe use of work instruments and devices, Specialized training –helicopter pilot training to enhance knowledge and skills for safe flying when controlling the state/Schengen border.*

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

Priority 1
(Main indicators, targets)
- Increased disclosure of illegal external border crossings.
- fulfilment of the required standards for implementing border controls,
- Increased safety of police officers, protection of equipment, control systems and transport means
- Improved mobility of police units, quicker response time.
- Increased disclosure of stolen vehicles, expired vehicle registrations and other irregularities which are under police jurisdiction.

Priority 2
(Main indicators, targets)

- Improved cooperation of the border authorities of Austria, Hungary and Slovenia in carrying out external border control tasks regarding disclosure, recognition and mediation.
- Increased effectiveness of the organization of state border controls on the European level in the sense of structured, strategic and operative cooperation in supervision.
- Improved supervision of the sea.
- Improved control of all entries of vessels into the territorial waters of Slovenia and the disclosure and prevention of all illegal activities.

Priority 3
(Main indicators, targets)

- quicker and clearer visa procedure, user friendly approach, easier service, shorter waiting list,
- cancellation of personal appearance at the representation to get a fixed day,
- reduction of administrative obstacles in visa procedure,
- higher data security,
- Increased capacities of treated applications from 8,000 visa applications per year per individual Member State to 30,000 a year for all included countries.

Priority 4
(Main indicators, targets)
- Successful connection to the central system SIS
- Improved possibilities for recognizing danger, implementing the control of persons in the green border area, shorter access time to data on persons, documents and vehicles in the field.
- Successfully implemented tests.
- Quicker treatment of visa applications.

Priority 5
(Main indicators, targets)

- No. of implementation of completed programmes each year (23 programmes each year),
- No. of repetitions of an individual programme,
- No. of participants in a programme..

Part II

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

(excluding Technical Assistance measures and Information and Publicity)

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

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

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

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

A maximum length is indicated for each item.

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

Actions to be implemented under the "awarding body" method

N/A. The Ministry of the Interior (with intermediary bodies) as the responsible authority operates as the executing body for all of the projects under Annual programme 2007.

Actions to be implemented under the "executing body" method
Priority 1 is by far the most funded priority with 74,69% of the funds allocated in AP 2007, 89,98% in AP 2008 and 89,43% in AP 2009.

Action **Investments into the infrastructure of border crossings** receives most funds (in a range between 28,60% and 39,89% in total AP 2007 through 2009). It includes investments into BCPs in order to achieve compliance with Schengen standards for international passengers and traffic, efficient border control and assurance of adequate employee working conditions.

Action **Investments into technical equipment and transport means** receives a substantial part of the total funding (25,1% in AP 2007, 39,46% in AP 2008 and 20,00% in AP 2009). It promotes purchases of biometric scanners, video surveillance systems, thermovisions and various detectors. The equipment prevents illegal border crossings of the external border and the transport of illicit substances and weapons.

Action **Upgrade of national communication systems to make them interoperable with the systems of other Member States (special priority)** follows with 12,61% of the allocated funds in AP 2007, 9,5% of AP 2008 and 22,16% in AP 2009). Purchased equipment includes TETRA digital radio system, microwave links and relevant equipment in order to establish broadband communication network that would enable international cooperation between neighbouring countries through increased bandwidth and capable cryptographic mechanisms.

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

Actions to be implemented under the "awarding body" method
N/A
Actions to be implemented under the "executing body" method
Action **Investments in the establishment or upgrade of a single common national control system covering all or some selected parts of the external border and enabling constant (24/7) distribution of information between all authorities participating in the external border control (special priority)** has received only a fraction of funds with 0,96% of AP 2007 and 0,87% of AP 2008. It includes establishment of the Dolga vas trilateral centre project which will enable quick exchange of information between border services of three MS (Austria, Hungary, Slovenia). The Dolga vas trilateral centre has been put into operation by the Director General of the Police on 18th of June 2008. The centre is in full operation since then and has contributed to cross-border crime prevention efficiency.

Further, action **Investments in the establishment or upgrade of a single common national control system covering all or some selected parts of the external border and**

enabling constant (24/7) distribution of information between all authorities participating in the external border control (special priority) accounts for only 1,37% of the AP 2007 but is very important due to establishment of sea surveillance radar connection with the AIS system and set-up of the VTMIS system that enables controlling of large vessels on the external Slovene sea border.

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

Actions to be implemented under the "awarding body" method

N/A

Actions to be implemented under the "executing body" method

Action **Initiatives for the development and establishment of the limited representation, co-location or common centres for receiving visa applications, initially for receiving and later for processing of visa applications (special priority)** has been funded with 6,57% of the funds in AP 2007 and included a project of Relocation of a common reception centre in Podgorica that aims to establish cooperation with as many EU Member States as possible.

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

Actions to be implemented under the "awarding body" method

N/A

Actions to be implemented under the "executing body" method

When looking at total funding for the years 2007-2009 the priority 4 receives between 8,98 % in AP 2007 and 3,55% in AP 2008. In AP 2009 it received 5,91% of the total yearly allocation for 2009.

Action **Investments related to Schengen Information System (SIS) (special priority)** is important in the funding aspect as 8,93% of the funds for the AP 2007 have been allocated for its objectives. Action includes activities *Compliance testing of the SIS II environment in the ITSP* that will ensure the suitable operation of the Slovenian Police information system in accordance with the required use of the SIS II, *Purchase of the system server for SISone4ALL* that will provide system server for ensuring information services, *Remote access to SIS and police records from a vehicle – mobile solutions for border control* that will provide equipment for several specialized police units that perform regular checks on persons, vehicles and documents in line with the Schengen Standards. Action **Investment in infrastructure and equipment** has been funded in APs 2008 and 2009 (3,55%, 5,91%) and includes activity *Purchase of passport scanners for diplomatic consular representations.* Activity aims to improve administrative procedures connected to consular activities, thus increasing "pre-border" activities by introducing new technological solutions and equipment for quicker treatment of visa applications.

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

<u>Actions to be implemented under the "awarding body" method</u>
N/A
<u>Actions to be implemented under the "executing body" method</u>
Action **Improvement of border guards' competence for the implementation of duties related to control and checks, training of pilots, training of external border police candidates** receives (respectively 4,54% of the funding in AP 2007, 1,63% in AP 2008 and 3,5% in AP 2009) funds for projects for *Improvement of border guards' competence for the implementation of duties related to control and checks, Pilot training for night flight and flight during decreased visibility and external border police candidates training.* Activity objective is to improve the competence of police officers, providing them with the required knowledge and skills.

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

AP 2007
In the AP 2007 action 1 *Investments into technical equipment and transport means* recorded 8,5 % increase compared to budgeted action funds due to the additional need for purchases of vital equipment for external border control.
Action 3 *Upgrade of national communication systems to make them interoperable with the systems of other Member States (special priority)* has also increased in AP 2007 for 7,8% compared to budgeted due to the additional requirements for TETRA equipment.
Action 5 *Investments in the establishment or upgrade of a single common national control system covering all or some selected parts of the external border and enabling constant (24/7) distribution of information between all authorities participating in the external border control (special priority)* also recorded modest increase of 3,5% compared to budgeted.
Action 7 *Investments related to Schengen Information System (SIS) (special priority)* has recorded a 10% increase in AP 2007 compared to budgeted due to the needs for additional equipment and availability of funds from projects.
Action 8 *Improvement of border guards' competence for the implementation of duties related to control and checks, training of pilots, training of external border police candidates* received 7,3% more resources than budgeted in AP 2007 due to higher costs for training of pilots and border guards.
AP 2008
AP 2008 has been revised twice. With second revision action 1 *Investments into the infrastructure of border crossings (BCPs)* under priority 1 has been slightly lowered. Two projects were removed and one added (*Urgent improvements of border crossings).* Overall, the amount for Priority 1 has decreased in the revised AP 2008. New project financial information reflect the change in macroeconomic trends in Slovenia (sharp decrease in prices e.g. in construction sector) and ability of responsible authority to negotiate lower prices in some cases. Action 2 *Investments into technical equipment and transport means* under priority 1 has been slightly reduced.
For AP 2009 it is still too early to tell if there will be any significant changes to the actions of the programmes.

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

Yes/**No** :

If Yes, fill in this part.

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

Part IV
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE "EXECUTING BODY" METHOD

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

Yes.

If Yes, fill in this section

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

IV.1   <u>Share of the overall EU contribution to the programmes granted in the "executing body" method from 2007 to 2009</u>

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

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

- Programme 2008:   **75 %**

- Programme 2009:   **75 %**

IV.2   <u>Calls for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method</u>

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

- Programme 2007:   1 (call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

- Programme 2008:   1 (call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

- Programme 2009:   1 (call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method)

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

Definitions:

- If more than one call for expression of interest, call for proposals or similar was organised for a given annual programme, provide in the table below, for that annual programme, figures combining all of that annual programme's calls.

- Project <u>funded</u> = a contract, a grant agreement or any equivalent form of legal instrument has been signed with the beneficiary

- If <u>multiannual</u> projects have been funded, they should be counted only in the first programme year they were received, selected and funded

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

Number of …	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Proposals received	24	30	15	69
Projects selected	20	27	13	60
Projects funded	19	27	13	59

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

Yes/**No** :   The construction of the Podplanina border crossing point has not been funded

- If No, explain why : In AP 2007 the BCP Podplanina construction project was postponed to future APs (2008) due to the unforeseen budgetary constraints and the need to modify to the project documentation.

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

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

The continuation of multiannual projects which were selected after a previous call should <u>not</u> be taken into account. Neither should Technical Assistance measures, since they are not considered as "projects".

Projects funded in the "executing body" method without a call for expression of interest or for proposals or similar selection method	*Programme 2007*	*Programme 2008*	*Programme 2009*	*TOTAL 2007-2009*
Number	*-*	*-*	*-*	*-*

IV.5 Total number of projects funded in the "executing body" method in the programmes 2007, 2008 and 2009

Number of …	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	TOTAL 2007-2009
Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, calls for proposals, or similar selection method(see table IV.3)	*19*	*27*	*13*	*59*
Projects funded without such calls (see table IV.4)	*-*	*-*	*-*	*-*
TOTAL Projects funded in the "executing body" method	*19*	*27*	*13*	*59*

Part V

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS FUNDED
IN THE "AWARDING BODY" METHOD AND
IN THE "EXECUTING BODY" METHOD
2007 - 2009

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

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

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

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

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

In addition , highlight any significant change to the projects funded in the "awarding body" method, on the one hand, and to projects funded in the

"executing body" method, on the other hand (other than their distribution).

It is not required to make a full description of all projects. What is needed is a concise, but <u>very concrete</u> description of the types of operations implemented under each Priority. Wherever relevant <u>highlight national specificities</u>. It is essential that the description <u>can easily be understood by those who are familiar with the EBF, but not necessarily familiar with your national programme.</u>

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

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

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

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

In the "awarding body" method
N/A
In the "executing body" method
Allocation of funds under priority 1 is connected with the following main types of operations (2007-2009):

- **The construction of the border crossing points.** Purpose and scope of this type operations is construction or upgrade of the border crossing points in accordance with Schengen standards for international passengers and traffic and also the assurance of adequate employee working conditions. *(AP 2007 Dobovec, Podplanina (postponed), Rigonce, Zgornji Leskovec, Urgent improvements of BCPs, Traffic arrangements at BCPs (notice boards); AP 2008 – Babno Polje, Petrina, Vinica, Sočerga, Podplanina, Razkrižje, Urgent improvements of BCPs; AP 2009 – BCP Sočerga, Ormož, Razkrižje, Orešje).*

- **Investments into technical equipment.** This type of operations enable better prevention of illegal border crossings of the external border, ensuring the safety of border police and protection of equipment. This includes several projects such as *Introduction of stationary and portable biometric scanners for passports, Video surveillance of border crossing points*, *Mobile thermovision system upgrade and replacement of irreparably damaged hand-operated thermovisions and worn batteries, Purchase of new and upgrade of old equipment for state border control and equipment for preventing the smuggling of illicit substances and weapons, Introduction of fingerprint scanners, Improved mobility of police units and Specialized Unit for State Border Control, Police boat, Equipment for image documentation and transmission from helicopter to the ground, Equipment for night flight for the helicopter AUGUSTA AB-412.* Other projects funded under Priority 1 include also: *TETRA digital radio system (international cooperation, graphical interfaces, GPS), Replacement of depreciated terminal information equipment at the border, Establishment of broadband communication network, Microwave links for TETRA infrastructure, Development of Single sign-on system, SIS – equipment upgrade to ensure secure data transfer, Protection of the ITSP at BCPs.*

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

In the "awarding body" method
N/A
In the "executing body" method
Allocation of funds under priority 2 is connected with the following main types of operations (2007-2009):

Establishment of the Dolga vas trilateral centre (AP 2007 and AP 2008) project will enable quick exchange of information shall be enabled between border services between three MS (Austria, Hungary, Slovenia) and cross-border crime prevention efficiency shall thus be increased.
Sea surveillance radar connection with the AIS system and set-up of the VTMIS system (AP 2007) project enables controlling of large vessels on the external sea border.

Republic of Slovenia did not allocate any funds for priority 2 in the AP 2009.

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

<u>In the "awarding body" method</u>
N/A
<u>In the "executing body" method</u>
Relocation of a common reception centre in Podgorica project aims to establish cooperation with as many EU Member States as possible in the centre which will contribute essentially to more reconciled visa operations in Montenegro. The realization of the project has been lower than budgeted due to the fact that only part of the project has been claimed by the final beneficiary *(Software for the Centre's operations).*

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

<u>In the "awarding body" method</u>

N/A

<u>In the "executing body" method</u>
Allocation of funds under priority 4 is connected with the following main types of operations (2007-2009):

- **SIS upgrade/interoperability.** Compliance testing of the SIS II environment in the ITSP project will ensures the suitable operation of the Slovenian Police information system in accordance with the required use of the SIS II. Purchase of the system server for SISone4ALL project will provides system server for ensuring information services. Remote access to SIS and police records from a vehicle – mobile solutions for border control provides equipment for several specialized police units that perform regular checks on persons, vehicles and documents in line with the Schengen Standards and also of vehicles during operation.
- **Investment in equipment (VISA/consular).** *Purchase of passport scanners for diplomatic consular representations* project increases "pre-border" activities by introducing new technological solutions and equipment for quicker treatment of visa applications.

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

<u>In the "awarding body" method</u>

N/A

<u>In the "executing body" method</u>
Allocation of funds under priority 5 is connected with the following main types of operations (2007-2009):

- **Capacity building of staff.** *Improvement of border guards' competence for the implementation of duties related to control and checks* project objective is to improve the competence of police officers, providing them with the required knowledge and skills. *Pilot training for night flight and flight during decreased visibility* project enables our pilots to acquire theoretical and practical knowledge and skills for safe flying with NVG equipment when controlling the state/Schengen border. *Police employee training programme for the EU external border protection and preparations for the exam on the implementation of police powers (external border police candidates)* project enables acquisition of theoretical and practical knowledge and skills in the area of EU external border protection for future border guards.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

The distribution of projects under priority 1 has remained on a very high level through APs 2007-2009. Share of allocation for priority 1 has been 74,69% in AP 2007 and surged to 89,98% in AP 2008 where it levelled at 89,43% in AP 2009. The reason lies in the fact that absolute amount of project under priority 1 has remained relatively steady in 2007-2009 APs

but the level of available total allocations has been significantly lower in APs 2008 (EUR 6.163.172,04) and 2009 (EUR 6.769.379) when compared to AP 2007 (EUR 8.373.428,75).

The distribution of projects under priority 2 has been 2,33% in AP 2007 and then dropped to 0,87% in AP 2008, while there was no allocation under priority 2 in AP 2009.

The distribution of projects under priority 3 has been 6,57% in AP 2007. In AP 2008 and AP 2009 there was no allocation of funds for priority 3.

The distribution of projects under priority 4 has been 8,93% in AP 2007. In AP 2008 the share in total allocations for priority 4 dropped to 3,55% and recorded strong increase to 5,91% in AP 2009.

The distribution of projects under priority 5 has been 4,54% in AP 2007. In AP 2008 the share in total allocations for priority 5 dropped to 1,63% and increased to 3,50% share in AP 2009.

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

In the "awarding body" method
N/A

In the "executing body" method
Under priority 3 in AP 2007 there was significant change in the *Relocation of a common reception centre in Podgorica.* The realization of the project has been significantly lower than budgeted due to the fact that only part of the project has been claimed by the final beneficiary *(Software for the Centre's operations).* Due to the limited amount of available funds final beneficiary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) implemented rationalizations of the project.

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

- 2007 annual programme
Project **Compliance testing of the SIS II environment in the ITSP** had the goal ensure the suitable operation of the Slovenian Police information system in accordance with the required use of the SIS II. Conformity tests must have been implemented by each Member State switching from the SISone4ALL to the SIS II system. This comprised a large number of tests which could not be carried out manually since the set of test must have been performed a number of times (informal testing, general testing, conformity testing, new version testing, technical documentation) and thus special equipment was purchased. It is a relatively small project with large impact on all MS. The testing was done on EU level and national level and thus presenting itself as a good practice.

- 2008 annual programme

Improved sea border control – police boat project includes the purchase of smaller boat for tasks of sea border control with the following characteristics: mass production, rubber boat with hard bottom and a cabin, easy and safe to use while visually and instrumentally executing sea border control stopping and checking other boats, fast and agile vessel which can be used all year and for implementing control over smaller boats, professional navigation and communication equipment, recording of events and positions on sea etc. will improve the efficiency of sea border control, especially the speed of intervention on the sea. The project provides high level of equipment of Police on Slovene sea external border.

- 2009 annual programme

Purchase of new and upgrade of old equipment for state border control and equipment for preventing the smuggling of illicit substances and weapons projects In the past, the Police purchased a lot of equipment for state border control from the Phare and Schengen Facility resources. Destroyed equipment must be replaced with new equipment and constantly upgraded to achieve efficient operation. Under AP 2009 Police plans to purchase sensors (sensor fence) for the detection of illegal crossings of the border, night vision goggles, border control stamps and the purchase of magnifying glasses with various lighting sources. The project is important due to the fact that equipment is state-of-the-art and upgrades the external border security extensively. It also represents high level of standardized equipment and procedures at external borders.

12. Description of <u>one</u> "success story", among all the projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2009

Project **Purchase of new and upgrade of old equipment for state border control – purchase of equipment for image documentation and transmission from helicopter to the ground** can be considered as "success story" and "good practice". Project implementation was without any obstacles and in line with national and EU regulations. The project demanded close and coordinated cooperation between various departments and professionals in the Police and Ministry of Interior in order to assure 100% operability and compatibility of the equipment with already established systems in use by the Police. Equipment enables our pilots to achieve higher level of operability which improves state border surveillance from the air by allowing for the qualitative real-time receipt of images from the air to operative support on the ground. The equipment is extremely effective during night state border control operations.

13. Description of <u>one</u> "failure", among all the projects funded in the annual programmes 2007 to 2009

Key risks that were/are managed during project implementation are: good technical description of activities, timeliness of project activities, compatibility with other Member states, reasonableness of expenditure, ...

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                        Part VI                           │
│                                                          │
│                 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE                     │
│                                                          │
│              INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY                   │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Reference documents to be used for this part:

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

1.   Technical assistance

Tasks include technical and administrative assistance in the preparation and implementation of the annual programme, translation of reports which shall be forwarded to the Commission, activities related to the provision of information and visibility of co-financing from the External Borders Fund, as well as to various notices in official and other publications. There were labour costs incurred for employees working in RA, delegated authority, CA, AA. The costs include gross salary , travel expenses, education (seminars) and official duty travels.
Technical assistance was also used for purchase of certain equipment for RA, CA, AA, such as laptops, computer application (and server) MIGRA that is used by RA, CA, AA in order to monitor implementation of the 4 funds. In 2009 we had also

2.   Information and Publicity

- Information and publicity activities by the Responsible Authority
The yearly information activity was organized for all four funds in November 2009 in Centre Evropa, where the launch of the multiannual programme and the achievements of the annual programmes for all four Funds, as set in article 33 (2) (a), were presented.

In accordance with the instructions of Commission and in line with Article 33 (2) (b) of the RF Implementing rules we developed the website for four Funds in the year 2008 and since then all relevant information related to the implementation of four Funds have been regularly published. Website was upgraded and optimized in February 2010. RA is tracking visits to each sub page of the website
(http://www.mnz.gov.si/si/mednarodno_sodelovanje/crpanje_evropskih_sredstev/).

The Ministry of the Interior also publishes the values of all approved projects and names of final beneficiaries and all decisions and instructions on its website, and when necessary and appropriate, use another manner for notifying the public.

Application for monitoring four funds (MIGRA) is equipped with EU Logo, documentation for expenditure related to TA (invoices, receipts, contracts) have EU logo affixed or statement that EU is financing the activities).

Responsible authority has also adopted The Manual for implementing information and publicity measures regarding the four funds under the general programme "solidarity and management of migration flows" for the programme period 2007–2013.

- Information and publicity activities by the final beneficiaries

Final beneficiaries equip purchased equipment with a special bar code which on the basis of the initial number displays that it has been co-financed from the Fund and also the location of this equipment. Any investments into infrastructure have also a prominent plaque affixed on them.
For projects that are improving staff competence (e.g. pilot training) the notice about the implementation of certain training is displayed. The notice includes reference that activity was cofinanced by the External Borders Fund.

Documentation for expenditure related to implementation of projects (invoices, receipts, contracts) have EU logo affixed or statement that EU is financing the activities).

Part VII

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

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

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

In each case please explain the <u>reasons</u> for your judgement. If for any
item you cannot provide an assessment by June 2010, please answer
"Not known by June 2010".

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

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

Programme 2007 has been broadly in line with the programme schedule. There was one project that was postponed for implementation in following annual programmes, while there were some that were financially less important than originally planned. Some projects/actions recorded < 10% increase due to reasons that could not be foreseen at the programming exercise. Main reason for slight increases was that during the implementation phase we detected need for additional purchases of vital equipment for external border control. There were also additional requirements in order to make national communication systems interoperable with the systems of other Member States. Additionally, we incurred higher cost for improvement of border guards' competence projects due to the fact that the costs of certain specialized training increased compared to the period in which we made budget calculations.

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

There were no problems after the confirmation of annual programmes. Due to late confirmation it was very useful that eligibility period for 2007 AP was half a year longer than it is for other APs.

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

No, revision by the commission was not necessary.

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

Yes, nearly all project set out in the original programme were implemented. Due to unpredicted increase of some projects we were able to implement the programme fully in the financial aspect.

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

Quantitative and qualitative results for projects that require provision of certain equipment, providing construction services or education of employees have been

met. However, impacts of these projects are often revealed after longer time and we can only assess that at this time their impacts are positive.

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

Yes, we consider that distribution of funding between the actions was appropriate. Actions set out in the programme that were submitted to the Commission is also appropriate.

VII.2.   <u>Assessment of the implementation of the 2008 Annual Programme</u>

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

The 2008 programme has had two revisions. The changes were proposed mainly because constraints related to the contribution from the state budget due to our system of prefinancing of EU contribution from state budget and delays in implementation and due to the changes in the macroeconomic trends in Slovenia.

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

Problems or challenges of implementation of 2008 programme were present in a form of changed macroeconomic trends in Slovenia that enabled us to obtain more for lower price that was predicted at programming stage. Thus revisions were inevitable.

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

Yes, two revisions of 2008 programme were necessary. The main changes implemented by the second revision are:
- the value of projects, especially under priority 1, have been slightly modified; overall, the amount for Priority 1 has decreased in the revised AP 2008. New project financial information reflect the change in macroeconomic trends in Slovenia (sharp decrease in prices e.g. in construction sector) and ability of responsible authority to negotiate lower prices in some cases;
- three projects were removed from the approved (revised) AP 2008; due to the fact that the construction works for this BCPs were later on postponed to the future APs. As changes in legislation with regard to the efficient use of energy in buildings are expected in the near future, we decided to postpone certain projects.
- three new projects were added. Two of them were added under Priority 1, one under priority 2. Main reasons for inclusion were due to the need to replace depreciated terminal information equipment, provide urgent improvements at the border and provision

of proper working condition for border police officers that are working in trilateral centre used by 3 MS (Slovenia, Austria, Hungary).

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

The programme will be implemented fully as proposed in the second revision of AP. The information from the Commission of 10th June 2010 suggests that proposed adjustments to the programme are in general likely to increase the effectiveness of the proposed actions and that the modifications in question are justified. However, formal approval of the revised annual programme still has to take place.

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

In order to increase effectiveness of the actions the second revision was proposed. According to Project implementation reports prepared by the delegated authorities that act as final beneficiaries the expected results are being met. With some type of projects impacts can not be seen yet, while there are indications that they will be in line as predicted.

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

Yes, we consider that distribution of funding between the actions was appropriate. Actions set out in the programme that were submitted to the Commission is also appropriate.

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

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

Yes, the programme is being implemented broadly as planned. It is still to early into eligibility period to assess implementation because some projects have not started yet. However, there are indications that revision will be necessary. One of the reason is the need for inclusion of projects that were not started in AP 2008 due to difficulties that could not be

foreseen previously (e.g. terrain unsuitable for construction of BCP; expected changes of legislation with regard to the efficient use of energy in buildings;...).

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

At this point we have encountered some problems that will result in delays of construction projects due to unforeseen constraints related to the contribution from the state budget. Currently we are coordinating activities in order to obtain the necessary funds.

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

No, the revision of the 2009 AP has not been necessary yet. However, if there will be indications that there are possibilities to increase effectiveness of the proposed actions, we will propose revision of the annual programme to the Commission.

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

Programmed actions are being implemented. There are some delays with construction projects, but at this point we have reasonable assurance that they will be implemented until 30.6.2011.

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

It is still too early to tell in June 2010 about the achievement of expected results of AP 2009. Indications in Project implementation reports, that are being sent to the responsible authority by the delegated authorities, are good.

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

For now we consider that distribution of funding between the actions is appropriate. Actions set out in the programme that were submitted to the Commission are also appropriate, at this point (June 2010).

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

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

With the Decision of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia No. 20000-1/2007/7 of 26 April 2007 and Decision No. 20000-1/2007/12 of 6 March 2008 the Government of the Republic of Slovenia approved the Management and Control Systems within the framework of the general programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows and designated:

- the Ministry of the Interior as the responsible authority,
- the Ministry of Finance, Department for Management of EU Funds (MF-DMEUF) as the certifying authority and
- the Ministry of Finance, Budget Supervision Office of the Republic of Slovenia (BSO) as the audit authority.

The Agreement on Management and Control (Annex 1) establishing the relationship between the certifying, responsible and audit authority was signed on 16 May 2008.

Additionally the management and control systems of the Republic of Slovenia establishes 5 delegated authorities which act as intermediate bodies and are responsible for the implementation of the projects. The intermediate bodies for the implementation of the RF are the Police, a body within the Ministry of the Interior, and the Ministry of Justice.

The Management and Control System of the External Borders Fund has been efficient for the implementation of the annual programmes so far.

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

We are preparing new version of the Management and Control System for four Funds in Slovenia with minor changes. In general the system works, but it needs some adjustments. It was prepared in 2008 and since than we have obtained new knowledge and experience with the implementation of the Funds. Additionally, the revision of adopted Management and Control System, was made by audit authority.
We will submit the new version of the MCS to the Commission in August 2010, but there will be no significant changes. We will include the new intermediate body (delegated body)- Ministry of Justice, which will implement some projects in AP 2010 of the Return Fund and specially stress out, that the 100% control of eligibility and administrative financial control of expenditure has will be done by RA – Project Unit for European Funds. Likewise, the delegated bodies are responsible for all financial controls of expenditures, which are in line

with Slovenian legislation and required prior to the disbursement of the funds from budget of the Republic of Slovenia.

Part VIII

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

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

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

External Border Fund enables Republic of Slovenia to develop in line with Schengen standards. The Police has tools for effective and efficient external border control which enables high level of security for twenty-five European countries that comprise Schengen area.

The Republic of Slovenia has been in the process of establishing its State border control according to Schengen standards since 1999 also with the aid of PHARE pre-accession support programmes, the Transition Facility and the Schengen Facility. Therefore, majority of equipment results from that time period. Day-to-day operations at external border create major constraints on equipment, therefore the need for replacement is relatively high. With regular replacement of equipment Republic of Slovenia is maintaining high level of equipment with up-to-date technology for border control.

Despite that, we are noticing several shortcomings of External Border Fund in the fact that maintenance of such equipment is not considered as eligible. Republic of Slovenia has obtained very expensive, specialised state-of-the-art technology e.g. thermovisions, nigh vision equipment, narcotics detectors, radioactivity detectors, explosives detectors etc. Maintenance of such equipment is high, but still favourable compared to purchases of new items of such equipment. Costs of this maintenance are huge burden for the Police national budget, therefore it would be rational if these costs of technical maintenance of equipment and vehicles, would be considered eligible. That would enhance burden-sharing between Member States and the EU.

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

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

Procurement plan connected with External Borders Fund is prepared by the final beneficiaries (Police, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Public Administration). The priorities and actions are therefore assessed in comparison with national situation and needs. For the future we are seeking to streamline processes needed for changes to specific APs if the situation at external border (e.g. shift of migration flows, other incidents at external border,...) changes. In this way we would offer constructive and effective support for the operations at external border.

2.   Effectiveness of the programme

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

Due to the nature of Police work and preventive impact of activities it hard to attach resolute indicators that would exclude any other factors also impacting the results of operations at external border. Accordingly, we are recording sharp decrease of illegal border crossings in Republic of Slovenia, but we are not able to isolate the net impact resulting from activities cofinanced by External Borders Fund. Data shows that illegal migration flows have shifted and are flowing through borders of countries that have lower probability of illegal border crossings detection.

Good equipment is certainly one of the most important factors of police unit's effectiveness at detecting illegal border crossings. This equipment and replacements are expensive and without the Fund's co financing purchase of such high-tech equipment would not be possible. Thus burden sharing between MS and EU definitely adds to the security of the Schengen area as a whole. Another important benefit is also the cohesion in types of equipment and border procedures that is enhancing every year and results in comparable border controls procedures in MS with external border.

3.   Efficiency of the programme

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

Costs of the Fund implementation are in line with planned (< 7% of the total annual amount of co-financing allocated to that Member State plus EUR 30.000 of respective AP). On the other hand, efficiency would be enhanced if

External Borders Fund would cover also maintenance cost of equipment and other duly justified expenditure. The majority of the equipment has been bought through Phare and Schengen Facility and starting APs of External Borders Fund, therefore maintenance of this equipment and running costs (e.g. fuel for external border patrol vehicles, helicopter,...) will become the dominant expenditure category in the future. We consider that solidarity principle should also apply to this financial burden and the mentioned expenditure should be shared by all Schengen area member states (with or without external border) and the EU as this is one of the five components of the common policy for the management of the external borders.

4. Complementarity

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

In order to obtain synergies with other projects/programmes we discussed respective APs at the Interministerial Working Group and Monitoring Committee.
We have also been tracking activities of Structural Funds. There have been some projections that we would promote efficient use of energy at border crossing points (BCPs) but that was not realized due to the expected changes of legislation in Slovenia on the field of efficient energy use in buildings. Additionally, there was also a risk that there would be some overlap.

5. Added value

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

Without External Borders Fund Republic of Slovenia would not be able to keep pace with the development of new technologies on the field of border control, which would result in decreasing effectiveness in preventing illegal migrations and cross-border crime prevention. Results of lower equipment would be felt now and in the future in Republic of Slovenia and neighbouring countries. Correspondingly, the principle of effective external border control in line with Schengen standards is also the principle of deterrence that prevents future problematic incidents (prevention, not only detection). As a result, it is essential that equipment of member states with external border is beneficial or in the interest of all Schengen area member states.

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

In an effort to achieve even better results in the prevention and fight against illegal migration, the eligibility rules, programming exercise of the External Borders Fund should become more flexible and should be modified.

Eligibility rules of the External Borders Fund are not flexible enough and with increasing level of equipment tend to diminishingly reflect the real financial burden that is borne by the Schengen member state that has external border. Therefore, from our perspective it would be prudent if External Borders Fund would cover also high maintenance costs of bought state-of-the-art equipment and other duly justified expenditure. The majority of the equipment has been bought through Phare and Schengen Facility and starting APs of External Borders Fund, therefore maintenance of this equipment and running costs (e.g. fuel for external border patrol vehicles, helicopter,...) will become the dominant expenditure category in the future.

A big step towards better programming has been made with Manual to assist Member States in Programming for the four Funds of the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'. We will use it for preparing 2011 programmes and it will help us to draft clear, comprehensive and relevant annual programmes, working within the regulatory framework, that achieve the Funds' objectives.

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

In an effort to achieve even better results in the prevention and fight against illegal migration, the eligibility rules, implementing rules of the External Borders Fund should become more flexible and should be modified.

Eligibility rules of the External Borders Fund are not flexible enough and with increasing level of equipment tend to diminishingly reflect the real financial burden that is borne by the Schengen member state that has external border. Therefore, from our perspective it would be prudent if External Borders Fund would cover also high maintenance costs of bought state-of-the-art equipment and other duly justified expenditure. The majority of the equipment has been bought through Phare and Schengen Facility and starting APs of External Borders Fund, therefore maintenance of this equipment and running costs (e.g. fuel for external border patrol vehicles, helicopter,...) will become the dominant expenditure category in the future.

We were also very pleased with granted access to CIRCA Solid group but are lacking the access to the documents that Commission sends to individual member states as a result to their questions about the eligibility of certain expenditure. As a result, we are often accidentally finding out that some member state has faced the same dilemma or question a few months ago and already received detailed answer by the Commission. If there would be one database of answers to questions divided by general topics on-line (e.g.

CIRCA) we would look there first and potentially find suitable answer there and would not separately write to the Commission regarding the same topic.

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

In an effort to achieve even better results in the prevention and fight against illegal migration, the eligibility and implementing rules of the External Borders Fund should change.

The rules should be more flexible and include more expenditure (maintenance, running costs,...) that is actually incurred by the Member State in order to protect interests of all Schengen Member States or they should allow that Member State defines the eligible expenditure under Fund itself, similarly to the Structural Funds.

End of the report

☻