

**EX-POST EVALUATION REPORT ON THE RESULTS AND IMPACTS OF ACTIONS
CO-FINANCED BY THE EXTERNAL BORDERS FUND IN GREECE
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: **GREECE**

Date: **11.01.2013**


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

G R E E C E

***Ex-Post Evaluation Report on the Results and Impacts
of Actions
Co-financed by the External Borders Fund in Greece
Annual Programmes 2007 to 2010***


Responsible Authority for EBF & RF

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


Programming and Evaluation Unit of EBF Dpt

4, P. Kanellopoulou str.
101 77, Athens - GREECE

URI: <http://www.yptp.gr>

**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?

The external recourse concerns points from all parts of the evaluation report. However, the final content of the report was completed and finalised by the Responsible Authority.

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

The Responsible Authority decided to implement this evaluation report, with the contribution of an external evaluation expertise, by outsourcing the main task of drafting the Ex-post evaluation report of EBF to a consultant company. According to the Responsible Authority's guidance, the external evaluators conducted on-spot visits to the places where the actions were implemented and via interviews with the competent personnel and the local society, in some cases, produced the requested results.

During the drafting of the current evaluation exercise, was taken into account the results of the mid-term evaluation, concerning the 2007-2009 Annual Programmes as well as the verifications and audits, made by the Responsible and the Audit Authorities.

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

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK PUT IN PLACE IN YOUR COUNTRY	5
PART I – NATIONAL CONTEXT IN WHICH THE FUND WAS IMPLEMENTED	6
1.1. SECURING CO-FINANCING AND INVESTMENTS IN THE FIELD	6
PART II – REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION	9
2.1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “AWARDING BODY” METHOD	9
2.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMES IN THE “EXECUTING BODY” METHOD	9
2.3. PROGRAMME REVISIONS	11
2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)	12
2.5. QUALITATIVE OPINION ON THE OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION SET-UP	14
PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS	16
3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT	16
3.2. VISA POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS ABROAD	23
3.3. DEVELOPMENT OF IT SYSTEMS SUPPORTING BORDER MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATION FLOWS	26
3.4. TRAINING, RISK ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY SUPPORT	29
3.5. OVERALL RESULTS ACHIEVED WITH THE FUND'S INTERVENTION	32
3.6. CASE STUDIES/BEST PRACTICES	38
3.7. LESSONS LEARNED	39
PART IV – OVERALL ASSESSMENT - IMPACT AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE	40
4.0. ANALYSIS ON THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIGRATION FLOWS	40
4.1. ADDED VALUE AND IMPACT	41
4.2. RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMMES' PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS TO THE NATIONAL SITUATION	45
4.3. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMME	46
4.4. EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAMME	46
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 current evaluation exercise is based in the actual results of the implemented actions, in relation to the initially programmed ones. The evaluation system was built in the base of data collection for each implemented action/project, at the time of the delivery, including any other special information provided.

In practice, the main final beneficiaries, i.e. the Hellenic Police, the Hellenic Coast Guard, the First Reception Service and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, submit to the Responsible Authority the necessary data concerning the description of the current situation- given also in the Annual Program- and the expected results from the new-upgraded equipment, infrastructure or training. In addition, after one year period of actual use of the financed action/project, the associated bodies (final beneficiaries) send, after Responsible Authority's request, a report concerning the achieved results in relation to the previous situation, if these results can be measured. Actually, most of the actions co-financed under EBF, refer to measurable factors which can easily be assessed, comparing two different situations, during one year time period.

After the collection of the necessary data and the adequate information for each implemented action/project, the applied evaluation techniques are focused to the comparison and analysis of the actual results (taken from the collected reports) in relation to the indicators set out in the Annual Programs and the expectations of the personnel who actually used the productive result of the action.

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

The Responsible Authority in order to certify the accuracy of the provided results from the implemented actions sets an evaluation team, in order also to check the workload and the productive results of the contractor which had undertaken the evaluation task. Additionally, the specific team compared relevant statistical data provided by the independent Services or Organizations (i.e. Schengen Evaluation Committee, reports from European Commission's monitoring visits etc.) and asked, in some cases, the final beneficiaries for clarifications.

Furthermore, in the framework of the current evaluation report, several on-spot visits were conducted on the points where the actions' results have been established or allocated, in order for the evaluators to gain their own perception of the implemented projects. Special attention was also given to the indicators, which were set in the Annual Programs and was examined if these measurable objectives (outputs, outcomes, impact), were finally achieved and in what degree.

Generally, the produced data were cross-checked by the Responsible Authority, based also to personal interviews that the evaluation team performed, with representatives of the final beneficiaries, who actually, had used the purchased equipment or had been participated in a training course funding by EBF.

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?

According to the national legislative framework for the public investments projects, the competent Ministry which intends to implement any investment action/project, asks annually from the Ministry of Competitiveness, to earmark the total budget of the program or project to the Public Investment Program (P.I.P.).

For all EBF Annual Programmes, when the Responsible Authority is informed about the amount of the next Annual Program allocation, sends a request to the Ministry of Competitiveness, asking for the earmarking of the total amount (European and National funds). The above Ministry issues an Accession Decision, according to which the total amount is available to the RA for making payments. After the implementation of each program, the Responsible Authority asks from the European Commission to deposit the compensatory payment of balance to the bank account belonging to the Public Investment Program.

During the last years, the governmental policy fully supports the financing of co-financed Programs and for this reason prioritize the coverage of the specific cost categories, in comparison with the pure national projects. Of course, each time of submission a request for an investment proposal, it is also examined, the added value, the cost benefit analysis and the expected results, if applicable.

- 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).

For the period 2007 – 2010 eighty seven (87) projects were implemented, relative to the categories of Border Management, Visa Policy and IT systems/VIS, funded under EBF. The majority of these investments are categorized in "Border Management" with the number of 83 projects, three (3) within the IT systems/VIS and one (1) for Visa Policy. The IT systems' projects include the VIS roll-out investments, concerning new installations and establishments for Visa procedures through NET-VIS IT and Network Systems.

The investments at national level, without EBF funding, concern only staff expenditures, which are estimated as they are showed below:

Border Management

Table n° 1:

	Infrastructure and equipment	Staff	Other	Total
2007 total	0,00 €	24.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	24.000.000,00 €
2008 total	0,00 €	25.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	25.000.000,00 €
2009 total	0,00 €	26.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	26.000.000,00 €
2010 total	0,00 €	28.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	28.000.000,00 €
				103.000.000,00 €

Visa Policy

Table n° 2:

	Infrastructure and equipment at visa sections	Staff at visa sections and headquarters	Other	Total
2007 total	0,00 €	15.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	15.000.000,00 €
2008 total	0,00 €	16.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	16.000.000,00 €
2009 total	0,00 €	17.000.000,00 €	0,00 €	17.000.000,00 €
2010 total	0,00 €	17.500.000,00 €	0,00 €	17.500.000,00 €
				65.500.000,00 €

IT Systems

Table n° 3:

	VIS (total investments/all authorities)	SIS (total investments/all authorities)	Total
2007 total	0,00 €	0,00 €	0,00 €
2008 total	0,00 €	0,00 €	0,00 €
2009 total	0,00 €	0,00 €	0,00 €
2010 total	0,00 €	0,00 €	0,00 €
			0,00 €

1.1.3. Do the above tables include all your expenditure in the field of borders, visa and IT systems?

The above tables include all expenditure in the field of borders, visa and IT systems.

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

The share of the contribution from EBF in relationship to total national expenditure, has been calculated according to the formula: $EBF\ EU\ contribution / (EBF\ national\ cofinancing + EBF\ EU\ cofinancing + other\ national\ investments) * 100$. In Border Management area the specific share is estimated up to 18,27 %. The total contribution from EBF, in relationship to the total national expenditure, is estimated

to 24,36 %. This figure has taken into account the national expenditures as well as the co-financing by the Fund (2007-2010 Annual Programmes).

Accordingly, the respective share of the contribution from EBF for the Visa Policy reaches the 0,036%. The total of the contribution from the Fund, is approximately 0,0047%. Despite that the whole VIS project (including actions concerning Visa policy) in Greece will be financed exclusively by the External Borders Fund, the rate is still very low, because most of the total expenditure will be covered by 2011-2013 Annual Programmes.

The share of the IT systems field is 75,00%, due to the fact that there are no national investments in this area and the projects are financed under EBF with the maximum co-financing (75%). The total of the contribution from the Fund, in relationship to the total national expenditure, is 100%, because the total investments of VIS and SIS projects are financed exclusively by EBF.

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.

The scheme in the field of border management and visa policy has been changed dramatically, since the approval of the Multiannual Program. In spite of the fact that the trends of the immigration flows were ranged almost in the same levels, at least for the period 2007-2010, the main changes concern the number of the equipment used for the all kind of borders' surveillance as well as the quality of the educational level of the personnel dealing with the borders' security. Specifically, the number of the Border Crossing Points remains the same (19 Land BCPs, 29 Air BCPs and 56 Maritime BCPs), but from the 2010 Annual Program was begun the financing of the initial equipment (207 PCs, 800 magnifiers and 200 ultraviolet lighting devices) which have already been allocated to the BCPs. Almost the same condition applies for the 59 consular posts (in accordance to the Visa Code), where most of the equipment which is necessary for the VIS function, was delivered to the consulates and paid by the 2009 and 2010 Annual Programmes.

The above impact concerning the modern – upgraded equipment of the Services dealing with the borders' security and the management of immigration flows improved, qualitative and quantitative, the level of the provided services, in terms of the travelers' convenience and the personnel better working conditions. Indicatively, the new equipment, infrastructures and trainings, financed by the 2007-2010 Annual Programmes, supported the workload of the above services to the management of the travellers who have crossed the Greek external borders, as it is appeared below:

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
41.489.684	47.127.281	53.499.480	58.763.303	57.311.674

The following numbers of visa applications, refer *only* to the consular posts function and not the operation at the BCPs, since there are no recorded data for the requested visas at the border crossing points, for these years:

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
110.621	1.143.414	1.056.200	704.172	834.299

The main services implementing border controls and visa policy are: a) The Hellenic Police Headquarters (the Technical Matters Division, the IT Division, the Finance Division, the International Police Cooperation Division, the Aliens Division, the Criminal Investigations Division and the Alexandroupoli and Orestiada Police Directorates), b) The Hellenic Coast Guard Headquarters (the Security Division, the Safety of Navigation Division, the Programming, Organising and Training Division, the Operational Means and Special Units Division, the Technical Support Division, the Informatics and new technologies Division, the Financial Services Division and the Procurement and Infrastructure Division) and c) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the C4 Directorate of Justice / Home Affairs and Schengen and the ST 2 Directorate of Information Technology and Communications).

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

Not Applicable

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

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

The selection process, which the Responsible Authority implements for all Annual Programs, is a “close” procedure, corresponding to its exclusive operation using the executing body method. The Responsible Authority sends a letter to the competent (“call for proposals”) national authorities (Hellenic Police, Hellenic Coast Guard, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), operating as the main beneficiaries of the Fund and asks for update of the actions which had already been included in the Multiannual Program or for submission of new proposals, depending on the needs and priorities of each Service. The competent Authorities respond to the RA, after the authorization for the proposed actions by the respective national instrument, which is competent for the approval of each Authority’s proposals. The Responsible Authority’s programming exercise, is limited to the notification of a letter to the above Services concerning the available resources for the next Annual Program, due to the exclusiveness of these main final beneficiaries (public bodies) to the borders surveillance and security and the *de jure* existence of legal monopoly for the actions financed under EBF.

The Responsible Authority in most of the programming exercises selects the actions, via a call of interest to the above main beneficiaries. In some cases, i.e. the action for the linguistic training of the Hellenic Police personnel, financed from 2009 and 2010 Annual Programmes were also prompted by both the Responsible Authority and the Hellenic Police. In any case, for all co-financed actions, is applied prior to their selection the call for expression of interest and after a long consultation between the beneficiaries (associated bodies) and the Responsible Authority, the actions are being selected and implemented.

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	22	26	33	30	111
Project selected	20	25	31	27	103
Projects funded	16	16	29	20	81

Out of which multiannual projects	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

*The above information concerning the received and selected proposals, concern the planning that took place during the drafting of the initial Annual Programmes. The main reason is that most of the actions which finally have been included to the revised Programmes, have already been previously, either included in the initial Programmes or transferred from the concessive previous Annual Programmes. However, the figures, concerning the funded projects, correspond to the revised Annual Programmes only.

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

Annual Programme 2007: The two actions under the 2007 Annual Program were not selected because they were not eligible under the EBF objectives and eligible actions (the first one concerned the financing of running costs for the Hellenic Coast Guard boats and the second the procurement of bulletproof vests).

Annual Programme 2008: The action which was not selected refers to the purchase of one Helicopter (for the Hellenic Police needs) and the rationale behind this non-accession was the lack of updated technical specifications which could cause the untimely completion of the specific Procurement procedure.

Annual Programme 2009: The non-selected actions were not eligible under EBF. Specifically the first one concerned the purchase of one bus for the transportation of the Police Postgraduate Academy students for several uses (outside of the EBF scope) and the second one the financing of a training concerning techniques for the localization of stolen vehicles.

Annual Programme 2010: The two out of the three proposed actions, concerned actions which were not possible to be implemented within the eligible time frame of the specific Annual Programme, due to inadequacy of expertise (purchase of Geographical Information System for the Hellenic Police and Hellenic Coast Guard needs and the purchase of airplanes), whereas the third project-proposal was not eligible to be financed under EBF (purchase of a system for the automated recognition of the vehicles' plates which cross the Hellenic BCPs).

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

Table n° 9

	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Number of 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

	Programme 2007	Programme 2008	Programme 2009	Programme 2010	TOTAL 2007-2010
Number of ...					

Projects funded after calls for expression of interest, or similar selection method (see table 8)	16	16	29	20	81
Projects funded without such calls (see table 9)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Projects funded in the "executing body" method (including multi-annual)	16	16	29	20	81

2.2.5. Co-financing

For all co-financed actions implemented by the three main associated bodies (Hellenic Police, Hellenic Coast Guard, Ministry of Foreign Affairs), the presence of co-financing is guaranteed by the Public Investment Program (PIP). The earmarking of the Annual Programmes' budget to the PIP, refers to the total budget and not only to the EU contribution. Thus, the state budget, through PIP, provides the whole amount, to the above beneficiaries, that is mentioned as the total budget in the APs and receives the EU contribution as payment of balance, after the conclusion of each AP's implementation. Also, the Responsible Authority, acting as an executing body, sends a proposal, after the approval of the Annual Programmes, to the competent Division of the Ministry of Competitiveness, asking for the earmarking of the respective amounts to the PIP of each beneficiary. In this way it is ensured that both the EU and National contribution are used for the financing of the implemented actions under EBF.

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	13.466.667,48 €	Yes	30,19 % (decreased budget)
AP 2008	13.743.088,85 €	Yes	40,24 % (decreased budget)
AP 2009	23.459.508,00 €	Yes	0,00 % (balanced budget)
AP 2010	27.448.281,00 €	Yes	0,00 % (balanced budget)

The percentage of 10%, concerns the change of the actions' budget within the Annual Programs (from action to action) and not necessarily the total budget of the Program. The rates correspond to the revision of the budget that was made due to the revision of the whole Annual Programs. Therefore, for the 2007 and 2008 Annual Programs, the rates were decreased, due to the implementation stage of the actions included in these two Annual Programs at the time of the revisions. Besides, the Responsible Authority did not have the obligation to balance the EU contribution allocation in the Revised Annual Program budget, in contrast to the 2009 and 2010 annual Programs. Thus, the percentage of the revised allocation is 0,00%, since the total amount of the two budgets (initial Annual Program and the Revised Annual Program) are the same.

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 nature of the actions
- ☐ New actions needed
- ☐ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration: The Annual Programme 2007, which was initially approved by the European Commission on 16 December 2008, has been revised due to the complications which have arisen during the implementation of the actions. The implementation of some actions included in the previous version of the Annual Program, would have exceeded the eligibility period and thus the actions were considered ineligible in the frame of the Annual Programme of 2007. Due to the abovementioned complication, it was decided to replace them with other actions either previously included under the 2008 Annual Programme and

already completed within the eligibility period for the 2007 Annual Programme or completed and financed from national budget. Therefore, the revision of 2007 AP, was necessary due to: a) the new actions that were introduced, since many of the initial were replaced by more mature ones and b) the decrease of the allowed percentage limit rate of 10%.

Annual programme 2008

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

Explanation/elaboration: The Annual Programme 2008, which was approved by the Commission on 16 December 2008, has been revised due to the delays in the procurement process which have arisen during the implementation of the actions. The implementation of some actions included in the previous version of the Annual Programme, would have exceeded the eligibility period and thus the actions were considered ineligible in the frame of the Annual Programme of 2008. Moreover, several actions previously included under the 2008 annual Programme but already completed within the 2007 AP eligibility period were transferred under the revised 2007 Annual Programme. Due to the abovementioned circumstances, it was decided to implement the mature actions, some of them were presented initially in the 2007 AP, and some of new actions, were completed and financed by the national budget.

Annual programme 2009

- ☐ Financial change beyond 10%
- ☐ Changes in the substance of the actions
- ☐ New actions needed
- ☐ Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration: The 2009 Annual Program was initially approved by the Commission on 08 July 2009, containing 24 actions and the Technical assistance. The reasons that led the Responsible Authority to revise the specific AP, are the following:

- (a) Delays in the procurement process during the implementation of actions;
- (b) Implementation delays which would have made actions ineligible under AP 2009;
- (b) The need to urgently finance uncompleted actions launched under AP 2007 and

AP 2008.

Due to these circumstances, it was decided to revise the program's priorities, notably, to finance a part of the VIS project (NVIS) which was started to be implemented as a multiannual action running across AP 2009 until AP 2011. Moreover, the revised Programme included several actions, of which part had been completed and financed by the national budget.

The revised annual programmed is composed of 30 actions. Compared to the initially approved 2009 AP, twenty two (22) new actions are introduced: eight (8) actions are transferred from previous APs and fourteen (14) actions are introduced as new actions.

Annual programme 2010

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

- All of the above
- Other (please explain)

Explanation/elaboration: The Annual Program 2010 has been revised due to delays in the procurement process during the implementation of actions which would have made actions ineligible under AP 2010;

Due to these circumstances, it was decided to revise the program's priorities, notably, to finance large part of the NVIS project that was implemented as a multiannual action running across AP 2009 until AP 2011. The revised annual program is composed of 26 actions. In total 21 new actions were introduced: four actions were presented in the previous version of the AP but their scope was modified and 17 actions were added being transferred from the previous EBF programmes or initially financed under the national budget.

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?

Actually, in all cases of Annual Programs' revisions, the change of the programmes content was necessary for the on going process of the actions' implementation. In this way, the specific revisions were very useful and actually allowed the Responsible Authority to change the whole programming strategy from the initial approved Annual Programs to the revised one, in a progressive way. Indicatively, the implementation rate of the revised 2007-2010 Annual Programmes was oscillated around 65%, whereas if the revisions wouldn't have taken place the respective rate would be much more lower, approximately 20-25%. In general, the revision of these Annual Programmes, raised up to the triple, the implementation rate and thus the Responsible Authority managed to implement the most useful and cost-effective actions.

2.4. USE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

2.4.1. Allocation and consumption 2007-2010

Table n° 12

AP	TA allocated (€)	TA consumed (€)
2007	119.416,17 €	45.144,30 €
2008	44.169,02 €	50.848,56 €
2009	968.531,63 €	486.660,66 €
2010	134.901,52 €	134.901,52 €
Total 2007-2010	1.267.018,34 €	717.555,04 €

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	0,00 €	41.435,55 €	0,00 €	33.575,38 €	34.609,09 €	9.796,15 €	119.416,17 €
2008	3.076,61 €	11.057,70 €	1.476,00 €	14.558,71 €	0,00 €	14.000,00 €	44.169,02 €
2009	686.639,54 €	57.045,08 €	184.945,22 €	34.775,49 €	4.099,59 €	1.026,71 €	968.531,63 €
2010	14.205,23 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	5.263,10 €	11.683,37 €	541,45 €	31.693,15 €

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 support is very useful in all aspects of the co-financed projects implementation, with most significant intervention, relative to equipment, trainings, meetings and information exchange, publicity measures and project management. Under the revised of the implementing rules, concerning the eligibility capacity of the technical assistance, most of the projects are eligible, since they are connected to the Responsible Authority's operation.

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 (M.C.S.), has been changed on March 2011, concerning mainly the Responsible Authority's administrative structure. Specifically, according to the law 3938/2011 (Government Gazette 61 A'/31-03-2011) has been established the European & Development Programs Division, attached directly to the Minister of Public Order & Citizen Protection, and with the same law this Service was set as the Responsible Authority for the European External Borders and Return Funds. After authorization of the above law, the Presidential Decree 82/2011 (Government Gazette 198 A'/09-09-2011) has been issued, determining the tasks and the internal structure of the European & Development Programs Division, dealing as the Responsible Authority for the two Funds. In that context, the Responsible Authority have already submitted (on 13-07-2012) to the European Commission, the revised description of the Management and Control System. Additionally, other administrative reforms have also taken place concerning the final beneficiaries' status. With the law 3922/2011 (Government Gazette 35 A'/04-03-2011), the Hellenic Coast Guard Headquarters has been established. The competences and tasks of its Divisions have been determined with the Presidential Decree 67/2011 (Government Gazette 149 A'/27-06-2011). With the Presidential Decree 94/2012 (Government Gazette 149 A'/17-07-2012) the competences of the Hellenic Coast Guard Headquarters have been transferred to the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and the Aegean.

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?

The Responsible Authority was absolutely dependent on the approval of the Commission decisions for all Annual Programs, since theses decisions constitute the binding legal documents for the Greek Government in order to give permission to the Responsible Authority to start implementing the co-financed actions. Without this very important prerequisite, the Greek Ministry of Competitiveness do not proceed to the earmarking of the credits for each annual program in the Public Investment Program (PIP) and thus the associated bodies (final beneficiaries) cannot launch any procurement procedure.

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

Table n° 14

Implementation rates by priority						
	Priority 1		Priority 2		Priority 3	
	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP 2007	98.85%	98.85%	0.00%	0.00%	84.98%	84.98%
AP 2008	77.78%	77.78%	94.78%	94.78%	0.00%	0.00%
AP 2009	41.11%	34.07%	99.93%	99.93%	0.00%	0.00%
AP 2010	22.77%	22.77%	84.94%	84.94%	0.00%	0.00%
%	47.46%		44.95%		84.98%	
Implementation rates by priority						
	Priority 4		Priority 5		Total	
	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)	EU cofin	Total budget (EU and national)
AP 2007	100.00%	100.00%	74.85%	74.85%	97.09%	97.09%
AP 2008	71.85%	71.85%	20.85%	20.85%	77.47%	77.47%
AP 2009	38.52%	38.52%	63.55%	63.55%	42.22%	37.70%
AP 2010	38.94%	38.94%	3.51%	3.51%	24.37%	24.37%
%	43.35%		37.32%		46.48%	

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.:

The average of implementation, according to the outputs' implementation average, is reaching up to 62,96%. The average derives from the quantities of investments actually implemented, comparing to the programmed.

PART III – REPORTING ON ACHIEVEMENTS

3.1. BORDER MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

Priority 1 : The target of developing in Greece an integrated border management system, as part of the common European model, is achieved within the 2007 – 2010 funding frame, in accordance with the relative period's defined objectives. The 75.63% of the total amount invested to achieve better accommodation for police personnel and apprehended illegal immigrants, in new or upgraded buildings, new and integrated equipment for patrols, and a new integrated part of various types of police vehicles.

Priority 2: The implemented equipment and facilities through Priority 1 actions, constitutes the preparation for reconstruction of the national border surveillance system, with the incorporation of the European standards. Only the 1.59% of the total amount is invested in this implementation, within the 2007 – 2010 funding period. Priority's 2 actions, are depending and following the Priority's 1 actions, because the establishment of such Surveillance System, is based on the appropriate infrastructure, resulted by the Priority 1 actions.

The investments for Priority's 1 actions, are also essential for the next funding periods, in order to complete the needed infrastructure and in the same time developing the Surveillance System, which is one of the main goals to achieve in next funding period.

Table n° 15

ANNEX

Table n° 15

ANNEX

Category	Indicators												
	OUTPUT						RESULTS						
1. Means of transport	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded			Quantity of acquired or upgraded			Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised		Average intervention time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot) [min]	
	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	After the intervention through the fund	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
Total	2	5	2	1225	5175		5,577,000	25,961,600					
1.1. Motorbikes	1	1	1	148	550		422,160	3,870,300		15,72%	8,36	30,65	
1.2. Cars (including SUVs, vans, trucks, but excluding mobile surveillance units)	1	1	1	1077	4651		3,144,840	21,585,300		21,75%	30,78	30,93	
1.3. Planes	0	1	0	0	7		0	3,090		0,00%	24,84	30	
1.4. Helicopters	0	1	0	0	15		0	16,425		0,00%	90,00	60	
1.5. Boats	0	1	0	0	317		0	1,368,400		0,00%	51,43	35,43	

[Πληκτρολογήστε κείμενο]

Category	IT 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 level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010
		2	3		17	164		3100	1100	0	30,7%	35,4%	
2. Border surveillance systems	Control and Control Centres, mobile surveillance units												
3. Operating equipment for border surveillance	night cameras, vision goggles, optronic systems, mobile cameras, sensor systems												
		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010									
		443	1457					30,2%	100,00%	30,20%	40,7%	35,53	
4. Operating equipment for border checks	category 4.3. Other: mobile passport readers, magnifiers, microscopes, etc.												
		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline level 2007-2010	Overall at national level 2007-2010									
		1801	4680					1050	3100				
Total													
4.1. ABC gates		0	1560										
4.2. Documents verification		1332	1360										
4.3. Other		469	556										

S. Border Infrastructure	Number of Border Crossing Points developed or upgraded	Number of places in detention facilities at external borders	Number of other infrastructures developed or upgraded	Number of staff working in new/upgraded infrastructures	Number of border crossing points and stations adapted to needs of border guards and travellers	Average waiting time for travellers at borders
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
renovation works for buildings	7	104	17	8	17	0
infrastructure adjustments, creating new capacity for detention centres at borders						

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

21

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)

According to Multi – Annual Programme 2007 – 2013 period, the following objectives were defined for the actions of Priority 1 :

- (1) Buildings infrastructures at the external land borders (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 2)
- (2) Equipment to detect and check if travel documents and papers and other documents are forged / genuine (Requirement 1 – Operational Objective 1 and Requirement 12 – Operational Objective 2)
- (3) Organisation and operation of structures analysis for criminological information for the organised crime of illegal immigration in Greece from third countries (Requirement 8 – Operational Objective 1)
- (4) Detection, identification and intervention on borders and in the hinterland (Requirement 1 – Operational Objective 2)
- (5) Technical equipment for the detection of illegal immigrants and their facilitators (Requirement 2 – Operational Objective 1)
- (6) Equipment for the transportation of the Police Personnel and the Border Guards in the areas of realization of operations (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 3)
- (7) More effective control at ports, more effective control and surveillance of the territorial waters as well as more frequent surveillance of the high seas by operational means (Requirement 1 – Operational Objective 3)
- (8) Installation of Automatic Identification System (AIS) infrastructure (Requirement 1 – Operational Objective 4)
- (9) Purchase of appropriate technical equipment to locate illegal immigrants and their facilitators in transportation means or at land close to the coastline (Requirement 2 – 44 Operational Objective 2)
- (10) Purchase of technical – electronic systems and equipment for the HCG Operations Centre (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 4)
- (11) Upgrading of the HCG Airplanes' and Helicopters' central bases (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 5)
- (12) Purchase of main engines, electric engines, gear boxes as well as propulsion systems of HCG vessels (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 5)
- (13) Purchase of crypto – devices for the transmission of classified information (Requirement 5 – Operational Objective 1)
- (14) Participation of HCG operational means in joint operations at bilateral and EU level (Requirement 6 – Operational Objective 2)
- (15) Purchase and installation of radio – communication and electro – maritime equipment (Requirement 9 – Operational Objective 2)

The overall implementation to the initial objectives of multi-annual programme is over 100%, comparing the sums of delivered and the defined quantities.

In addition, the overall implementation through period 2007 – 2010 to the annual programmes, is reaching the 75,63% of the annual programmed total expenditure, while the percentage of actually delivered quantities is the 62,83% of the annual programmed quantities.

There is no implementation for the defined above objectives (8), (9), and (13).

The main investment amount, as part of the total amount for Priority 1, was delivered for two objectives: a) No (4) (62,04%) concerning the purchase of equipment for border surveillance of police personnel and b) No (1) (19,45%) concerning building infrastructure (new

[Πληροφορίες σε κείμενο]

buildings and upgrades) close to the borderlines. The new premises offer upgraded accommodation and detention facilities for the illegal immigrants and upgrade the functionality of police personnel.

The expenditure for the rest of the objectives oscillates, between 0,18% and 4,53%.

For Priority 2 the defined objectives in Multi – Annual Programme 2007 – 2013 period, are :

- (1) Set up and operation of a National Coordination Centre (Requirement 6 – Operational Objective 1)
- (2) Interoperability of National Coordination Centre with similar centres in other Member States (Requirement 9 – Operational Objective 1)

The overall implementation to the initial objectives of multi-annual programme is 49,13%, comparing the sums of delivered and the defined quantities.

The overall implementation through period 2007 – 2010, is reaching the 92,22% of the annual programmed total expenditure, while the percentage of actually delivered quantities is the 100,00% of the annual programmed quantities.

The combined average for Priorities 1 and 2, is 83,92% of the annual programmed total expenditure and 81,42% of actually delivered quantities.

AP 2007

Priority 1

The implementation through year 2007, results from objectives (2), (3) and (4). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 9.415.279,31 € the 30,74% of Priority's 1 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

Priority 2

There was no action programmed and there is no implementation.

AP 2008

Priority 1

The implementation through year 2008, results from objectives (1), (4) and (5). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 7.757.406,88 € the 25,33% of Priority's 1 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

Priority 2

The implementation results from objective (3). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 28.435,00 € the 4,41% of Priority's 2 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2009

Priority 1

The implementation through year 2009, results from objectives (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (12) and (15). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 7.170.309,22€ the 23,41% of Priority's 1 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

Priority 2

The implementation results from objective (1). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 323.775,03€ the 50,21% of Priority's 2 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2010

The implementation through year 2010, results from objectives (1), (2), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (11). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 6.280.994,42 € the 20,51% of Priority's 1 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

Priority 2

The implementation results from objectives (1), (2) and (3). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 292.628,48€ the 45,38% of Priority's 2 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

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.

The 77,22% of total implementing expenditure, stands for Priorities 1 and 2 and the rest 22,78% for Priorities 3, 4 and 5.

According to multi annual programme, the initial main target is the improvement of border management, in order to confront the vast increased migration flows. The projects implemented within Priorities' 1 and 2 framework, were focused into:

- (i) the improvement of border surveillance equipment for police personnel and
- (ii) building infrastructure for accommodation and temporary detention for illegal immigrants.

The expected planned outcome is the ability to establish new methods, more effective in border surveillance and adapted to European Union's standards. The implementation achievements of Priorities 1 and 2 are the basis for developing new or upgraded methods, within a short period.

Indicating the Fund's contribution, according to the above table of 3.1.1, the main overall results of the projects already implemented, is the renewable of vehicle fleet by 19,24% comparing to initial, reduction of reaction time by 17,06% (using the vehicles) and the renewable of surveillance equipment, used by borderline personnel, by 30,20%. In border infrastructure, the achievement concern the upgrade of the 17 most vulnerable border crossing points, out of a total number of 104 existing border crossing points.

The establishment of the intended methods is already under development but more efforts (funding and human resources) have to be undertaken, in order to confront the illegal immigration flows and their differentiations. The modern equipment supports effectively the human efforts made by the competent personnel, for the confrontation of the illegal immigration in Greece, in a rate of at least 60%.

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?

The main objective of Priority 3, is to reorganize and adapt the management of illegal immigration, travel documents and visa issuing, to European Union's practices and framework.

The implementation of Priority's two relevant actions concerns only the 0.19% of the total expenditure and the essential time for communication between the Central Service (Hellenic Police Headquarters) and Greek police liaison officers abroad and between police liaison officers and their counterparts in other Member States, is reduced while the ensured security level is increased. Moreover, these communications transformed to direct communications, not only among the Greek authorities and with their counterparts in the rest of European Union Member States, but with a total number of 157 countries globally.

This is the first phase of implementation, concerning mainly the provision of the appropriate equipment, in order to develop in the future, the already established workflow rearrangement and the scale of achievements is proportional to the limited intervention level.

Table n° 16

Category		Indicators													
		OUTPUT							RESULTS						
6. SES	development of national systems to comply with the CSIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of CSIS							% of successful connection tests						
7. VIS	developments of the national system to comply with the CVIS	% of EBF contribution to total investment undertaken to support development of CVIS							Number of consulates connected to CVIS						
8. Consular cooperation and ILDs	common application centres, deployment of ILDs, Schengen local cooperation	Number of joint consular practices developed							Number of Member States with whom such practices were developed						
		Number of ILDs deployed							% of consular offices affected						
		Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)							% of visa applications affected						
		Number of consulates connected to CVIS							Number of border crossing points connected to CVIS						
		Number of other stakeholders connected							Compliance Test Extended (where applicable)						
		Number of institutional stakeholders involved							YES NO NA						

10. Consular Infrastructure	renovations/works within visa sections within consulates, security windows, security doors, X-ray scanners, camera systems	Number of visa sections in consular posts initially renovated						Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality/security 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			Achieved through APs 2007-2010			Baseline			Overall at national level			Achieved through APs 2007-2010			Baseline				Overall at national level																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
		2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010				2007-2010																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0			0		

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?

According to Multi – Annual Programme 2007 – 2013 period, the following objectives were defined for the actions of Priority 3 :

- (1) Development of a complete network of Police Contacts (ILOs) (Requirement 10 - Operational Objective 1)
- (2) Computerize and standardize procedures for Visa issuing (Requirement 14 Operational Objectives 1, 2)

The overall implementation to the initial objectives of multi-annual programme is 27,84%, comparing the sums of delivered and the initial defined quantities.

In addition, the overall implementation through period 2007 – 2010 consists only to implementation through the year 2007 and is reaching the 17,88% of the annual programmed total expenditure, while the percentage of actually delivered quantities is the 100,00% of the annual programmed quantities.

The main investment amount, as part of the total amount for Priority 3, was delivered for the objective No (1) (58,93%) and for No (2) (41,07%).

AP 2007

The implementation through year 2007, results from both of the objectives (1) and (2). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 76.263,56 € the 100,00% of Priority's 3 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2008

No implementation developed.

AP 2009

No implementation developed

AP 2010

No implementation developed

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 EUP? In answering, please refer to the outputs and results at section 3.2.1. above.

The contribution of the implemented actions and projects is the significant support for developing the first phase of adaptation, to a common management practice within European Union. Since the implementation is only the 0.19% of the total investment amount through 2007 – 2010 period, it is obvious that the intervention is limited and more implementation actions should be applied during the coming period.

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

[Πληκτρολογήστε κείμενο]

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

The projects implemented within 2007 -2010 period, aim to establish and to ensure the functionality of the N-VIS and NET – VIS system.

According to implemented actions, the 99,72% of the Priority's 4 total investment amount, is spent to promote and establish the interoperable functionality of both systems, by installing the appropriate equipment.

Table n° 17								
ANNEX								
Category	Indicators							
	OUTPUT			RESULTS				
8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT systems developed or upgraded			Number of institutional stakeholders involved			Improvements in average time consultations/number of consultations (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		
Total	472							
8.1. API	0							
8.2. FADO	1							
8.3. Other (i.e. national systems)	471							

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)

According to Multi – Annual Programme 2007 – 2013 period, the following objectives were defined for the actions of Priority 4 :

- (1) Rendering systems of visa issuing compatible to the demands of the VIS Regulation (Requirement 11 Operational Objective 1)
- (2) Installing telecommunication infrastructure for operating VIS, supplying with appropriate technical equipment and building facilities for hosting VIS infrastructure (Requirement 12 Operational Objective 1)
- (3) Promoting the installation of the N-VIS, implement and render it interoperable with other National Systems and Services (Requirement 12-Operational Objective 1, Requirement 13 –Operational Objective 1)

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

- (4) Support to the 2nd generation of the SCHENGEN Information System (SIS) with the upgrading of the existing network of the Ministry of Mercantile Marine, the Aegean and Island Policy and the purchase of appropriate hardware (desktops and laptops) as well as software (Requirement 7 – Operational Objective 1)
- (5) Training of HCG personnel on the computerized applications of Schengen Information System (SIS) and national database (Requirement 7 – Operational Objective 2)

The overall implementation to the initial objectives of multi-annual programme is 4,74%, comparing the sums of delivered and the initial defined item quantities. In fact, the implementation is reaching up to 40%, taking into account that the Server Room and the Disaster Recovery Center are considered as two items, while they are constituted by a number of equipment items. Therefore, the evaluation of current implementation derives from qualitative estimation rather than quantitative.

In addition, the overall implementation through period 2007 – 2010, is reaching the 43,35% of the annual programmed total expenditure, while the percentage of actually delivered quantities is the 73,97% of the annual programmed quantities.

The main investment amount, as part of the total amount for Priority 4, was delivered for the objective No (3) (81,69%). The rest is 16,59% for the objective (2), 1,43% for the objective (4) and 0,43% for the objective (5). No implementation developed for the No (1) objective.

AP 2007

The implementation through year 2007, results from the objective (2). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 1.201.374,26€ the 16,59% of Priority's 4 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2008

The implementation through year 2008, results from the objectives (4) and (5). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 103.461,50€ the 1,43% of Priority's 4 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2009

The implementation through year 2009, results from the objectives (3) and (5). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 3.995.606,00€ the 55,19% of Priority's 4 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

AP 2010

The implementation through year 2010, results from the objectives (3) and (5). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 1.939.093,92 € the 26,78% of Priority's 4 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

- 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.

As it is also mentioned to the multiannual programme, one of the main targets for the programming period 2007-2013, is the establishment of IT systems required for implementation of the Community legal instruments in the field of external borders and visas.

The actions implemented, concern mainly the objective (3), since the 81,69% of the total investment amount is spent for the installation and establishment of the N-VIS and NET-VIS systems, included in objective (3).

The remaining 18,31% is spent for the equipment provision for SIS II and training of HCG personnel, in computerized applications for SIS II.

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?

According to implemented actions, the 97,80% of the Priority's 5 total investment amount, is spent in developing training courses for police personnel, incorporated with common European standards, specialized and linguistic trainings.

By these trainings, the participants have incorporated the common European standards in their activity, in the fields of visa policy issues, technical aspects of visa management and management (for HCG personnel) of external maritime borders issues. The total number of the participants and educated is 1396 members of police and HCG personnel.

Table n° 18														
ANNEX														
Indicators														
Category		OUTPUT						RESULTS						
		Number of persons trained			Number of practices/tools developed or upgraded (software, statistics)			Number of reports issued		Share of staff trained (compared to total)		Number of institutional collaborations on risk analysis developed		
12. Training and risk analysis	renovation/ building of training classrooms, trainings in CCC or other topics, risk analysis software or studies, IT tools to monitor risks, information documentation	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Actually achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010	Achieved through APs 2007-2010

[illegible]

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)

- (1) Trainings of the Hellenic Police personnel (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 1)
- (2) Necessary technological equipment for the trainings of the Hellenic Police personnel (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 1)
- (3) Application of a common training program on visa policy issues and technical aspects of visa management (Requirement 15-Operational Objective)
- (4) Training of HCG personnel on external maritime borders management issues (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 6)
- (5) Purchase of a simulator and the appropriate software to be used in training described in point (k) (Requirement 4 – Operational Objective 6)

In addition, the overall implementation through period 2007 – 2010, is reaching the 37,03% of the annual programmed total expenditure, while the percentage of actually delivered quantities is the 80,07% of the annual programmed quantities. The main investment amount was delivered for the objective No (1) (94,45%). The rest is 4,54% for the objective (2) and 0,47% for the objective (4). The objective (3) is not implemented.

The implementation through year 2007, results from objectives (1) and (2). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 644.727,69 € the 33,80% of Priority's 5 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

The implementation through year 2008, results from objective (1). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 10.321,98 € the 0,54% of Priority's 5 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

The implementation through year 2009, results from all objectives, (1), (2) and 4. The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 1.169.771,50 € the 61,32% of Priority's 5 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

The implementation through year 2010, results from all objectives, (1) and (5). The total (national and EC's) investment amount is 82.821,48 € the 4,34% of Priority's 5 total expenditure for 2007 – 2010 period.

The projects implemented were focused into objective No (1), since the 94,45% of the total investment amount is spent for the training of police and HCG personnel, in linguistic, specialized trainings for pilots of police helicopters and management relevant to external borders elements.

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

ANNEX													
Category	Indicators												
1. Means of transport	OUTPUT						RESULTS						
	Number of means of transport acquired or upgraded			Quantity of acquired or upgraded			Number of patrol missions performed			% of the fleet modernised	Average interdiction time (time between the alert and arrival on the spot) [min]		
	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	After the intervention through the Fund	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level 2007-2010
	2	3	2	4	5	4	6	7	6	8	9	10	9
Total				7225	6175		3 577 000	26 864 031					
1.1. Motorbikes				148	585		432 180	3 876 390		15,72%	8,30	10,66	
1.2. Cars (including SUVs, vans, trucks, but excluding mobile surveillance)				1077	4561		3 144 840	21 987 641		21,75%	30,28	35,40	

[Πληκτρολογήστε κείμενο]

8. Other ICT systems	Number of other ICT system developed or upgraded			Number of institutional stakeholders involved			Improvements in average time consultations/number of consultations (Yes/No)												
	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level										
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
8.1. API	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
8.2. FADO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
8.3. Other (i.e. national systems)	471	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
9. Consular cooperation and ILOs	common application centres, deployment of ILOs, Schengen local cooperation	Number of joint consular practices developed			Number of Member States with whom such practices were developed			Number of ILOs deployed			% of consular offices affected			Average waiting time for visa issuance (days)			% of visa applications affected		
		Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52.35%	100.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Consular infrastructure	renovation/extension within visa sections within consulates, security windows	Number of visa sections in consular posts now renovated			Number of equipment acquired to enhance the quality/security 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)					
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

39

	security doors, X-ray scanners, camera systems	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
		2007-2010		2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010			2007-2010
11. Operating equipment for visa issuing	biometric equipment, fingerprint scanners, working stations, etc.	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
		B		23									
12. Training and risk analysis	renovation/building of training classrooms, trainings in OCC or other topics, risk analysis software or studies, IT tools to monitor risks, information documentation	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level	Achieved through APs 2007-2010	Baseline	Overall at national level
Total		1366											

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

40

impressive, since in a very short time period (appr. six months) the specific building was delivered on time and operated effectively.

3. Another crucial project, implemented by the Hellenic Coast Guard, is the preliminary activities for the further establishment of the second generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II), in terms of the maritime borders. The specific project can be considered as an important action, especially because of the gravity and attention that the EU instruments pay to the conclusion and effective operation of such a system in the Schengen area. The purchase of the necessary technological equipment contributes to the timely and more effective conduct of police checks required under the Schengen Borders Code by the HCG personnel, within the framework of implementation of SIS II in Greece. At the same time, the five days trainings of the HCG personnel in computer applications of SIS II, contributes to the completion of the above system application, by the familiarisation of the trainees - users with these applications, making SIS II fully useable by them as regards the capabilities it offers and, as a result, more effective in its operation (Actions 3.4.1, 3.4.2. and 3.4.3. – 2008 A.P. & Action 3.5.6. – 2009 A.P.).
4. The fourth project to be considered as important for the implementation of an efficient border management strategy, is the preparation of a feasibility study for the establishment of the National Coordination Centre in Greece (Action 3.2.1. – 2009 A.P.). The chief objective of this study was to implement the decision adopted by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union concerning the operation and utilisation of the (financial) resources of the External Borders Fund for the coordination of all border activities, through Greece, via the establishment and operation of the National Coordination Centre. The study results, have been assessed by the competent Services of the Hellenic Police Headquarters and the Hellenic Coast Guard Headquarters and constitute the guide for the actual development of the National Coordination Centre in Greece, which is going to start be implemented within 2013, financed under 2012 and 2013 Annual Programs.
5. The last project, which is vital for the implementation of an integrated management of the immigration routes throughout Greece, is the establishment of the IT Visa information System (N-VIS) required for implementation of the Community Legal Instruments in the field of external borders and Visas. This action, which is implemented mainly by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the visa issuing at the consular posts, was firstly financed under 2009 Annual Program and continued under the 2010 respective one. The specific project constitutes the major intervention in the field of migration management control, since it will provide an extended database for the travelers crossing the EU member states.

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.

One basic best practice, which the responsible Authority has implemented in many cases, in the base of projects' management strategy, is the timely transfer of the actions which were implemented on time to previous Annual Programmes, within the same eligibility period. Thus, the Responsible Authority, managed to raise the implementation rate of each Annual Programme, without risks, since the "mature" actions had already been included to Annual Programs.

The second best practice, which applies to the management model method which the Responsible Authority chose to activate, is the intervention of the Responsible Authority in the implementation of some actions which were difficult to be concluded by the main three associated bodies (Hellenic Police, Hellenic Coast Guard and Ministry of Foreign Affairs), due to administrative constraints or inadequacy of experience. Some examples of such cases are: a) the initiative-from the RA-to finance a project, hiring one external expert in modern technology, in order to assist the competent Service of the HPHQ for the technical specifications drafting, concerning the X-Ray Vehicles and the respective one equipped with thermal cameras, b) Also, the Responsible Authority, has undertaken the initiative to finance, under the Technical Assistance, several trainings and specializations for its personnel in projects management issues, aiming to capacity building and the improvement of the personnel skills.

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

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

All actions that have been included in the revised 2007 – 2010 annual Programs and were funded by the respective Programmes, constitute important developments in the border management strategy and the visa policy enforcing. However, the less successful projects are those that could not be implemented on time and had to be transferred in next Annual Programmes. Indicatively, are mentioned below three such cases, which were implemented by the Hellenic Police competent Service, and had been scheduled to be financed initially by 2007 Annual Program but were finally covered under the revised 2009 Annual Program:

1. The purchase of 50 seat buses,
2. The purchase of night vision and long distance day googles and
3. The purchase of portable thermal cameras.

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.

The programming and implementation approaches are continuously improved over the years, starting from the programming techniques (drafting of annual programmes) and ending to the implementation and final payments. The projects that are less successful or those that have not been finally implemented by 2007-2010 Annual Programmes, were indicated the rearrangements needed, even from the starting point of the programming

cycle. In this direction, the Responsible Authority has revised the necessary steps (i.e. Grant Agreements establishment) for the management and the conclusion of the Annual Programs, making interrelations between the successful and the less successful projects. Furthermore, the "lessons" which have been taken from these weaknesses are that, during the selection processes of the Annual Programs' projects, the RA will only choose to implement actions or projects, which are mature and there is a big possibility to be implemented, based on the experience which each competent Service (final beneficiary) has, from previous similar projects.

3.7.2.2.

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

Actually the missing points and failures that were identified in each step of the initial Annual Programmes management (2007, 2008 APs), were avoided in the next Programmes, revising the necessary process each time. Such an important case, was the fact that, after 2009 AP the implementation started before the official approval of the Programme, by the European Commission, whereas for the 2007 and 2008 respective Programmes, the implementation of the projects, took place right after the official decision was issued. Furthermore, the same applied for the earmarking of the Annual Programmes' budget to the Public Investment Program.

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).

The basic change that appeared through the years 2007-2012, in comparison with the multiannual programming period, is located to the increased immigration flows, which is observed both from the travel movement as well as from the apprehended immigrants, who crossed the external borders illegally. As it is mentioned to the below table, there is a slight decrease in 2011 apprehensions, due to the fact that the actual use of the EBF co-financed surveillance equipment, patrol means and infrastructures came into operation in 2010, when the procurement procedures were concluded or almost concluded for the 2007, 2008 and 2009 Annual Programmes.

Table n° 20

Number of ..	2006	2009	2011
--------------	------	------	------

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

45

Passenger crossings at external borders	37.620.661	53.499.480	57.311.674
Third country nationals refused entry at the external borders	12.377	2.792	11.362
Third country nationals apprehended after having crossed the external border illegally, including persons apprehended at sea	74.487	81.620	71.313
Visa applications made*	957.368	1.056.200	834.299
Visas issued**	646.087	743.751	804.832

* The number of visa applications made, refer *only* to the consular posts function and not the operation at the BCPs, since there are no recorded data for the requested visas at the border crossing points.

** The numbers of visas issued response to both the consular posts and Border Crossing Points function.

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.

Considering the figures of the above table (No 20), the general outcome is that the intervention of the External Borders Fund, is seems to be very positive and extremely essential, due to the fact that most of the actions have been implemented after the year 2009, meaning that the volume positive effects are multiple, for the period 2010-2012.

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?

Greece confronts the largest migration flow in European Union, so the decisions concerning the intervention were taken specifically, under the fact of the localisation of the vast illegal migration flows. The programme reshape concern the evaluation of implementation and not for any unforeseen needs.

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 main goal for border management through period 2007 – 2010, was the continuing of modernization and adaptation of border checks and surveillance, to the average of the European standards and best practices, in order to achieve better reaction correspondence, against the vast illegal migration flow, through all Greek

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

46

borderlines. The most significant contribution by the Fund, occurred in the field of infrastructure and equipment, where the interventions targeted to building infrastructure (new buildings, upgrades and housing equipment), provision of high technology surveillance equipment and various types of vehicles for patrols. These three interventions are complementary and constitute the objective axis for the illegal immigration management: Surveillance – Localisation – Apprehension – Hosting.

- 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?

By purchasing the appropriate equipment, the significant contribution by the Fund is the support for developing the first phase of adaptation, to a common management practice within European Union. The intervention is limited and more efforts should be applied during the coming period, noting that the implementation is only the 0.19% of the total investment amount through 2007 – 2010 period.

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

The projects implemented within 2007 -2010 period, aim to establish and to ensure the functionality of the N-VIS and NET – VIS system.

The support by the Fund is significant for the establishment of N-VIS and NET – VIS systems, by purchasing the essential equipment.

For the SIS, the implementation is below satisfactory level and the Fund's final investments do not have a significant contribution in developing this system.

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

Considering the volume of illegal migration flows, the contribution of the programme's results, had very positive affects to the local society at the external land and sea borders area. The increased number of the surveillance equipment, in addition to the modernisation and upgrade of the patrol operational means, brought very encouraging feelings both to the local society as well as to the personnel who is actually using this equipment. The specific affects are located mainly at the external land borders, where the majority of the co-financed equipment and means were allocated and the illegal immigration flows were increased, especially during the specific period (2007- mid 2012).

- 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 existing national programmes are in accordance with the Fund's programme, in order to maximize the national efforts in the relevant fields of activity. The added value of the national programmes is proportional to the available investment amount

and limited to a minimum needed. The additional investment amount by the Fund, is proportional to the total available investment amount, so the added value of intervention by the External Borders Fund, is multiple to the national.

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.

Considering the results of implementation, there is reduction of the reaction time and improvement in detecting methods and management of the apprehending individuals.

- 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?

The projects implemented within 2007 -2010 period, aim to establish a system of surveillance, in accordance with European Union's framework. The purchased equipment for border surveillance and border checks constitute the first phase of implementation of the whole system, including the interoperability with the European systems of surveillance. The next phase has already started, by implementing systems of delivering information (N-VIS, NET- VIS, IT systems). The Fund's contribution is significant in the first phase of implementation.

- 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.

As referred above, it is the first phase of implementation, concerning mainly the provision of the appropriate equipment. The purchase of the equipment reduced the needed time for communications and increased the security level of exchanging information. The creation of economies of scale in consulates, will be achieved after the establishment of new procedure flow, based in the equipment and the developing alignment between the Member States.

- 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).

Considering the results of the implementation, there is no developing research or introducing innovative / state-of-the-art technology at borders and in consulates.

- 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?

There would be no other alternative, than national funds.

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)

Explanation : Renewable of vehicle fleet by 19,24% comparing to initial, reduction of reaction time by 14,83% (using the vehicles) and the renewable of surveillance equipment, used by borderline personnel, by 30,20%.

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

Explanation : the implementation concerns the 0.19% of the total investment amount through 2007 – 2010 period

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)

Explanation: The implementation is reaching the 43,35% of the annual programmed total expenditure, spent for the installation and establishment of the N-VIS and NET-VIS systems.

Role effects:

Multi – Annual Programme (Par. 2)+ Percent by priority coming out of par. 3 above

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.

The main investment amount was delivered for the purchase of transportation equipment for police personnel, concerning procedures and infrastructure for border intervention, in order to detect and identify illegal entrances. In addition, the building infrastructure (new buildings and upgrades) close to the borderlines, for accommodation and detention for illegal immigrants and upgrade the functionality of police personnel and equipment.

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

The contribution of the implemented actions and projects is the significant support for developing the first phase of adaptation, to a common management practice mainly for N-VIS and NET – VIS.

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.

There are no unexpected effects.

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

- ☐ they could not have been carried out
- ☒ they could have been carried out to a limited extent
- ☐ they could have been carried out to a significant extent
- ☐ part of the activities carried out by public authorities (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

Most of investments in projects are relevant with purchasing of new facilities and equipment and less in new practices and methods. The co-financing by the Fund enlarged massively the intervention level and volume of quantities.

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.

The Fund's contribution for the management of passenger flows at border crossing points, is positive, considering the increment of the cases managed after the year

2007, which the starting year for the programme and the volume of passenger flow. The efficiency of management will be evaluated with accuracy, by the end of the programme in 2013 and the completion of all actions.

- 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.

The overall difference is located in border infrastructure and equipment, parting the 75% of the total Fund's contribution. The investments improved significantly the whole procedure of border management in the most vulnerable 1/3 of the length of borderlines, where illegal migration is developing.

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

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

The programme's objectives are initially adapted to the main issue of border management, focusing in the country's weakness aspects, which are related with infrastructure. For this reason the objectives are absolutely relevant to the country's needs. The reshape of the intervention is not required, considering the former annual revisions.

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?

The adaptation to multi annual programme reaches the 89,50% of the achievement of programmed deliverables. This overall percentage of achievement is relevant to the 84,39% achievement of Priority 1. Considering that Priority 1 is the main expenditure recipient, the intervention is consistent with its objectives, within Priority's 1 frame of implementation.

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	45,144.30 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	45,144.30 €
2008	50,848.56 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	50,848.56 €
2009	486,660.66 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	486,660.66 €
2010	134,901.52 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	134,901.52 €
TOTAL	717,555.04 €	0,00 €	0,00 €	717,555.04 €

The programme management costs are not related to the Technical Assistance contribution, since the specific expenditures refer only to the support of the Responsible Authority's operation.

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

Not applicable.

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

The implementation concerns mainly border infrastructure, equipment, building structures and operation equipment so the programme is unilateral. By this point of view, the efficiency of the programme is satisfactory. Opposed to that, is the fact that additional expenditure is essential to increase the absorption in general and for funding the other actions (SIS, VIS and IT systems), in order to achieve completeness and coherence.

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.

The Responsible Authority, before the drafting of Annual Programs was taken into account the complementarity of the Annual Program's actions with the rest National or European Programs. Therefore, the RA did not face any problems, concerning Complementarity issues.

Besides, were taken into consideration, for drafting the 2007 - 2010 annual programs, the general axes of the approved European programs in Greece in the framework of the Structural Funds, as well as the rest Annual Programmes of the other three Solidarity Funds (European Refugee and Return funds).

- 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.)

Not applicable.

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 2007													
3.1.1. The purchase of equipment to detect and check if travel documents and papers and other documents are forged / genuine	X			X	X		X		X				X
3.1.2. Purchase of 1600 cc patrol passenger vehicles	X			X	X		X		X				X
3.1.3. Purchase of two-wheeled patrol motorcycles 650 p.a. (colors of Hellenic police)	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.4. Purchase of 1800 cc patrol passenger vehicles (colors of Hellenic Police and any colors)	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.5. Purchase of 1600cc patrol passenger vehicles (any colors)	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.6. Purchase of 1600cc patrol passenger vehicles (any colors)	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.7. Purchase of 1600cc patrol passenger vehicles (any colors)	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.8. Organisation and Operation of Structures for Analysis of Criminal Intelligence on Organised Crime concerning Illegal Immigration	X			X	X		X		X		X (New Action)		
3.3.1. Improving communications between Greece and the other Member States	X			X	X		X		X		X		

GREECE

53

External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

3.3.2. Modernization of Management of Consular Functions	X				X	X			X		X		X
3.4.1 Support for the establishment of NET-VIS IT and Network Systems required for implementation of the Community Legal Instruments in the field of external borders and Visas	X				X	X			X		X		X
3.5.1 The incorporation of the common training standard for the country's police personnel	X				X	X			X		X	X (New Action)	
3.5.2 Training equipment	X				X	X			X		X		X
AP 2008													
3.1.1 The construction and upgrading of border infrastructure at the external land borders with Albania	X				X	X			X		X		X
3.1.2 Purchase of patrol passenger vehicles (colors of Hellenic Police and any colors) 1800 cc	X				X				X		X		X
									X (It was spent higher amount, because the budget was not adequate for the purchase: increase 0,93%)				
3.1.3 Purchase of 1600 and 2000 cc patrol passenger vehicles (Conventions nr. 32/2009 & 42/2009)	X				X	X			X		X	X (New Action)	
3.1.4 Purchase of thermal cameras		X (not implemented)			X				X (not implemented)		X	X (New Action)	
3.1.5 Purchase of night vision goggles		X (not implemented)			X				X (not implemented)		X	X (New Action)	

GREECE

54

External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

3.1.6 Purchase of Long distance day goggles		X (not implemented)		X		X (not implemented)		X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.7 Enhancement of the detention capacity for the illegal immigrants apprehended at the external borders	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.2.1 The improvement of drafting the technical specifications of modern technology operational means for the effective protection of the external land borders	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.4.1 Implementation of the 2nd Generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II) – Purchase of desktops to conduct checks in the framework of SCHENGEN obligations	X			X	X			X		X	X		
3.4.2 Implementation of the 2nd Generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II) – Purchase of laptops to conduct checks in the framework of SCHENGEN obligations	X			X	X			X		X	X		
3.4.3 Training of HCG personnel in computerised applications of the 2nd Generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II)		X (not implemented)		X		X (not implemented)		X		X	X		
3.5.1 Trainings of the police personnel on issues concerning checks and examinations of forged/genuine travel documents and other papers	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.5.2 Training of HCG personnel in matters of external borders management		X (not implemented)		X		X (not implemented)		X		X			X
AP 2009													
3.1.1 Purchase of patrol passenger vehicles	X		X (It was spent higher)		X			X		X			X

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

55

			amount, because the budget was not adequate for the purchase: increase 0,89%)										
3.1.2 Purchase of passenger vehicles (type VAN)	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.3 Purchase of passenger vehicles (type station wagon)	X			X	X			X		X			X
3.1.4 Purchase of 4x4 police patrol vehicles (type jeep)	X			X	X			X		X			X
3.1.5 The purchase of police lorries of open type (rural)	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.6 Purchase of 50-seat buses	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.7 Purchase of thermal cameras	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.8 Purchase of night vision goggles	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.9 Purchase of Long distance day goggles	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.10 Purchase of p.cs (servers) for the efficient function of the Operation of Structures for Analysis of Criminal Intelligence on Organised Crime concerning Illegal Immigration	X			X	X			X		X			X

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

56

3.1.11 Construction and upgrading of border infrastructure at the external land borders for police services involved in the border control - Studies and Construction of the first Phase	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at 22,06 %)		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.12 Upgrading infrastructure and providing equipment for police services' involved in external border control and upgrading and renovation of detention facility near the external land borders	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at 9,09%)		X		X (New Action)		
3.1.13 The purchase of two helicopters to be used for the air surveillance of Greek external borders and to support land patrols controlling land borders		X (not implemented)		X		X (not implemented)		X				X
3.1.14 Purchase of Operational Equipment (Aviator's Night Vision Imaging System - ANVIS)	X			X	X			X		X (New Action)		
3.1.15 Purchase of Navigational Equipment for HCG Aerial Means	X			X	X			X		X (New Action)		
3.1.16 The purchase of Radiocommunications equipment	X			X	X			X				X
3.1.17 The purchase of Electro-Maritime equipment (AIS Systems)	X			X	X			X				X
3.1.18 The upgrading of HCG vessels (purchase of electric engines)	X			X	X			X				X
3.1.19 The upgrading of HCG vessels (purchase of outboard main engines)	X			X	X			X				X
3.1.20 The purchase of IT equipment for the verification of travel documents at the BCPs (frontline and second line border zone)	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at		X				X

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

57

						14,76 %						
3.2.1 The preparation of a feasibility study for the establishment of a National Coordination Centre	X				X	X			X		X (New Action)	
3.2.2 The establishment of one Operational Centre for the Land Borders' Management	X				X	X			X		X (New Action)	
3.4.1 Support for the installation of the Visa Information System, consisting from the Network Systems (NET-VIS) and the National Visa Information System (N-VIS), in the Greek consulates	X				X	X			X			X
3.5.1 The incorporation of the common training standard for the Hellenic Police personnel	X				X	X			X		X	
3.5.2 Linguistic training of the Hellenic Police personnel	X				X	X			X			X
3.5.3 Training of the police helicopter pilots on ATPL theory	X				X	X			X		X (New Action)	
3.5.4 Purchase of Training equipment					X	X			X		X (New Action)	
3.5.5 Training of HCG personnel in matters of external borders management	X				X		X (It was implemented partially at 9,43 %)		X		X	
3.5.6 Training of HCG personnel in computerised applications of the 2nd Generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II)	X				X	X			X			X
3.5.7 Training of the Hellenic Police and Hellenic Coast Guard personnel in the implementation of the Schengen borders	X				X	X			X		X (New Action)	

GREECE
External Borders Fund
Ex-Post Evaluation Report (2007-2010 A.P.)

58

3.1.26 Purchase of a heartbeat detector	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.1.27 The development of illegal immigrants' recording stations to be used at the border crossing points	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.2.3 The establishment of two Regional Operational Centres for the External Land Borders' Management	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.2.4 Conduct of a feasibility study for the establishment of a surveillance system in north Aegean Sea	X		X (It was spent higher amount, because the budget was not adequate for the preparation of the study; increase 0,98%)		X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.4.3 The purchase and development of i-FADO (False Authentic Documents On Line) System to be used at the border crossing points	X			X	X			X		X			X
3.4.4 The purchase of software for the upgrading of the Hellenic Police Network for the development of the SCHENGEN Information System II (S.I.S. II)	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		

3.4.5 Training of HCG personnel in computerised applications of the 2nd Generation of SCHENGEN Information System (SIS II) and SIS-SIRENE	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at 2,01%)		X		X	X (New Action)		
3.4.6 Support for the installation of the Visa Information System, consisting from the Network Systems (NET-VIS) and the National Visa Information System (N-VIS), in the Greek consulates	X			X	X			X		X			X
3.5.6 Training of Hellenic Police personnel in matters related to the management of external borders	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at 1,51%)		X		X	X (New Action)		
3.5.7 Linguistic training of the Hellenic Police and the Hellenic Coast Guard personnel involved in border control	X			X		X (It was implemented partially, at 0,27%)		X		X			X
3.5.8 Training of HCG's REIMS F-406 pilots [(Priority 5-Objective of M.A.P) Action implemented by the Ministry of Citizen Protection/Hellenic Coast Guard]	X			X	X			X		X	X (New Action)		
3.5.9 Training equipment		X (not implemented)		X		X (not implemented)		X		X	X (New Action)		

End of the report

®

