

Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the ISF National Programmes (NP)

Needs Assessment Questionnaire

Purpose and scope: The purpose of this questionnaire is to help Member States in assessing their needs for the second half of the implementing period (2018-2020) in light of developments on the ground and political priorities, both at EU and national level. Member States shall notably take into consideration the allocation of additional amounts (*top-ups*), the results of the EBCG vulnerability assessment, and complementarity with EMAS funding.

Timing: This questionnaire has to be returned by **15 September 2017** at the latest, by SFC.

1 – Summarise how the Member State's overall situation in the policy areas covered by the Fund has changed as compared to when the NP was adopted (December 2013 baseline). Does the (revised) NP require an adjustment to the key policy issues addressed, as well as respective allocations? Briefly explain. Provide key figures/statistics when possible. (max 1 page)

The Estonian National Programme (NP) for ISF was compiled according to the principle of flexibility. It means that the description of potential actions under the national objectives is sufficiently general in order to leave room for certain amendments and additions related to the specified needs. For today, the Estonian NP has been amended once due to the need to address the obligations of the PNR Directive (Directive 2016/681). As a result of the mid-term review of the programme, it can be said that the needs/bottlenecks related to the policy areas covered by the Fund have not changed significantly compared to the situation at the time of programming.

Regarding the policy area of **border management** then large share of ISF resources have been directed to the replacement and/or renewing of different equipment contributing to more effective border control and surveillance. A need to procure more equipment for border surveillance than foreseen within the NP rose to the spotlight at the starting phase of the programme, mainly due the incident that took place at the Estonian-Russian border in 2014. The additional financial resources for acquiring necessary border surveillance equipment have so far been mostly ensured by the state budget.

No major changes have taken place in the field of **visa policy**. In order to ensure the effective processing of visa applications and execute tasks at consulates in accordance with the Schengen acquis on visas, consular officers have to be trained regularly and relevant information systems to be developed.

At the time of planning, prevention of drug-related crimes was one of the most important issues to be addressed with the programme in the field of **crime prevention**. It does not mean, though, that the projects focus on this specific topic only; increasing capability of pursuit activities, ensuring the reliability and security of ICT systems and other programme measures contribute to themes topical also at the present moment (e.g. enhancing the prevention of terrorism). In other words, actions implemented within the field of preventing and combating crime are relevant not only today but require attention in the future as well.

In the field of demining (**risks and crisis**) one of the main focus points of the programme has been raising the capability of deactivating the Second World War munition. This topic is still of high importance (constant findings of new munitions), but recent developments in the world show that new threats (e.g. terrorism) emerge that have to be addressed. For instance, in connection with the Estonian Presidency, the demand for the services of deminers has significantly increased (preparation of different summits). Therefore, in the future, more attention should be paid to acquiring not only protective equipment, but also bomb X-rays, containers and techniques which enable to perform works from distance.

Although some new topics have emerged during the implementation phase, they mostly fall into the scope of the existing objectives and actions of the programme (e.g., Member States are obliged to introduce different (information) systems required at EU level (e.g. ETIAS, Entry/Exit)). Therefore, the question is rather about the need for additional financial resources in order to tackle the new issues.

2 – Summarise the changes which, in your view, are needed to enable the NP to integrate developments in Union policies and political priorities, notably those highlighted in the Annex. If no changes are needed, explain how these policy developments will be addressed. Make reference to the SO and NO. (max 1 page)

In view of what was discussed above, no specific changes are needed to enable the national programme to integrate developments in Union policies and political priorities. The Estonian National Programme for ISF addresses to a greater or lesser extent all of the issues highlighted in the Annex. The priorities related to children in migration, integration of third-country nationals, return and resettlement are mostly covered by the Estonian NP for AMIF.

Although **radicalisation** is not yet a significant threat in Estonia, its prevention requires more attention in Estonia as well. The questions to be solved in case of radicalisation are multifaceted. One of those is improving the preparedness of communities for issues related to radicalisation (including the issue of refugees). This is addressed by an AMIF project, which focuses on raising competencies in the field of recognizing and managing the religion, culture and migration related risk behaviour of those in daily contact with immigrant people (e.g. educational sector employees, youth and social workers, law enforcement officers and others). On a wider scale, the Estonian programme for ISF addresses radicalisation through actions that aim at the prevention of terrorism (e.g. enhancing information exchange between law enforcement organs). In addition, implementation of measures related to prevention and combating of terrorism is financed from national budget (preventing and combating financing and supporting of terrorism; necessary information gathering and its processing).

Due to the limited resources of the ISF, **cyber security** activities are mostly financed through state budget (in the Police and Border Guard Board the number of officials engaged with cybercrimes and the capacity of the officials to handle digital data carriers (including evidence) will be increased). Nevertheless, one of the ISF projects focuses on the development of centralised surveillance IT system of the vital service providers aimed at identification of cyber-attacks and malware.

Concerning the development and implementation of the **ENTRY/EXIT** (EES) system, then creating the future interface possibilities with the EES was already financed with the support of External Borders Fund in Estonia. Also the NP for ISF foresees activities that facilitate the readiness to introduce the system in Estonia. However, the amount of financial resources necessary to perform the work related to the EES is unclear as the content of the tasks have likely changed compared to the situation at the planning phase.

The EU's future travel authorisation system **ETIAS** was not in focus at the time of ISF programming. Therefore, no specific actions were planned within the NP for ISF in this field. But Estonia supports the establishment of the ETIAS system and provision of access to data in the system by law enforcement authorities in order to combat terrorism and other serious crime. The project related to the PNR system is ongoing and will be likely completed by the transposition deadline of the relevant PNR Directive.

Estonia successfully passed the **Schengen evaluations** and **vulnerability assessment** (carried out in 2012-2013 and 2017 respectively). The evaluations did not detect any shortcomings that should be addressed with EU financial instruments.

Although the Estonian NP for ISF addresses today's political priorities, the effectiveness of the programme in tackling the emerging issues requires additional financial resources. Especially in the case of preventing and combating terrorism (including radicalisation) more emphasis should be put on investing in equipment and infrastructure and raising competence through trainings.

3 – Based on questions 1 and 2, please explain which SO and NO have to be modified, why and to what extent. Please provide a response for each SO and NO. If no change, report "N/A" (not applicable).

Specific Objective SO1 – Support a common visa policy

• What are the major changes having an impact on your policies and activities under this SO? Do these imply the need to revise your NP to address new/increased needs or priorities? Explain the changes and how they affect the NP. Provide key figures if relevant. (max 1/2 page – do not repeat what has been written under previous questions)

Current NP is flexible enough and no major changes have taken place in the policy area of supporting a common visa policy, which would imply the need to undertake substantive amendments in the NP.

Specific Objective SO2 – Borders

• What are the major changes having an impact on your policies and activities under this SO? Do these imply the need to revise your NP to address new/increased needs or priorities? Explain the changes and how they affect the NP. Provide key figures if relevant. (max 1/2 page – do not repeat what has been written under previous questions)

No major changes have taken place in the policy area of borders, which would imply the need to undertake substantive amendments in the NP. However, in order to ensure an even stronger consistency of the programme with the increased needs, additional financial resources are required. Additional investments are expected mainly to contribute further to EUROSUR (e.g. integration of surveillance system, reliability of ICT systems), harmonisation of border management-related measures in accordance with common Union standards (e.g. Entry/Exit system, additional development of distribution system for certificates) and raising national capacity (in terms of border surveillance and checks, e.g. Travel Authorisation System).

Specific Objective SO5 – Preventing and combating crime

• What are the major changes having an impact on your policies and activities under this SO? Do these imply the need to revise your NP to address new/increased needs or priorities? Explain the changes and how they affect the NP. Provide key figures if relevant. (max 1/2 page – do not repeat what has been written under previous questions)

Current NP is flexible enough and no major changes have taken place in the policy area of preventing and combating crime, which would imply the need to undertake substantive amendments in the NP.

Specific Objective SO6 – Risks and crisis

• What are the major changes having an impact on your policies and activities under this SO? Do these imply the need to revise your NP to address new/increased needs or priorities? Explain the changes and how they affect the NP. Provide key figures if relevant. (max 1/2 page – do not repeat what has been written under previous questions)

Current NP is flexible enough and no major changes have taken place in the policy area of risks and crisis, which would imply the need to undertake substantive amendments in the NP.

4 – Based on question 3, provide an estimation of the budgetary adjustments needed as compared to the Financing Plan of the NP. Provide the variation in absolute terms. Where no adjustment is needed, report "0" (zero).

National Objective	Adjustment needed: variation (+/-) in comparison to National Programme (estimates in euro)
SO1 Support a common visa policy	-
SO2 Borders	+ 10 000 000
SO3 Operating support	N/A
TOTAL extra funding needs ISF BORDERS, in light of new developments (for information only; will not automatically lead to increased EU funding)	+10 000 000
SO5 Preventing and combating crime	-
SO6 Risks and crisis	-

TOTAL extra funding needs ISF POLICE, in light of new developments *(for information only; will not automatically lead to increased EU funding)*

-