Procedure file

Basic information

INI - Own-initiative procedure	2008/2181(INI)	Procedure completed
Next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries Subject 7.10.02 Schengen area, Schengen acquis 7.10.04 External borders crossing and controls, visas 7.10.08 Migration policy 7.30 Police, judicial and customs cooperation in general		

Key players

European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	LIBE Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs		08/04/2008
		ALDE HENNIS-PLASSCHAERT Jeanine	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	AFET Foreign Affairs	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	
	DEVE Development	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	

European Commission	Commission DG	Commissioner	
	Justice and Consumers	BARROT Jacques	

Key events

13/02/2008	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(2008)0069	Summary
04/09/2008	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
10/02/2009	Vote in committee		Summary
17/02/2009	Committee report tabled for plenary	A6-0061/2009	
10/03/2009	Results of vote in Parliament	✉	
10/03/2009	Decision by Parliament	T6-0085/2009	Summary
10/03/2009	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2008/2181(INI)

Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Strategic initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 54
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	LIBE/6/61556

Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document	COM(2008)0069	13/02/2008	EC	Summary
Document attached to the procedure	SEC(2008)0153	13/02/2008	EC	
Document attached to the procedure	SEC(2008)0154	13/02/2008	EC	
Committee draft report	PE415.255	21/11/2008	EP	
Amendments tabled in committee	PE418.328	26/01/2009	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	A6-0061/2009	17/02/2009	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading	T6-0085/2009	10/03/2009	EP	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary	SP(2009)3244/2	06/10/2009	EC	

Next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries

PURPOSE: to propose the next steps in border management in the European Union.

BACKGROUND: the external borders of the EU are crossed every year by more than 300 million travellers, EU citizens and third country nationals combined. The dismantling of the EU's internal border controls is one of the greatest achievements of European integration. An area without internal borders, which has expanded from 7 countries in 1995 to 24 countries at the end of 2007 - a unique, historic accomplishment -, cannot function, however, without shared responsibility and solidarity in managing its external borders. Other actions have been completed by the Union as regards border management (legislative framework, Schengen Borders Code, simplified rules for local border traffic, the establishment of the FRONTEX Agency). While Member States remain responsible for controlling their own border, the Union's common policy in support of Member States' efforts should be continuously developed and strengthened in response to new threats, shifts in migratory pressure and any shortcomings identified, using new technology extensively and proportionately. The social and economic dimensions should be given equal weight. Crossing the external border should be simple and quick for third-country nationals fulfilling the entry conditions set by Community and national law. Border management should support economic growth in border regions of neighbouring countries.

This communication intends to define the next steps of this ambitious framework.

CONTENT: against this background this Communication puts forward suggestions for new tools that could form an integrated part of the European border management strategy of the future. It proposes ways to look ahead and reflect on the next generation of border management tools, with the objective of preserving the integrity of the Schengen area while simultaneously facilitating the procedures and border crossings for those seeking to enter for legitimate reasons. The possible tools to reflect on, which would apply with regard to third country nationals travelling to a Member State taking part in the Schengen cooperation or to a country associated to this cooperation, could include:

- facilitation of border crossing for bona fide travellers;
- possible introduction of a registration of entry/exit;
- examining the introduction of an Electronic System of Travel Authorisation (ESTA).

1) Facilitating border crossings for bona fide travellers: the Commission believes that:

a) low-risk travellers from third countries, including those that are subject to the visa requirement and those that are not, could be offered a pre-screening process, on a voluntary basis, with a view to being granted Registered Traveller status;

b) when arriving at the borders of the EU Registered Travellers could benefit from a simplified and automated border check.

In concrete terms, awarding the status of "Registered Traveller" and providing for automated checks for those persons would mean waiving the verification of certain entry conditions at the border (purpose of stay, means of subsistence, absence of threat to public order). Persons could be granted "Registered Traveller" status after appropriate screening on the basis of common vetting criteria. These could as a minimum include a reliable travel history (the person should not have exceeded the authorised stay at previous visits to the EU), proof of sufficient means of subsistence, and holding a biometric passport. The Commission presents the outline of the technical conditions aiming to facilitate the implementation of this solution.

Besides the criteria that have been waived for the purpose of allowing a simplified check of registered travellers at the borders, at the border itself, the introduction of automated gates could enable the automated verification of travellers' identity without the intervention of border

guards. A machine would read the biometric data contained in the travel documents or stored in a system or database and compare them against the biometrics of the traveller. This system could significantly increase cost-effectiveness as more passengers would be processed at the borders by a smaller number of border guards. A machine would read the biometric data contained in the travel documents or stored in a system or database and compare them against the biometrics of the traveller. One border guard should be able to oversee up to ten automated border gates in operation. This category is subject to a "minimum check", at both entry and exit, consisting of the examination of the travel document so as to verify the identity of the individual. The introduction of biometrics in passports could be completed by 2016 for one biometric identifier and by 2019 for two identifiers, at the latest (assuming a maximum period of validity of passports of 10 years). All EU citizens would at that time be able to benefit from automated border crossings should they be taken up by Member States in a widespread fashion. Automated border crossings for EU citizens based on the biometric passports would use the same automated gates as for third-country nationals that are registered travellers.

2) Creation of a system to register the entry/exist of third country nationals: the Commission believes that:

- the automatic registration of the time and place of entry and exit of third country nationals, both those that require a visa and those that do not, to identify overstayers, could be introduced at the borders;
- an alert available to national authorities could be issued once the validity of an individual's stay in the EU has expired, and no exit data had been captured.

An entry/exit system could apply to third country nationals admitted for a short stay (up to 3 months), covering both those that are subject to the visa requirement and those that are not. The system could include the recording of information on the time and place of entry, the length of stay authorised, and the transmission of automated alerts directly to the competent authorities, should a person be identified as 'overstayer', both at the time this occurs and upon departure from the EU.

The alert information would:

- enable national authorities to identify overstayers and take the appropriate measures;
- deter third-country nationals from overstaying;
- provide information for operational purposes on patterns of overstaying (e.g. travel route, fraudulent sponsors, country of origin and reasons for travelling) as well as data on migration flows and overstayers for visa policy purposes.

This new system could use the same technical platform as SIS II and VIS thereby exploiting synergies with the Biometric Matching System (BMS) currently under development and which could form the common basis for the entry/exit system, the VIS and the SIS II.

3) Electronic system of travel authorisation (ESTA): the Commission will examine the possibility of introducing an electronic system of travel authorisation. Such a system would apply to third-country nationals not subject to the visa requirement who would be requested to make an electronic application supplying, in advance of travelling, data identifying the traveller and specifying the passport and travel details. The data could be used for verifying that a person fulfils the entry conditions before travelling to the EU, while using a lighter and simpler procedure compared to a visa. The Commission intends to launch a study in 2008 to analyse the feasibility, the practical implications and the impacts of such a system.

The study to be launched by the Commission on the possibility of an electronic travel authorisation will also consider the relevant data protection issues arising from such a system.

Conclusions: having regard to the progress made in agreeing upon and launching the Visa Information System, the EU should consider building on this achievement by reflecting on the necessary parameters for putting in place an entry/exit system for all third-country nationals admitted for a short stay. Should this reflection conclude on the opportunity to build such a system, it could be operational by 2015 and future proposals would be needed in order to:

- amend the Schengen Borders Code to ensure that registration of dates of entry and exit is carried out systematically at all crossing points of the external border, and that the enrolment of biometrics at the border for third country nationals not requiring a visa becomes a compulsory entry condition. Also, if a "registered traveller" is created, the Borders Code would need to allow for a simplified check of travellers awarded such a status at the borders;
- decide the setting up of the new entry/exit system to register the entry and exit information and store biographic and biometric data of third country nationals. The system could build on the same technical platform as the VIS/SIS II.

Member States could also reflect on the need to use automated border control systems for EU citizens, based on the e-passport or national schemes. A discussion on the development of technical standards to achieve interoperability of national schemes not based on the e-passport should take place in the appropriate fora.

The Commission will report back to the European Parliament and the Council on the outcome of the study on an electronic travel authorisation system during 2009. The Commission therefore invites the European Parliament and the Council to engage in a reflection on the future overall architecture of the EU's integrated border management and the use of systems, from the angle of enhancing security and facilitating travel. On the basis of this reflection, the Commission will assess the further development of these systems, including the presentation of the necessary legislative proposals.

Next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries

The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs adopted the own initiative report by Jeanine HENNIS-PLASSCHAERT (ALDE, NL) on the next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries, recalling that the EU external border is crossed every year by 160 million EU citizens and 140 million third country nationals (TCNs), both those who require a visa and those who do not. In this context, the Commission intends to be ready in 2009-2010 to present legislative proposals for the introduction of an entry/exit system, a Registered Traveller Programme (RTP) and an Electronic System of Travel Authorisation (ESTA), in order to facilitate border management (similar systems exist in Australia and are being implemented by the USA). Therefore, MEPs make a number of recommendations on equivalent systems to put in place in Europe and make the following comments:

- Entry/exit system: although the proposed system and alert information might help to deter TCNs from overstaying, MEPs do not believe that it will put an end to the 'overstay' phenomenon as such. They recall that the correct functioning of the entry/exit system will depend both materially and operationally on the success of the VIS and SIS II, although these instruments are not yet fully operational. Moreover, MEPs are still convinced of the need to implement exist capability (in particular with regard to sea and land exit) while stressing their concerns about the cost-effectiveness of such a system;
- Registered Traveller Programme (RTP): while MEPs support the concept of an RTP for TCNs, they draw attention to the need to harmonise the systems in place. In this respect, they recall the blueprint proposed by the Netherlands, Germany, the UK and FRONTEX, a system known as the 'International Expedited Traveller Programme' proposed as a possible blueprint for other Member States;
- Electronic System of Travel Authorisation (ESTA): overall, MEPs question whether the proposed system is absolutely necessary as they are convinced that close cooperation between intelligence services is the right way forward, rather than a massive collection of data in general;
- Data protection and biometrics concerns: MEPs call on the Commission to consult the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) in respect of any action to be taken in this area, given the vast amounts of personal data that will be processed. While MEPs are aware that biometrics are theoretically effective personal identifiers, they stress that this technique is not infallible. Fall-back procedures should therefore be provided for at all times. Moreover, MEPs insist on a standard protocol for the use and exchange of biometric information in order to avoid divergences between different systems used by Member States. They also consider a "privacy by design" approach to be an essential feature of any development which risks jeopardising the personal information of individuals.

In conclusion, MEPs consider the objective of truly EU integrated border management to be legitimate but note that the Commission?s proposals run the risk of costing too much. They therefore call on the Commission to think in terms of the need for, and the cost of, the border logistics and they regret the notion that the EU's border management policy should be founded on the idea that all travellers are potentially suspect. MEPs also criticise the lack of a comprehensive master plan setting out the overall objectives and architecture of the EU's border management strategy. According to MEPs, the Commission must analyse first of all the effectiveness of the existing border management systems of the Member States, in order to bring about the optimal synergies between them. They believe, in particular, that no new instruments or systems should be launched until the existing tools are fully operational, safe and reliable. Moreover, they express doubts concerning the need for, and the proportionality of, the proposed measures (particularly given their expensive nature and the potential risks they pose for data protection).

Next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries

The European Parliament adopted by 600 votes to 46, with 30 abstentions, a resolution on the next steps in border management in the European Union and similar experiences in third countries. The resolution is in response to the Commission Communication of 13 February 2008 entitled 'Preparing the next steps in border management in the European Union' and, on the whole, supports the Commission?s proposals. The Commission intends to be ready in 2009-2010 to present legislative proposals for the introduction of an entry/exit system, a Registered Traveller Programme (RTP) and an Electronic System of Travel Authorisation (ESTA) in order to facilitate border management (similar systems exist in Australia and are being implemented by the USA).

The Parliament recalls that the EU external border is crossed every year by 160 million EU citizens and 140 million third country nationals (TCNs), both those who require a visa and those who do not. It requests, however, more information on the data collected by an external contractor estimating that 'there were up to 8 million illegal immigrants within the EU25 in 2006'.

Given the scope and possible cost of the Commission?s proposals, the Parliament makes a number of recommendations that can be summarised as follows:

- Entry/exit system: although the proposed system and alert information might help to deter TCNs from overstaying, the Parliament does not believe that it will put an end to the 'overstay' phenomenon as such. It recalls that the correct functioning of the entry/exit system will depend both materially and operationally on the success of the VIS and SIS II, although these instruments are not yet fully operational. Moreover, the Parliament is still convinced of the need to implement exit rather than entry capability (in particular with regard to sea and land exit) while stressing its concerns about the cost-effectiveness of such a system;
- Registered Traveller Programme (RTP): although the Parliament supports the concept of an RTP for TCNs, it draws attention to the need to harmonise the systems in place to avoid the risk of ending up with a patchwork of 27 systems based on different criteria. In this respect, the Parliament recalls the blueprint proposed by the Netherlands, Germany, the UK and FRONTEX, a system known as the 'International Expedited Traveller Programme' proposed as a possible blueprint for other Member States;
- Electronic System of Travel Authorisation (ESTA): overall, the Parliament questions whether the proposed system is absolutely necessary as it is convinced that close cooperation between intelligence services is the right way forward, rather than a massive collection of data in general;
- Data protection and biometrics concerns: the Parliament calls on the Commission to consult the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) in respect of any action to be taken in this area, given the vast amounts of personal data that will be processed. While the Parliament is aware that biometrics are theoretically effective personal identifiers, it stresses that this technique is not infallible. Fall-back procedures should therefore be provided for at all times. Moreover, the Parliament insists on a standard protocol for the use and exchange of biometric information in order to avoid divergences between different systems used by Member States. It also considers a "privacy by design" approach to be an essential feature of any development which risks jeopardising the personal information of individuals.

The Parliament considers the objective of truly EU integrated border management to be legitimate but notes that the Commission?s proposals run the risk of costing too much. It therefore calls on the Commission to think in terms of the need for, and the cost of, the border logistics and regrets the notion that the EU's border management policy should be founded on the idea that all travellers are potentially suspect. The Parliament also criticises the lack of a comprehensive master plan setting out the overall objectives and architecture of the EU's border management strategy.

According to the Parliament, the Commission must analyse first of all the effectiveness of the existing border management systems of the Member States, in order to bring about the optimal synergies between them. It believes, in particular, that no new instruments or systems

should be launched until the existing tools are fully operational, safe and reliable. Moreover, the Parliament expresses doubts concerning the need for, and the proportionality of, the proposed measures (particularly given their expensive nature and the potential risks they pose for data protection).