

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

**A6-0352/2008**

16.9.2008

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the draft Council regulation on migration from the Schengen Information System (SIS 1+) to the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)  
(11925/2/2008 – C6-0189/2008 – 2008/0078(CNS))

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

Rapporteur: Carlos Coelho

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\* Assent procedure  
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases  
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and  
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- \*\*\*I Codecision procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*\*II Codecision procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\*III Codecision procedure (third reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission.)

### ***Amendments to a legislative text***

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. In the case of amending acts, passages in an existing provision that the Commission has left unchanged, but that Parliament wishes to amend, are highlighted in **bold**. Any deletions that Parliament wishes to make in passages of this kind are indicated thus: [...]. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). Suggested corrections of this kind are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION .....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	7
PROCEDURE.....	11



## **DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION**

**on the draft Council regulation on migration from the Schengen Information System (SIS 1+) to the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II) (11925/2/2008 – C6-0189/2008 – 2008/0078(CNS))**

### **(Consultation procedure)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the draft Council regulation (11925/2/2008),
  - having regard to the Commission proposal (COM(2008)0197),
  - having regard to Article 66 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0189/2008),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (A6-0352/2008),
1. Approves the draft Council regulation as amended;
  2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 250(2) of the EC Treaty;
  3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  4. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the text submitted for consultation substantially;
  5. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

### **Amendment 1**

**Proposal for a regulation**  
**Article 11A a (new)**

*Text proposed by the Council*

*Amendment*

**Article 11A a**

**Reporting**

***The Commission shall submit by the end of every six-month period, and for the first time by the end of the first six-month period of 2009, a progress report to the European Parliament and the Council concerning the development of SIS II and migration from the Schengen Information System (SIS I+) to the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II).***

**Amendment 2**

**Proposal for a regulation**  
**Article 12**

*Text proposed by the Council*

*Amendment*

This Regulation shall enter into force on the third day following its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*. It shall expire on the date to be fixed by the Council, acting in accordance with Article 55(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006.

This Regulation shall enter into force on the third day following its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*. It shall expire on the date to be fixed by the Council, acting in accordance with Article 55(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006, ***and in any event no later than on 30 June 2010.***

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### **Background:**

The Schengen Information System (SIS) is the central tool for the application of the Schengen principles, in fact is rightly considered as the backbone of a "borderless" Europe and the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice.

Since this System was established its task has gradually changed. In fact, when the SIS was first created, its only purpose was to be a compensatory measure for the opening of the borders. Ever since, especially because the SIS has proved to be a useful and efficient tool, has been decided to maximise its potential, mainly within the frame of police cooperation.

The Schengen Information System is a large-scale database (in fact, the largest common European data base, with a total data volume - in December 2007 - of 22 450 781, from which 1 142 988 is related to persons) which operates as a joint information system enabling the relevant authorities in the Member States to cooperate and exchange the necessary information, something which is essential in order to establish an area without controls at its internal borders.

The system contains information on individuals and objects, which can be used by the relevant authorities, especially within the context of police and judicial cooperation on criminal matters, as well as in the field of checking individuals at external frontiers or on national territory, and for issuing visas and residence permits.

The decision to create a Second Generation of the SIS took account of the need to integrate new data (namely the introduction of biometric data), new types of alerts (ex. introduction of the European Arrest Warrant) and new functionalities needed to be implemented within the system (in order to reinforce security and to make a more efficient use of data, for instance through the interlinking of alerts) and to extend access to alerts by authorities at national or EU level, as well as to give answer to the need to integrate the new Member States, since the central system (C-SIS) could not connect more than 18 countries.

The Commission received the mandate to develop the new system, on 6 December 2001, which was scheduled to begin operating in March 2007. Due to several delays, a new timetable was announced, providing for SIS II to become operational by 17 December 2008 (exactly the same time as the Commission existing mandate ends).

In the meanwhile, a more updated version of the SIS (SIS I+R) was developed in 2006, replacing the C-SIS Machines and implementing a solution more up-to-date in communication terms and including the possibility of connecting new countries to the system.

Given the enormous disappointment for the new Member States that, according to what was promised, wanted to be connected to the SIS still in 2007, the Portuguese Government decided to move forward with a proposal which could serve as a technical transitional solution - the so-called SISone4ALL.

This system is now fully operational and has allowed to connect nine of the new Member States to the SIS. Nevertheless, in this enlarged Schengen area, the reinforcement of security requirements has become even more important and urgent.

This can only be achieved if the next generation of the system, known as SIS II, starts operating.

### **Establishment of the SIS II**

Provisions on the establishment, operation and use of the SIS II were agreed in 2006, between the Council and the European Parliament, under co-decision, on a first reading in order to avoid any more delays. It is foreseen that these instruments will start applying to the Member States participating in the SIS I + only as of the date to be fixed by the Council, acting by the unanimity of its Members representing the governments of the Member States participating in SIS1+ (according to art<sup>o</sup> 55(2) of Regulation 1987/2006).

Before this can happen and the system starts operating, the system must be closely tested, with a view to assessing whether SIS II meets all the technical and functional requirements as defined in the SIS II legal instruments, as well as the other necessary requirements such as robustness, response capacity and performance.

Only after the successful completion of all SIS II tests we can go for the next step: the migration of the SIS I + users to the SIS II environment, where the switch-over should take place on the same date for all Member States - one-shoot migration.

### **Current proposals: Migration**

The European Parliament has been asked to give its opinion regarding the two instruments aiming to establish the legal framework governing that migration.

This proposal for a Council Regulation aims to regulate the migration from the current Schengen Information System (SIS I +) to the Second Generation Information System (SIS II).

It arises taking into account the need for a change on the migration strategy. The initial plan was to have a migration of 15 Member States (the number at that time), during a process that should take around 8 hours.

In the meanwhile, the number of Member States increased to 25<sup>1</sup>, making this migration process much more complex, difficult and requiring more time for the process of transferring all the data to the new network. The risk became too high because if one Member State, during this common switch-over period, fails to have a successful migration, the direct consequence would be to put back immediately its borders (because it wouldn't have access anymore to the SIS). In order to avoid this contingency, it was necessary to create a sort of back-up solution so as to be able to switch back to SIS 1+ if necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Member states of SIS II are the following: 15 old EU Member states -except UK and IE plus 9 new Member states (the new 10 of 2004 enlargement minus CY) plus Norway and Iceland and CH.



In order to reduce the risks of service disruption during migration an interim technical architecture for the operation of SISI+ will allow SIS I+ and certain technical parts of the architecture of SIS II to operate in parallel for a transitional period, which will be kept very limited.

Beyond that, a technical tool will also be made available - a "converter" - allowing for the successful conversion and synchronisation of data between SIS 1+ and SIS II, to be used for a very limited period of time. The converter connects the SIS 1+ central system with the SIS II central system, enabling both to process the same information and ensuring that the Member States already successfully connected to the SIS II stay on the same level as the others that are still connected to the SIS 1+. In order to allow that interim technical architecture to work, a new function that was not previewed in the first contract has been added - the reverse mode.

The current proposal intends not only to establish the legal framework governing the migration, but also the comprehensive test, with a view to demonstrating, in particular, that the level of performance of SIS II is at least equivalent to that achieved with SIS 1+. Furthermore, it intends to regulate the performance of tests on the exchange of supplementary information.

### **Development and testing phase**

The conditions stated on art<sup>o</sup> 55(2) of Regulation 1987/2006), should be fulfilled (inclusive the fact that the European Parliament should be informed of all the results) and only after that, the migration of the data should take place, in one-shoot migration. These four conditions are:

- the adoption of the necessary implementing measures;
- the notification about necessary technical and legal arrangements by the Member States;
- the successful completion of a comprehensive test;
- the necessary technical arrangements for connecting the national systems to the central system;

The operational start of SIS II marks the end of the development phase and the beginning of the SIS II legal basis applicability. Following that logic, then the migration phase has to be the final task under the development mandate for SIS II.

Following a request of the European Parliament's Rapporteur, Vice-President Barrot responded with a letter, on 13th June 2008, stating that the testing phase is already taking place and describing the 12 different phases until the start of operations of the SIS II, that is foreseen for 30 September 2009.

### **Mandate**

It is necessary to have a SIS II development mandate until the operational start of SIS II, the so-called "go live".

This mandate must allow to carry out all tasks defined as preconditions in the SIS II Legal Instruments, including the preparation of the operational start. This means the correction of

any bugs identified during the test phases and the provision of all necessary preconditions such as test platforms and resources. The finalisation of all tests should only be considered successful when no more blockings or major bugs are identified.

Until now the project management has been done by the Commission, as well as the management of the relation with the firm contracted for this purpose. If the Commission ends its mandate before the "go live" phase, than the relations with the contractor should also come to an end. Nevertheless, this firm has been paid to deliver a system perfectly working. This being so, how can it be acceptable for its contract to end before we know that the system is fully operational and any eventual problems and bugs (that certainly still will appear) are solved, which should still be done in the framework of that contract? How can this contract finish in December 2008, if only 15 Member States will be tested and not all of them? Can guarantees be given that the performance of the system will be the same if 10 more Member States will be added?

It is expected that for this new phase, a new contractor will have to be found and a new working environment will have to be rebuilt, inside of the Council structures, in order to proceed with the work and carry out the necessary tests until the system is in a position to become operational (which was, in principle, already required from and paid to the previous contractor). In this case, will this option make it necessary to have a new calendar in order to take into account all these new aspects that were not previously foreseen?

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Migration from the Schengen Information System (SIS 1+) to the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)		
<b>References</b>	COM(2008)0197 – C6-0189/2008 – 2008/0078(CNS)		
<b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>	14.5.2008		
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	LIBE 20.5.2008		
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	BUDG 20.5.2008		
<b>Not delivering opinions</b> Date of decision	BUDG 11.9.2008		
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Carlos Coelho 28.5.2008		
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	28.5.2008	8.9.2008	15.9.2008
<b>Date adopted</b>	15.9.2008		
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 35	–: 0	0: 2
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Alexander Alvaro, Emine Bozkurt, Mihael Brejc, Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Giusto Catania, Jean-Marie Cavada, Carlos Coelho, Panayiotis Demetriou, Gérard Deprez, Bárbara Dührkop Dührkop, Urszula Gacek, Kinga Gál, Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, Lívia Járóka, Ewa Klant, Magda Kósáné Kovács, Stavros Lambrinidis, Kartika Tamara Liotard, Viktória Mohácsi, Javier Moreno Sánchez, Rareş-Lucian Niculescu, Inger Segelström, Csaba Sógor, Vladimir Urutchev, Tatjana Ždanoka		
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Edit Bauer, Frieda Brepoels, Simon Busuttil, Sophia in 't Veld, Iliana Malinova Iotova, Ona Juknevičienė, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Antonio Masip Hidalgo, Bill Newton Dunn, Luca Romagnoli, Eva-Britt Svensson		
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	Andres Tarand		