



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

2010/2154(INI)

25.3.2011

AMENDMENTS

1 - 89

Draft opinion
Judith Sargentini
(PE458.487v01-00)

on aviation security with a special focus on security scanners
(2010/2154(INI))

AM\859158EN.doc

PE460.651v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1

Mariya Nedelcheva, Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of ***dissuasion and prevention in*** the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society; ***recalls that the confidence of citizens in their institutions is essential and that there must therefore be a fair balance between the need to ensure security and a guarantee of fundamental rights and freedoms;***

Or. fr

Amendment 2

Timothy Kirkhope on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and ***supports in this only*** the use of ***legitimate means***, which are ***necessary*** in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism, and the ***importance of the use of proportionate and lawful security measures*** which are ***essential in the prevention of terrorist incidents, and stresses that any methods used must respect the fundamental rights of passengers and be reflective of*** a free and open democratic society;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Salvatore Iacolino

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and **supports in *this only*** the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and ***organised crime, which constitute threats to the security of the European Union, as already identified in the Stockholm Programme, and to that end supports*** the use of the legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Or. it

Amendment 4
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society, ***but recalls that there is still no definitive proof of the effectiveness of such a procedure;***

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Kinga Göncz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports ***in this*** only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society, ***fully respecting the Charter of Fundamental Rights***;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Sophia in 't Veld

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, ***which*** are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means ***that*** are ***prescribed by law, effective***, necessary in a free and open democratic society, ***and proportionate to the aim pursued***;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Ioan Enciu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Amendment

1. Emphasises the importance of the fight against terrorism and supports in this only the use of legitimate ***and proportionate*** means, which are necessary in a free and open democratic society;

Or. ro

Amendment 8
Sophia in 't Veld

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Stresses that the objectives and the expected value of the use of body scanners must be clearly defined;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Stresses that any counterterrorism measure should therefore be in full accordance with the fundamental rights and obligations of the European Union, which are necessary in a democratic society and must be proportionate, prescribed by law and thus delimited within the specific aim it wishes to achieve;

2. Recalls that the sole objective of any counterterrorism measure is to guarantee citizens' safety, based on criteria of proportionality and respect for fundamental rights and civil liberties;

Or. es

Amendment 10
Cornelia Ernst, Marie-Christine Vergiat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Stresses that any counterterrorism measure should therefore be in full

2. Stresses that any counterterrorism measure should therefore be in full

accordance with the fundamental rights and obligations of the European Union, which are necessary in a democratic society and must be proportionate, prescribed by law and thus delimited within the specific aim it wishes to achieve;

accordance with the fundamental rights and obligations of the European Union, which are necessary in a democratic society and must be proportionate, ***strictly necessary***, prescribed by law and thus delimited within the specific aim it wishes to achieve;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that any counterterrorism measure should therefore be in full accordance with the fundamental rights and obligations of the European Union, which are necessary in a democratic society and must be proportionate, prescribed by law and thus delimited within the specific aim it wishes to achieve;

Amendment

2. Stresses that any counterterrorism measure should therefore be in full accordance with the fundamental rights and obligations of the European Union ***Member States***, which are necessary in a democratic society and must be proportionate, prescribed by law and thus delimited within the specific aim it wishes to achieve;

Or. nl

Amendment 12
Cornelia Ernst, Marie-Christine Vergiat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Urges in this regard for the aim to be achieved to be precisely and duly specified; calls for an extensive technical assessment to be carried out regarding the usefulness of body scanners; urges furthermore to prohibit the use of body

scanners in case of any ambiguous or non-positive assessment;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Mariya Nedelcheva, Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Recalls that the use of body scanners must comply with Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data;

Or. fr

Amendment 14

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes that only few Member States have carried out trials of body scanners¹ and many of these have abandoned body scanners subsequently, due to the high costs, delays and inefficacy², while most of the Member States have not deployed body scanners or have opposed or affirmed that they do not intend to buy, deploy and use of body scanners;

¹ *UK, NL, DE, DK.*

² *IT and FIN.*

Or. en

Amendment 15

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Notes that, regardless of the inclusion of body scanners in the list of methods of screening allowed, those Member States already using body scanners are bound to ensure that citizens' fundamental rights enshrined in the ECHR and in the Charter of Fundamental Rights are respected, protected and promoted, notably the right to privacy and to health, as furthermore requested by the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 16

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2c. Highlights that those Member States that used body scanners have excluded some categories of vulnerable persons, such as children, pregnant woman, elderly people and persons with disabilities or with implanted medical devices and workers who are frequently exposed to radiations, and that common rules in this field shall be applied at EU level when Member States deploy and use body scanners;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2d. Believes that body scanners should only be used by those Member States that decided or will decide to deploy them, on an ad hoc basis, and for those flights where there are reasons to believe that security is at stake, for instance on the basis of intelligence information, of specific risks or threats, of the country of destination of the flights (if the country of destination requested body scanning of the passengers for specific security reasons) or of origin (if the country of origin is targeted by terrorist groups); believes that body scanners should not be used for intra-EU flights;

Or. en

Amendment 18

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2e. Reiterates its negative opinion in relation to the efficacy, necessity and proportionality in a democratic society of the use of body scanners, due to their intrusiveness and impact on the fundamental rights to privacy, data protection, health, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, non-discrimination, as well as in relation to the high costs and time-consuming

procedures, that repercute negatively on citizens and passengers;

Or. en

Amendment 19

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2f. Calls the Commission not to add body scanners to the list of authorised screening methods, as this would create an incentive for the use of body scanners at national level, but calls it to issue instead binding recommendations to Member States in relation to the rules for the use of body scanners, shall they decide to continue trials or apply more stringent measures in relation to the use of body scanners in aviation security;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 g (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2g. Calls for a in depth analysis, evaluation and review of current security situation and procedures at airports, including the liquids regulation, and for an anticipation of the timetable related to the suspension of the ban on liquids and of the conditions foreseen in relation to the availability of screening technologies, while questioning the efficacy and high

*costs of the future procedures for
systematic screening of liquids;*

Or. en

Amendment 21

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 h (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

*2h. Believes that the comitology
procedure in the aviation security sector,
at least for measures having an impact on
citizens' rights, is inappropriate and calls
for the EP to be fully involved through co-
decision;*

Or. en

Amendment 22

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

*3. Points to the fact that the use of body
scanners is not restricted only to airports
but also to other public places; urges
therefore that the Commission present a
proposal covering the deployment and use
of security scanners in places other than
airports;*

deleted

Or. es

Amendment 23

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Points to the fact that the use of body scanners is not restricted only to airports but also to other public places; urges therefore that the Commission present a proposal covering the deployment and use of security scanners in places other than airports;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 24

Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Points to the fact that the use of body scanners is not restricted only to airports but also to other public places; **urges therefore that the Commission present a proposal covering the deployment and use of security scanners in places other than airports;**

3. Points to the fact that the use of body scanners is not restricted only to airports but also to other public places;

Or. nl

Amendment 25

Salvatore Iacolino

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Points to the fact that the use of body

3. Points to the fact that the use of body

scanners is not restricted only to airports but also to other public places; urges therefore that the Commission present a proposal covering the deployment and use of security scanners in places other than airports;

scanners is not restricted only to airports but also to other public places; urges therefore that the Commission present a proposal covering the deployment and use of security scanners in places other than airports ***that are adjudged to be susceptible to terrorist attack;***

Or. it

Amendment 26

Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Points*** to the ***fact that*** the use of body scanners ***is not restricted only to airports but also to other*** public places; ***urges therefore*** that the ***Commission present a proposal covering*** the ***deployment and use*** of ***security*** scanners ***in places other than airports;***

Amendment

3. ***Underlines that the obligation to respect the fundamental rights to privacy, data protection and health in relation to the use of body scanners applies wherever these are used and also outside of airports and in general in all public places where body scanners are or could be deployed and consequently calls on the Commission to monitor Member States practices in this respect and ensure that the upcoming rules on the protection of citizens' rights to privacy, data protection, health, non-discrimination are applied whenever body scanners are used;***

Or. en

Amendment 27

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Points out that the decision to install security scanners at airports falls within the sphere of competence of the Member

States, and in this context they must meet the minimum common standards and requirements set by the European Union, without prejudice to the right of the Member States to apply more stringent measures;

Or. es

Amendment 28
Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Proposes that, once common rules on the use of security scanners have been laid down, the Commission should revise them where necessary to adapt the provisions on the protection of health and fundamental rights to technological progress;

Or. es

Amendment 29
Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Calls on the Member States to periodically monitor the long-term effects of exposure to security scanners, taking new scientific developments into account, and to check that the equipment has been correctly installed and is properly used and operated;

Or. es

Amendment 30

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every **body** scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; ***calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;***

Amendment

4. Calls for every **security** scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks, ***comply with European and national legislation in relation to the ALARA principle, pay particular attention to groups considered vulnerable and prevent the use of imaging technology based on X-ray transmission;***

Or. es

Amendment 31

Ioan Enciu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Amendment

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should *inter alia* ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks ***and side effects liable to aggravate or retrigger diseases or conditions;*** calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Or. ro

Amendment 32

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva, Simon Busuttil, Georgios Papanikolaou

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for **any form of x-ray technology** to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Amendment

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for **full** x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list, **when it does not meet existing EU health standards; in this regard, particular attention should be given to vulnerable people;**

Or. en

Amendment 33

Timothy Kirkhope on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for **any form of x-ray technology** to be **explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;**

Amendment

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk **to the passenger,** including long-term risks; calls in this regard for **the use of those scanners which use ionizing radiation, for example x-rays, which can have a cumulative effect** to be **restricted and to ask for further research as to their effects;**

Amendment 34
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Amendment

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for any form of technology ***using x-rays or any other type of harmful ray*** to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Or. ro

Amendment 35
Sophia in 't Veld

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list;

Amendment

4. Calls for every body scanner to meet a minimum set of technical requirements before it can be placed on a permissible screening methods list; these requirements should inter alia ensure the prevention of any possible health risk, including long-term risks; calls in this regard for any form of x-ray technology to be explicitly excluded from the permissible screening methods list ***at the current stage of technology***;

Amendment 36
Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that no data processing or data storage should be possible;

Amendment

deleted

Or. nl

Amendment 37
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that no data processing or data storage should be possible;

Amendment

5. Points out that protection scanners will have to be equipped with technology that guarantees protection for human dignity, privacy and intimacy, and it is desirable to use a standard figure or gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images and for images to be destroyed immediately after screening has been carried out without incident;

Or. es

Amendment 38
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that no data processing or data storage should be possible;

Amendment

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that no data processing or data storage should be possible; ***points out that staff responsible for the storage of processed data should be held criminally responsible for their actions;***

Or. ro

Amendment 39
Cornelia Ernst, Marie-Christine Vergiat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that ***no*** data processing or data storage ***should*** be possible;

Amendment

5. Insists furthermore that body scanners should only be equipped with technology that does not enable any possibility of rendering full body images but merely standardised gender-neutral ‘stick figure’ images that are fully anonymised, and that ***any*** data processing or data storage ***must not*** be possible;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Sophia in 't Veld, Jan Mulder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Commission to impose deterrent sanctions for unauthorized recording or distribution of security screening images;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Cornelia Ernst

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls for periodic technical controls to be carried out by a competent organisation to review the devices' integrity and their compliance with the conditions laid out in paragraphs 4 and 5;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Cornelia Ernst, Marie-Christine Vergiat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points to the fact that data security is largely undermined by the implementation of electronic networking technologies; notes that this is especially the case with wireless technologies or

connectivity to the internet;

Or. en

Amendment 43

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra

Draft opinion Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that the obtaining of images will have to comply with the requirements laid down in Community legislation on the protection of personal data;

Or. es

Amendment 44

Ioan Enciu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that there is sufficient proof to suggest that body scanners cause seriousness diseases, such as cancer; consequently, in accordance with the precautionary principle, believes that their use in the European Union must be prohibited until in-depth studies have been conducted on the real health risks occasioned by exposure to the radiation emitted by different types of body scanner;

Or. ro

Amendment 45

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual
Draft opinion Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every person *should have the right to* refuse a *body* scan, *without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive* training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every person *may* refuse to *undergo* a scan, *in which case they would be obliged to submit to alternative screening methods that guarantee security to the same levels of effectiveness as security scanners, and in this context calls on the Commission to propose that security staff responsible for using security scanners should receive specific training that takes into account the impact on personal dignity, health and the protection of personal data;*

Or. es

Amendment 46

Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every person should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every person should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; *insists that particular attention be paid to vulnerable people such as pregnant women, children, disabled persons or people suffering from illnesses which make this kind of check inappropriate;* calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Or. fr

Amendment 47

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva, Simon Busuttil, Georgios Papanikolaou

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every *person* should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, **and the right to request** a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every *passenger* should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation; **in case of refusal, the person concerned should undergo** a standard security check, **that should guarantee the same level of security**, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper **and** extensive training;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Petru Constantin Luhan

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every person should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every person should have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training; **calls on the Commission to propose alternative methods of body scanning, bearing in mind that everyone has the right to refuse to undergo this type of scanning;**

Or. ro

Amendment 49
Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every person **should have the right to** refuse a body scan, **without the obligation to give any** explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every person **could** refuse a body scan, **albeit provided that they give a demonstrably sound** explanation, and **must have** the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Or. nl

Amendment 50
Ioan Enciu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that every person **should** have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Amendment

6. Stresses that every person **must** have the right to refuse a body scan, without the obligation to give any explanation, and the right to request a standard security check, with full respect for the rights and dignity of that person; calls in this regard for all security personnel to receive proper, extensive training;

Or. ro

Amendment 51
Cornelia Ernst

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Stresses that current security procedures at airports do not include full searching of the body;

Or. en

**Amendment 52
Sophia in 't Veld**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable;

Amendment

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, ***national origin***, genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable;

Or. en

**Amendment 53
Birgit Sippel, Anna Hedh**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity,

Amendment

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity,

genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable;

genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable; ***insists on sound legislative guarantees ensuring that passengers who opt out from the scanning process will not suffer additional burdens including exhaustive searches or delays;***

Or. en

Amendment 54
Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that ***refusal*** to undergo a body scan ***should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that,*** in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, ***any form of profiling*** based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief is ***unacceptable;***

Amendment

7. Stresses that ***the reasons stated for refusing*** to undergo a body scan ***may be investigated; takes the view that any form of profiling*** in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief is ***undesirable;***

Or. nl

Amendment 55
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on,

Amendment

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned ***or give rise to such inconvenience as long waits or detailed searches*** and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body

for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable;

scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief is unacceptable;

Or. fr

Amendment 56

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva, Simon Busuttil

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of **profiling** based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief **is unacceptable**;

Amendment

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, any form of **discrimination** based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief **should be prohibited**;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Timothy Kirkhope on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, **any form** of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or

Amendment

7. Stresses that refusal to undergo a body scan should not constitute ipso facto any suspicion of the person concerned and that, in the procedure before being submitted to a body scan or related to the refusal of a body scan, **forms** of profiling based on, for example, sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or

belief is unacceptable;

belief is unacceptable;

Or. en

Amendment 58

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Points out that the operating rules must ensure that the selection of people for security scanning cannot be based on criteria relating to sex, race, colour, ethnicity, genetic features, language, religion or belief;

Or. es

Amendment 59

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the **body** scanner, including their right to refuse **to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;**

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be **fully**, properly and comprehensibly informed about **security checks by means of the protection** scanner, including their right to refuse **such screening;**

Or. es

Amendment 60
Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, ***including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;***

Amendment

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner;

Or. nl

Amendment 61
Luis de Grandes Pascual
Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Calls for*** people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, ***including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;***

Amendment

8. ***Takes the view that*** people ***undergoing checks should receive all the necessary information in advance, particularly regarding the operation of*** the scanner ***concerned, what images can be seen and by whom, the conditions in place to protect the rights to intimacy, privacy and data protection, the impact on people's health, the possibility of refusing to pass through the scanner and the alternative control methods available to them;***

Or. es

Amendment 62

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva, Simon Busuttil, Georgios Papanikolaou

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for *people* who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of *perceived* irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment

8. Calls for *passengers* who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check; ***stresses that information to the traveller about the body scan should be provided not only at the time of the booking by the airline or on the airport website but also at the screening point;***

Or. en

Amendment 63

Timothy Kirkhope on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for *people who are willing* to be ***submitted to a body scan to be*** properly and comprehensibly ***informed about*** the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment

8. Calls for ***information*** to be ***made available in order for passengers*** to properly and comprehensibly ***understand*** the ***procedure of being checked by a*** body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment 64

Mariya Nedelcheva, Monica Luisa Macovei, Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check; ***recalls that the training of airport security personnel is a basic necessity;***

Or. fr

Amendment 65

Salvatore Iacolino

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed ***in advance*** about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Or. it

Amendment 66
Birgit Sippel, Anna Hedh

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Amendment

8. Calls for people who are willing to be submitted to a body scan to be properly and comprehensibly informed about the body scanner, including their right to refuse to be submitted to a body scan and their right to complain and seek ***an effective legal*** redress in case of perceived irregularities related to the body scan or their refusal to be submitted to it and the subsequent standard security check;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

8a. Recognises the right of passengers to complain about any irregularity that might arise from security checks carried out using both security scanners and other alternative means, in cases where passengers did not wish to submit to a security scan;

Amendment

Or. es

Amendment 68

Mariya Nedelcheva, Monica Luisa Macovei, Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Underlines the importance of penalties for any instances of misuse of body scanner images;

Or. fr

Amendment 69

Cornelia Ernst, Marie-Christine Vergiat

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners, ***especially with a view to the principles of proportionality and necessity,*** and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Or. en

Amendment 70

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the **deployment and** use of **body** scanners as a **permissible screening** method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering **inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and** the possible health risks, **taking into account the opinions of** the European Union, **international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;**

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the use of **protection** scanners as a **control** method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering the possible health risks **and risks relating to the degree of protection for fundamental rights, including the protection of personal data, for which purpose account must be taken of the recommendations made by the European Data Protection Supervisor, the Article 29 Working Party and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights;**

Or. es

Amendment 71

Daniël van der Stoep

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia **the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and** the possible health risks, **taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;**

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the possible health risks **associated with body scanners;**

Amendment 72
Birgit Sippel, Anna Hedh

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in ***a proportionality test and*** an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks ***of passengers and staff submitted to frequent checks in the course of their work***, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Or. en

Amendment 73
Mariya Nedelcheva, Monica Luisa Macovei, Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment ***covering inter alia*** the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment ***showing what the real added value of this kind of initiative would be; insists in this regard on the importance of calculating the cost of investment,***

Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

maintenance and management which would be incurred by installing and using body scanners; recalls that the impact assessment must also cover the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners, the possible health risks – particularly for vulnerable persons – and the protection of personal data, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, *the Article 29 Working Party*, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Or. fr

Amendment 74
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks; *calls on the Commission to provide conclusive studies on the possible impact of security scanners on the health of passengers and members of staff who undergo regular checks*, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Or. fr

Amendment 75

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Georgios Papanikolaou, Simon Busuttil

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism; ***considers that such a proposal should also foresee a long term monitoring and evaluation on body scanners, taking into account the development of new technologies;***

Or. en

Amendment 76

Ioan Enciu

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified ***in an*** impact ***assessment*** covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified ***by means of prior in-depth studies and*** impact ***assessments*** covering *inter alia* the fundamental rights

and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights and data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Or. ro

Amendment 77
Salvatore Iacolino

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights *and* data protection authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA *and* the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism;

Amendment

9. Stresses that any proposal to allow the deployment and use of body scanners as a permissible screening method should be extensively justified in an impact assessment covering inter alia the fundamental rights aspect of body scanners and the possible health risks, taking into account the opinions of the European Union, international and national human rights, data protection *and public health* authorities, such as the EDPS, the FRA, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Protection of Human Rights while Countering Terrorism *and the World Health Organisation*;

Or. it

Amendment 78
Sophia in 't Veld

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Stresses that the technical specifications of the European Civil Aviation Conference Technical Task Force, and the vendor contracts for body scanners should be declassified and made publicly available;

Or. en

Justification

In the U.S., the documents obtained from DHS concerning body scanners via a FOIA request revealed that the technical specifications demanded by TSA included the ability to store, record, and transfer images.

Amendment 79

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Mariya Nedelcheva

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Considers that the decision to use body scanners in airports should not be mandatory for Member States; stresses that if a Member State chooses to deploy body scanners in its airports, those body scanners should meet the minimum standards and requirements set at EU level;

Or. en

Amendment 80

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Monica Luisa Macovei, Simon Busuttil, Mariya Nedelcheva

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9b. Calls on the Commission and Member States to raise the issue of the use of body scanners in the appropriate international bodies, as fight against terrorism is a global challenge and aviation security has to be pursued beyond European borders;

Or. en

**Amendment 81
Sylvie Guillaume**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Recommends that every passenger's ticket show the cost of security measures;

Or. fr

**Amendment 82
Luis de Grandes Pascual**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Recognises the right of passengers to complain about any irregularity arising from security checks carried out both using security scanners and using other alternative means, where passengers do not wish to submit to a security scan;

Or. es

Amendment 83
Mariya Nedelcheva, Monica Luisa Macovei, Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9b. Underlines that those Member States which decide to use body scanners should be able, under the principle of subsidiarity, to apply more rigid standards than those defined in the European legislation on the protection of citizens and their personal data;

Or. fr

Amendment 84
Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Expects that the Commission will base its proposal on extensive independent and objective scientific information gathered among EU experts in the field and without interferences from the industry sector, Member States governments and third countries;

Or. en

Amendment 85
Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Luis de Grandes Pascual
Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

Amendment

10. Requests that the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights be asked

deleted

to provide an extensive opinion on the fundamental rights aspect of any proposal concerning the deployment and use of body scanners.

Or. es

Amendment 86
Birgit Sippel, Anna Hedh

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Asks the Commission to explore alternatives to the use of body scanners, taking into account other measures already in use for detecting aviation security threats, demonstrating the need to replace current airport security monitoring measures by these scanners;

Or. en

Amendment 87
Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Reiterates and upholds its standpoint that the ban on carrying liquids should come to an end in 2011 and 2013 if the technological effectiveness of the tools provided for the purpose of preserving security is confirmed; invites Member States and airports to take all necessary action to ensure that adequate technology is available in good time so that the scheduled end of the ban on carrying liquids does not have the effect of undermining security;

Amendment 88
Luis de Grandes Pascual

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10b. Takes the view that checks on cargo and mail, based on a risk analysis, should be proportional to the threats posed by transporting them and that adequate security should be provided, particularly where cargo and mail are carried in passenger planes; takes the view that the level of security for cargo still varies from one Member State to another and, in line with the objective of one-stop security, the Member States should ensure that the existing measures relating to European cargo and mail are correctly applied;

Or. es

Amendment 89
Renate Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Gianni Vattimo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Calls the Commission, the Council and Committee responsible to substitute the words 'security scanner(s)' with the words 'body scanner(s)' where the scanners are used to screen persons, including in the title of the report, hereby avoiding inappropriate and unnecessary confusions and ambiguities;

Or. en

