

Position paper of the Federal Government on the Post-Stockholm Programme - Home Affairs -

1. General issues / horizontal aspects

The Stockholm Programme sets out the strategic guidelines for legislative and operational planning for the period 2010 to 2014 in the area of freedom, security and justice and is characterized by numerous legislative acts. These have largely been implemented, also those concerning asylum and Schengen. By contrast, additional legislation in the area of migration management and border security (smart borders) as well as IT security has just begun to be taken up.

The Federal Government agrees with the other Member States of the European Union that a post-Stockholm programme (PSP) is necessary. The legal basis is provided by Article 68 TFEU which states that the "European Council shall define the strategic guidelines for legislative and operational planning within the area of freedom, security and justice". A PSP is very important owing to the institutional balance between the Commission and the EU Council, because the guidelines adopted under Article 68 TFEU are the specific expression of the European Council's determination to shape the direction of EU policy in the area of justice and home affairs.

Common application of existing EU law

With regard to the PSP, Germany and others agree – based on the Informal JHA Council meeting held on 18–19 July 2013 and the JHA Council on 5–6 December 2013 – that there should be no extensive catalogue of new legislative initiatives. New legislative initiatives should therefore be the exception and should essentially be limited to closing gaps that have been identified and consolidating existing procedures: less legislation, more consolidation. The aim must be the common implementation of EU law in the Member States. Existing EU law should be consistently enforced.

Greater involvement of EU agencies in implementing EU law

In the framework of their authority under the various founding regulations and on the basis of applicable EU treaties, existing EU agencies should play a greater role in implementing EU law and reviewing its implementation, as is already provided for to some extent in the case of EASO.

The aim is to make the best possible use of the agencies' potential for the interests and needs of the Member States with regard to implementing EU law. In this way, the agencies can take advantage of their role as a link between the Member States to yield greater understanding for problems and better information on specific implementation processes within the Member States.

Emergency mechanisms

If a Member State is unable to fulfil its obligations in the field of justice and home affairs, this may lead under certain circumstances to cross-border or EU-wide problems.

If these problems worsen to the point that security or functional systems such as critical infrastructures are seriously threatened, then appropriate instruments and mechanisms should be available in case of such emergencies while maintaining the institutional balance, in order to ensure continuing security and functionality within the EU for the limited time until these problems have been remedied.

Such mechanisms are not entirely unknown in some areas. Good examples are the mechanisms for early warning, preparedness and crisis management in the Common European Asylum System, the mechanism to temporarily suspend visa-free travel and the mechanisms for Schengen governance. Schengen reform has shown that the EU Member States and the European Commission can work together to take decisive action against problematic developments.

To increase the EU's flexibility in case of emergency or crisis, area-specific emergency mechanisms which create more options for rapid action with the involvement of the European Commission should be subject to a needs-based review. Where Union law is not always applied in the area of justice and home affairs to the extent advisable for various reasons (such as crisis situations), these emergency mechanisms for temporary relief and mitigation would supplement institutional procedures in the case of treaty infringements.

Discussion of strategic JHA issues in CATS and SCIFA

In the past, the European Commission has sometimes substituted informal coordination processes in ad-hoc structures (e.g. expert groups, workshops) for coordination with the Member States. We are critical of this development. The high-level committees in

particular play an important role for cooperation in the JHA area. CATS and SCIFA must be effectively involved, as their mandate allows, in the discussion of strategic and legislative JHA issues in order to deal with unresolved issues and simplify the activities in the field of law enforcement and judicial cooperation as well as immigration, asylum and borders, thereby reducing the number of questions requiring review by COREPER and the Council. It is necessary to ensure early involvement of CATS and SCIFA in politically significant legislative proposals and initiatives so that these committees can fulfil their task of serving as a forum for an initial exchange of views, thus setting the course for the work at expert level in the competent groups.

Priorities

To ensure that the guidelines direct the actions of the EU and that the European Commission can be measured against them, the Council must also agree on the following concrete priorities:

- strengthening and protecting the right of free movement within the EU and fighting abuse;
- mobility, migration and asylum;
- securing the Schengen external borders;
- expanding police cooperation;
- developing common EU data protection; and
- expanding European IT and cyber security.

2. Strengthening and protecting the right of free movement within the EU and combating abuse

Freedom of movement in Europe is one of the most important achievements of the European integration process and one of the most visible benefits of the European Union for its citizens. As one of the freedoms in the single market, it is a driver of economic growth in Europe. Practical obstacles to exercising this right must be removed.

In order to maintain acceptance of the common European right of free movement, we must effectively combat its abuse.

To stress the importance of the freedom of movement and advance the implementation and awareness of the rights associated with Union citizenship, Union citizens must be empowered to participate actively and equally in the European integration process. To

this end, measures should be taken and supported by the Member States to remove barriers for workers in the EU, to dismantle bureaucratic hurdles, improve procedural rights and strengthen and advance the European public space.

The common European right of free movement is a historic achievement and should not be taken for granted. It must be preserved. To do so, it is also important to combat abuse effectively. We must step up our efforts to investigate and prevent fictitious marriages and other forms of fraud and abuse in connection with the right of free movement. The Member States should increase their cooperation in this area and continue their dialogue with the Commission. The aim is to achieve a shared understanding as to which measures and sanctions are necessary and permitted under applicable EU law on the freedom of movement and in accordance with ECJ decisions in order to counter and punish fraud and violations of the law. This does not entail amending EU rules on freedom of movement.

3. Mobility, migration and asylum

Future asylum and migration policy should include a comprehensive and consistent strategy (global approach governments/EU) covering all relevant policy areas including the external policy dimension.

With regard to future European asylum and refugee policy, the focus is on reforming the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) as consistently and as soon as possible.

The additional rules agreed in 2013 will result in key practical improvements, especially for the protection of refugees.

In the long term, countries of origin and transit will have a key role in solving these problems. They must respect human rights, protect refugees, improve living conditions and create a stable political and economic environment. The fight against human smuggling and human trafficking must be stepped up within the territory of the Member States as well as in the countries of origin and transit. The EU and Member States must increase their cooperation with these countries.

Future asylum and migration policy should concentrate on the complete implementation, consolidation and evaluation of existing law and policy. New legislative proposals should be presented only after thorough evaluation (including systematic impact assessment and cost-benefit analysis) of existing and proposed EU legislation. The Member States must be able to use EU funds effectively to implement such measures when carrying out their national policy priorities.

Crucial to achieving this goal is a new level of practical cooperation which enables the EU to continue to respond with the necessary flexibility to rapidly changing realities.

Responsibility and solidarity coupled with protection and prevention are the key elements in achieving our shared goals. To ensure solidarity in practice, Member States must meet their responsibilities for implementing the *acquis* in the fields of asylum, borders, visas and migration. This is the only way a migration and asylum system including effective border checks can be built and applied on the basis of mutual trust.

The external dimension in migration policy

Cooperation with countries of origin and transit must be intensified to promote legal mobility, protect refugees and prevent illegal immigration, among other things through measures to fight organized human smuggling and human trafficking, and by strengthening development policy to remove the causes of flight and expulsion as recently seen in the Mediterranean region.

The evaluation and further development of the external dimension in migration policy should build on the tested principles and methods of the EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility and the instruments for implementation developed within that framework. The further development of this Global Approach (GAMM) must be equally based on the following four operational priorities while the Member States retain responsibility for their national labour markets:

- organizing legal migration more efficiently and promoting managed mobility;
- preventing and combating illegal migration and stamping out human trafficking;
- maximizing the impacts of migration and mobility on development;
- promoting international protection and the external dimension of asylum policy.

This is also in line with the Council Conclusions on the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility of 3 May 2012 (no. 8 in the annex to Council Document 9417/12).

In the further development of the GAMM, the various security policy and migration policy needs of the Member States must receive special consideration while maintaining high standards of fundamental and human rights. This could ensure consistency between these interests and needs and those of the Global Approach and its individual operational priorities. The resulting policy would be an integrated whole.

European asylum policy

With regard to future **European asylum and refugee policy**, the focus is on reforming the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) as consistently and as soon as possible. The additional rules agreed in 2013 will result in key practical improvements, especially for the protection of refugees.

The EU has substantially improved the legal basis for a shared area of refugee protection and solidarity by amending the Dublin Regulation, the Eurodac Regulation, the Asylum Procedures Directive and the Directive on reception conditions. The CEAS provides for high standards and is intended to ensure fair, rapid and effective procedures which will also prevent asylum fraud. Those seeking protection are to receive equivalent treatment with regard to procedural guarantees, reception conditions and a common protection status no matter which Member State they are in.

Based on the CEAS, all Member States must strive to implement the legislative acts to a common standard. This applies especially to practical improvements in refugee protection which could help prevent tragedies like those off Lampedusa. Improvements in the protection of the EU's external borders should be achieved by the practical introduction of instruments which have already been created.

The Member States are obligated to ensure the effective implementation and consistent application of the EU asylum acquis, especially the CEAS. In return, the European Commission should be called on to perform its role as "guardian of the Treaties" to a greater extent, particularly with regard to capacity-building measures on refugee protection with the use of EU funds. The Common European Asylum System should continue to aim at treating similar asylum cases in similar ways and with the same result, including comparable EU-wide reception standards. In this context, practical cooperation and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) should be enhanced in order to help implement existing laws more consistently and cost-effectively, to promote policy and practical convergence in the Member States and to improve cooperation and information-sharing among the national asylum authorities. The mechanism for early warning, preparedness and crisis management in the CEAS should be used as a tool for strategic discussions and planning in the EU in order to better prepare for challenges and unforeseeable events (including emergency planning). The Member States' practical experience with the current acquis should serve as the basis for assessing the need for additional legislative proposals; where possible, improvements should be sought on the basis of existing instruments.

Cooperation with third countries on refugee issues and regional development and protection programmes (RDPP) should be further strengthened in order to advance the expansion of regional protection and reintegration capacities in solidarity with countries of transit and origin.

Promoting return

The return of persons residing in a Member State without a right to remain should be a priority. Such persons must return voluntarily or be deported in order to protect the integrity of asylum and migration management within the EU.

For this reason, effective and sustainable return policy which provides efficient ways to ensure the orderly and timely return of persons required to leave the country is an important instrument in the fight against illegal migration. We should always give priority to voluntary return as a more humane alternative to forced return; support for voluntary return helps returnees become socially and economically reintegrated in their country of origin. . In addition, we must implement an effective return policy, because it is very important to the success of voluntary return measures.

To increase the number of voluntary returnees, the EU needs a strategic approach to prioritizing countries (including country-specific strategies) which relies on increased political dialogue with key third countries in order to secure and enforce the necessary return agreements and to ensure that people can be issued new documents without delay. EU readmission agreements are an important instrument in the fight against illegal migration. Any future agreements must concentrate on priority countries; existing agreements must be fully implemented. Where negotiations have come to a standstill, new efforts must be undertaken to arrive at a result. The Council must be in a position to revoke mandates.

With attention to the special situation in individual Member States, the Asylum and Migration Fund should encourage and support Member States to initiate, continue or expand reintegration programmes.

EU visa policy

A strict and consistently designed and applied EU visa policy is an essential building block in a European area of freedom, security and justice. Openness and growth must be balanced appropriately with security and the ability to manage illegal immigration. In addition to security aspects, EU visa policy also enhances the EU's overall attractiveness. In order to improve mobility, the EU's visa policy and protection of its

external borders must be credible and its migration and asylum systems robust enough to stand up to future challenges.

EU visa policy should continue to be a key instrument for managing migration. Visa facilitation agreements and greater use of the possibilities allowed by the Visa Code may be considered where visa-free travel is not (yet) a realistic option. Negotiations on visa agreements and readmission agreements should be conducted in tandem. The EU must make sure that rights and obligations with regard to all future agreements on visa liberalization and facilitation go hand in hand, especially with regard to cooperation on readmission. It is necessary to determine whether the Council can withdraw a negotiating mandate and whether visa liberalization may be introduced temporarily.

Better local cooperation must be a priority to ensure that all Member States examine visa applications consistently and reliably. More extensive use of external service providers, the use of representation agreements and the establishment of joint visa centres all require further study.

4. Securing the Schengen external borders

Expanding the integrated border management system

Protecting the EU's external borders is one of the most important tasks to preserve the area of freedom, security and justice. Securing the external borders is essential for removing the internal borders. External border protection has two aims: making it easier for EU citizens to legally cross borders and taking measures to prevent illegal immigration and cross-border crime. A high level of security should be maintained. The European Commission should develop a policy for gradually introducing integrated border management. Numerous measures for better protecting the EU's external borders have already been taken. However, work on issues such as implementing the Frontex Regulation, using the Eurosur border surveillance system and expanding automated border controls and consultations on the Smart Borders package should be continued. To this end, we need an IT architecture which fulfils the strict requirements of data protection, in particular data minimization, and interoperability.

Frontex

We should continue implementing the Frontex Regulation. The Regulation of December 2011 provides for numerous new instruments the implementation of which is very time-consuming and therefore has not been fully completed, in particular Article 14. The operational cooperation of Frontex with third countries and their responsible authorities

covered by Article 14 is a priority also of the Task Force Mediterranean whose work results were adopted by the JHA and the European Council (e.g. seconding liaison officers to third countries, projects in third countries). However, the civilian nature of border management must be preserved. Additional surveillance measures of individual Member States should be closely coordinated with Frontex operations. The existing cooperation between Frontex and Europol should be institutionalized in an operational cooperation agreement.

Before we consider creating new Frontex instruments consolidation is needed so that the described measures can bring their influence to bear and their efficiency and effectiveness can be assessed.

In addition to the Frontex Regulation we are currently negotiating a European legislative act which transposes the guidelines for Frontex operations at sea (previously annex to the Schengen Borders Code) into a separate Regulation. Consolidation is needed also after the legislative act has entered into force to assess, after a sufficient period of application, whether further improvement is needed or whether the Regulation is appropriate for the relevant processes.

In line with its mandate, Frontex should assume greater responsibility by increasing its operational capacities and conducting more joint operations, in particular with third countries (countries of origin and transit). To advance this ambitious agenda, it should become easier for Frontex member states to conduct joint operations, the focus being on a stronger coordinating role of Frontex. The agency's operational activities will continue to be limited to the EU's external borders in line with the mandate.

The border surveillance system Eurosur

The border surveillance system Eurosur went into operation in December 2013. Given the fact that some EU Member States are not yet connected and that the system components are operating at an initial basic stage, we should initially focus on including further EU Member States and technically enhancing the system. Only then will we be able to reliably assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the border surveillance system and make any necessary improvements.

Automated border control

Automated border controls should be introduced across the European Union. About two-thirds of all people crossing the EU's external borders are EU citizens. Given the growing number of passengers and limited border management resources, introducing automated border controls for nationals of the EU, the EEA and Switzerland as well as for registered third-country nationals is an important instrument to support border police officers. This helps officers focus on checking third-country nationals, which requires more staff and time. Expanding automated border controls can significantly accelerate processing at the border. In addition, introducing automated border controls not only makes in technical and organizational terms, it is also necessary for economic reasons so that the EU can keep pace with the development of international travel.

Germany has made significant progress in this area: By introducing the EasyPASS system at the five busiest airports in terms of passengers, including Frankfurt, Düsseldorf, Hamburg, Munich and later Berlin, about 100 eGates will be installed in 2014 and 2015 to cope with growing passenger traffic.

Smart Borders package

The European Commission presented initial proposals for a Smart Borders package on 28 February 2013. The proposals comprise a Regulation on an Entry/Exit System (EES) to record the time and place of entry and exit of third-country nationals at the EU's external borders, a Registered Traveller Programme (RTP) and follow-up amendments to the Schengen Borders Code.

Intensive follow-up on the Smart Borders package is needed in the coming years. The cost-benefit ratio of Smart Borders must be proportionate. Some financial issues need to be resolved. To this end, the planned systems EES and RTP need to take practical requirements adequately into account. Fundamental rights and security aspects must be given appropriate consideration.

The task of EU border and visa policy is to facilitate as far as possible travel movements of bona fide third-country nationals while continuing to ensure a high level of security. Innovative technologies have created new ways to fulfil the various requirements in a more coordinated manner.

To reconcile visa liberalization and security interests we must examine which instruments are best suited for this task.

The Federal Government welcomes the study announced by the Commission, which is intended to assess the Smart Borders package in terms of benefits, efficiency, interoperability, technical feasibility and costs.

Examining the development of a common, efficient and data protection friendly European IT architecture for border management

The need for a central IT architecture so that border police officers can better handle the different IT applications (VIS, SIS II) should be examined. This may include additional EU IT systems.

There is a growing need for such architecture, in particular with a view to the planned introduction of additional IT systems for biometric identification (e.g. Smart Borders package of the European Commission). Without improving the structures, we cannot ensure the performance and efficiency of border management.

A new architecture must also fulfil strict requirements of data protection, in particular data minimization, and interoperability. Therefore, the German EasyPass system was technically designed to immediately implement the planned EU projects and to support a central identification system.

5. Expanding police cooperation

The exchange of information is of paramount importance for cooperation between security authorities. Several legislative acts have been adopted in recent years that have strengthened the legal framework for the exchange of information and introduced relevant technical regulations on the exchange of specific data (such as fingerprint data, DNA data and motor vehicle registration data) on the basis of central and decentralized systems. The measures resolved have not yet been fully carried out in many areas. This is owing to the technical complexity, the administrative challenges and the scarcity of financial resources. In addition, many police authorities are not yet leveraging the possibilities of cooperation and exchange of information presented by applicable law to the desired extent. Further work is needed in this area.

Implementing the Prüm Decisions/Swedish Initiative

According to the Prüm Decisions Member States should give one another automated access to DNA profiles, fingerprint data and certain data from national vehicle registers.

All Member States had planned to implement the decisions by 26 August 2011. However, only half have implemented them so far.

That is why the European Commission is requested to formulate strategic recommendations to eliminate structural deficits that have already been identified in relation to the application of the Prüm Decisions. Specific solutions for the known deficits should be found.

The European Commission is also requested to conduct a feasibility study on how the automated exchange of fingerprint data could be supported in the framework of the Prüm Decisions; in this context, it should also examine whether to create a central fingerprint database.

Technically consolidating the exchange of biometric data in a standardized European IT architecture

A number of systems are used (Prüm, Eurodac, VIS, SIS II, Europol, and EES in future) to exchange biometric data (fingerprint data in particular). Data are being stored in a number of different systems, which seems unreasonable in economic, technical and data protection terms.

For this reason, the competent Council working group for the exchange of information between police authorities, DAPIX (Information Exchange and Data Protection), and the European Commission should jointly analyse the individual systems for exchanging biometric data and should develop a concept to consolidate the existing systems with a view to creating a common European IT architecture. In doing so, special importance should be attached to meeting data protection requirements.

Further developing eu-LISA into a central IT service provider for European security authorities

The exchange of police information plays a key role for cooperation between European security authorities. When the Schengen Information System II (SIS II) was launched on 9 April 2013, the EU Agency for management of large-scale IT systems took over responsibility for the operational management of SIS in the area of freedom, security and justice (eu-LISA). There are other decentralized systems in place in addition to SIS II for the exchange of information at EU level. Central support for these systems would greatly facilitate technical and organizational processes such as request management, standardized and binding test systems as well as evaluation measures.

The European Commission is requested to present a study on how eu-LISA could be further developed. The study should also address how eu-LISA can support the management of decentralized procedures (e.g. Prüm Decisions) as well as the development of forward-looking services by eu-LISA (e.g. providing comprehensive services in the field of infrastructure – “infrastructure as a service”).

When the study is completed, the European Commission is requested to present a strategic concept for the future role of eu-LISA in the exchange of information between European police authorities based on the results of consultations on the study.

European Police Records Index System (EPRIS)

In December 2012, the Commission presented a feasibility study on possible measures to make the exchange of police records between Member States more effective by developing a European system for the exchange of police records, EPRIS. The feasibility study conducted by the European Commission on EPRIS found that a police records index system was needed to provide initial information on whether there are police records available when certain personal data are accessed and, if so, in which Member States. The study also arrives at the conclusion that the various systems and methods currently used by police authorities to exchange information in the EU are insufficient.

Therefore, the European Commission is requested to explain in a study how these insufficiencies of existing systems for the exchange of police information can be corrected and in particular whether and under which conditions EPRIS is an appropriate means to this end.

Using financial instruments to promote operational cooperation

EU-Policy Cycle – Promotion of EMPACT measures

Continuing to strengthen police cooperation is vital for the effective and sustainable fight against international serious and organized crime. With the EU Policy Cycle, an instrument has been created at EU level to manage and prioritize operational police activities of the Member States in this area. It is vital for the success of this instrument that the European Commission provides financial support for the EMPACT measures provided for in the EU Policy Cycle (European Multidisciplinary Platforms against Criminal Threats) in accordance with the priorities defined in the EU Policy Cycle such as the fight against cyber crime, synthetic drugs and trafficking in human beings.

The European Commission is therefore requested to provide sufficient funds to promote the implementation of EMPACT measures from the centrally managed EU funds of the multi-annual financial framework (2014-2020).

Fight against cyber crime

The fact that criminals increasingly use the Internet is particularly important here. The soaring numbers of cases involving cyber crime are presenting the authorities with additional challenges. As criminals also operate across borders, it is vital to have a swift and effective exchange of data between law enforcement authorities in the Member States and to ensure access to the necessary technical expertise. The Europol Cybercrime Center (EC3) which has been operational since early 2013 is an important element of European cooperation to prevent and prosecute cyber crime. We must ensure that Europol receives additional funds necessary for running the EC3.

The European Commission is therefore requested to furnish EC3 with the necessary funding.

Examining the need for additional compensatory measures in the Schengen area

The Schengen area should be enhanced, as it has been expanded to include a total of 30 countries and as there is an increasing need for law enforcement cooperation, such as sharing police information. Close, efficient and smooth cooperation among Member States is necessary, especially in an area without internal border controls. We should therefore explore whether other ways are needed to compensate for the abolition of checks within the Schengen area.

6. EU data protection

General Data Protection Regulation

A state-of-the-art General Data Protection Regulation should protect citizens' privacy and help ensure fair competition in the digital internal market. We need to work vigorously to overhaul the EU data protection legislation, thus creating rules based on reasonable strategies and capable of addressing the challenges the digital society faces. Europe needs a common data protection law for businesses so that everyone offering services in Europe is subject to European data protection law.

The aim is to harmonize and modernize EU data protection law in order to create a level playing field and ensure that all citizens benefit from a common and high level of data protection on the digital internal market.

We need to find appropriate responses to today's challenges such as cloud computing, responsibilities on the Internet and the protection of individual privacy and consumer data.

One of the priority aims in completing the EU's Digital Agenda is to create common and modern data protection legislation to cover all businesses providing services in Europe (marketplace principle). With regard to the protection of employment-related data, the Federal Government seeks to uphold the national data protection level also in cross-border data processing and to allow for standards exceeding those provided for in the Data Protection Regulation.

Data Protection Directive

Germany welcomes the aim of the Directive, which is to enhance the protection and sharing of data in the area of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

However, there still are major concerns about the proposal. The high data protection level it seeks to achieve must be reconcilable with the interests of effective threat prevention and law enforcement. We must ensure that new provisions on domestic data processing do not unlawfully curtail the law on police and criminal procedures, which is the sole competence of the Member States.

7. Expanding European IT and cyber security

Our society has become more and more reliant on IT and the Internet in recent years. Robust and secure information structures and networks are central to the provision of vital services. By combining an intelligent legal framework for IT security, close cooperation with the IT industry and operators of critical infrastructure and ongoing international coordination we must find responses to these important home affairs policy challenges.

There are global interdependencies between infrastructures and networks, and Internet threats know no borders, either. We therefore need to combine our efforts to enhance international IT security mechanisms and standards. Some Member States, including Germany, treat cyber security as one of their priority issues, for instance as part of national cyber security strategies. Last but not least the European Commission, together

with the European External Action Service, submitted a Cyber Security Strategy in February 2013.

These papers need to be implemented systematically so as to actually improve the situation in a sustained manner. The great number of players and activities require coordinated action, ideally at a high level, as decisions may have far-reaching effects. In Germany, what is referred to as the Cyber Security Council has proved its worth in this context. Initial measures at EU level, for instance the Friends of the Presidency on Cyber (Cyber FoP), have not yet developed their full potential in terms of strategic cyber security coordination.

For this reason, the main IT and cyber security issues should also be addressed in the Justice and Home Affairs area, as they also affect data protection, security and critical infrastructures at EU level. The existing structures and responsibilities in the Council should be upheld.

A major aspect of cyber security is the protection of critical infrastructures. Our societies rely heavily on the provision of vital services, such as electricity, water supply and medical care. Our analysis shows that by now all areas of critical infrastructures depend on IT. However, we have so far failed to ensure sufficient protection standards for these IT services across the board. To guarantee an appropriate level of service provision throughout Europe, it is vital to have coordinated IT security standards in place for the operation of critical infrastructures.