



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 13.10.2010
COM(2010) 554 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND
THE COUNCIL**

**on the application of Title III (Internal Borders) of Regulation (EC) No 562/2006
establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across
borders (Schengen Borders Code)**

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL

on the application of Title III (Internal Borders) of Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code)

1. INTRODUCTION

Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code, hereinafter ‘the SBC’ or ‘the Code’)¹ entered into force on 13 October 2006. The SBC consolidated and further developed the Schengen *acquis*, in particular the relevant provisions of the Schengen Convention² and the Common Manual.³ Title III of the Code confirmed the absence of controls on persons crossing the internal borders between the Schengen Member States. The establishment of an area without internal borders, in which the free movement of persons is ensured, represents one of the most tangible achievements of the Union.

The Code includes criteria to determine whether the exercise of police powers in internal border zones has an effect equivalent to border checks. Under the Code, the abolition of internal border controls also obliges Member States to remove obstacles to traffic at road crossing-points at internal borders. In exceptional circumstances involving a serious threat to the public policy or internal security of a Member State, border control at internal borders may be reintroduced for a limited period of time, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Code.

According to Article 38 of the SBC, *the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council by 13 October 2009 a report on the application of Title III.*

The Commission addressed a questionnaire to Member States in order to obtain information on the application of Title III. This report has been prepared on the basis of the answers provided by twenty-three Member States. Two Member States (HU and MT) did not provide the requested information. This report also reflects information submitted to the Commission by citizens and Members of the European Parliament, pointing out alleged border checks at internal borders.

2. ABOLITION OF BORDER CONTROLS AT INTERNAL BORDERS (ARTICLE 20)

The Code confirms that internal borders may be crossed at any point without border checks on persons, irrespective of their nationality, being carried out. The abolition of border control at

¹ OJ L 105 of 13.4.2006, p. 1.

² Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, OJ L 239 of 22.9.2000, p. 19.

³ OJ C 313 of 16.12.2002, p. 97. The Common Manual has been repealed by the adoption of the Code.

internal borders also entails the abolition of border surveillance. It should be noted that the obligation of carriers to return passengers transported by land, air or sea is not applicable to internal traffic connections within the Schengen area.⁴

3. PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS GOVERNING CHECKS WITHIN MEMBER STATE TERRITORIES AND DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED (ARTICLE 21)

3.1. EXERCISE OF POLICE POWERS (ARTICLE 21(A))

3.1.1. LEGAL BASIS

In principle, the crossing of an internal border between two Member States should be treated the same way as travelling between districts or regions within a Member State. However, in view of the Member States' responsibility for maintaining law and order and safeguarding internal security, they may carry out checks in accordance with a risk assessment throughout their whole territory including internal border zones. The frequency of such checks may differ depending on the specific area.

Checks on persons in the exercise of police powers by the competent authorities of the Member States under national law are allowed throughout their territory, including border areas, insofar as the exercise of those powers does not have an effect equivalent to border checks. The Code contains a non-exhaustive list of criteria to assess whether the exercise of police powers is equivalent to border checks or not. Accordingly, police measures are not considered to be equivalent to border checks if they:

do not have border control as an objective,

are based on general police information and experience regarding possible threats to public security and aim, in particular, to combat cross-border crime,

are devised and executed in a manner clearly distinct from systematic checks on persons at the external borders,

are carried out on the basis of spot-checks.

3.1.2. APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA

In order to show that internal borders and border areas are not zones where checks cannot be carried out, several criteria have thus been established which allow assessing the (non-) equivalence to border checks. Border zones may present a particular risk for cross-border crime, so the frequency and intensity of police checks may be higher than in other parts of the territory. However, these checks must be targeted and based on concrete and factual police information and experience as regards threats to public security and must not be systematic. The police information must be based on facts and constantly reassessed. Consequently, checks must be carried out on a random basis according to the assessment of the risk.

⁴ Article 26 of the Schengen Convention and the Council Directive 2001/51/EC of 28 June 2001 supplementing the provisions of Article 26 of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985, OJ L 187 of 10.7.2001, p. 45.

Most Member States state that they carry out non-systematic, random police checks on the basis of risk assessments of the security situation (in particular, the risk of irregular immigration or breaches of criminal, security or traffic law), information exchanged at national, regional or local level, and profiling. These checks are often the result of international cooperation between neighbouring countries (regular meetings and exchange of police information through national contact points) and may take the form of joint patrols set up under agreements on police cooperation.

While it is easy to determine that a check is carried out to enforce traffic law and not as a border check, e.g. when car drivers coming from a discotheque located in the vicinity of the internal border are required to undergo breath tests, which might include the necessity to determine a person's identity, it is more difficult to assess the nature of checks that aim to enforce immigration law.

Another important element is the objective of a check, which may concern goods rather than persons as such. The objective of the check is decisive in order to assess possible breaches of the Schengen Borders Code or the EU provisions on the free movement of goods. Conversely, it is not relevant which national body carries out a check, since Member States may assign different responsibilities to different authorities, e.g. a customs officer may be entitled to verify the legality of a stay and a police officer may be entitled to verify goods.

3.1.3. FREQUENCY OF CHECKS — NON-SYSTEMATIC CHECKS

An important element in determining whether or not the exercise of police checks constitutes border checks is therefore the frequency of checks carried out in internal border zones, compared to other parts of the territory confronted with a similar situation. However, most Member States do not have data available on the frequency of checks in border areas. Some consider that it is not possible to compare the frequency of checks in border zones and in the rest of their territory, as practice and priorities in the border areas differ. Several Member States state that the frequency of police checks in the vicinity of internal borders is the same as in their whole territory.

A strict definition of the appropriate frequency and regularity with which checks may be carried out is not possible since this should reflect the security situation in the territory of the Member State concerned. Although a high frequency of checks may give an indication, it remains difficult to assess in individual cases whether this has an effect equivalent to systematic border checks.

3.1.4. VERIFICATION OF THE CORRECT APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA

On 22 June 2010, in a benchmark judgment⁵ the European Court of Justice clarified that national legislation conferring on the police authorities of a Member State the competence to check the identity of persons present exclusively in a 20-km internal border zone, independently of their behaviour and any particular circumstances presenting a risk to public order, for the purpose of verifying compliance with the obligation to hold or carry papers and documents required by law, without providing for the necessary framework to guarantee that the practical implementation of this competence does not have an effect equivalent to border

⁵ Joint Cases C-188/10 and C-189/10, *Melki and Others*.

checks, is in breach of Article 67(2) TFEU as well as Articles 20 and 21 of the Schengen Border Code.

In the light of this judgment, the Commission requests Member States to adapt accordingly any national legislation conferring specific competences on national police authorities within internal border zones.

The Commission is of the opinion that in order to assess whether or not police checks have an effect equivalent to border checks, it needs more information from Member States on the reasons and frequency of checks carried out in internal border zones. This information is necessary in order to monitor the situation in internal border zones and to address citizens' complaints and questions addressed by Members of the European Parliament to the Commission that travellers are regularly or even systematically checked in certain internal border zones. In this respect, it should be noted that some Member States have difficulties in assessing the purpose of checks systematically carried out by their neighbours on their own citizens when crossing the common internal border.

Therefore, the Commission will continue to carefully assess complaints and to address Member States in order to obtain explanations. If the explanations are not satisfactory, the Commission will use all available means, including the launching of infringement procedures, in order to ensure the correct application of Union law.

Accordingly, the Commission will request Member States to provide statistics on police checks carried out within their territories and in the border zones in particular.

In order to verify in practice the frequency of checks and the general information triggering a specific check, the Commission envisaged carrying out unannounced on-site visits in its proposal for a Council Regulation on the establishment of an evaluation mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen *acquis*.⁶ The Commission will maintain the concept of unannounced visits in the updated proposal following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty.⁷

Finally, in case the need arises to carry out regular and systematic checks as a response to the security situation in their territories, Member States shall envisage the temporary reintroduction of border control at the internal borders in accordance with Article 23 *et seq.* of the Code.

3.2. SECURITY CHECKS ON PERSONS (ARTICLE 21(B))

The abolition of border control at internal borders is without prejudice to *security checks on persons carried out at ports and airports by the competent authorities under the law of each Member State, by port or airport officials or carriers, provided that such checks are also carried out on persons travelling within a Member State*. The personnel of airports, ports or carriers verify the identity of passengers in the course of security checks either at check-in or upon entry into the secured zone of the airport or before boarding the aeroplane, or in a combination of any of these checks. While the Commission does not contest that these checks can be carried out in combination, it nevertheless recommends not doing so since such checks are often perceived by citizens as obstacles to their right to free movement.

⁶ COM(2009) 102 final.

⁷ The Commission will present the revised proposal in October 2010.

These checks should only verify the identity of the traveller against a travel document. EU citizens can identify themselves on the basis of their passport or identity card. Carriers are not obliged to, but may, accept other documents like driving licences, bank cards etc., as these are not identity documents. Third-country nationals can identify themselves on the basis of a passport. The checks should not verify whether the third-country national is in possession of a visa or residence permit, as they are mere identity checks for commercial or transport security reasons. Member States cannot request any additional check to be carried out and carriers are not subject to any liability when transporting persons who might not meet the conditions of entry or stay in other Schengen Member States. Also, carriers cannot themselves oblige third-country nationals to prove the legality of their stay by showing a visa or residence permit. Including such an obligation in the contract with the traveller would circumvent the abolition of border control at internal borders.

3.3. OBLIGATION TO HOLD OR CARRY PAPERS AND DOCUMENTS (ARTICLE 21C)

The abolition of border control at internal borders does not affect *the possibility for a Member State to provide by law for an obligation to hold or carry papers and documents*. If Member States impose such an obligation, it must be applied throughout their territory or in the external border zones. It cannot be limited to the internal border zones only, as that would necessarily lead to checks carried out only in these internal border zones, which would have an effect equivalent to border checks.

3.4. OBLIGATION TO REPORT PRESENCE (ARTICLE 21(D))

Finally, the abolition of border control at internal borders does not preclude *the obligation on third-country nationals to report their presence on the territory of any Member State pursuant to the provisions of Article 22 of the Schengen Convention*. Some Member States do not implement this provision (SE, EE, DE, FI, LT, DK, NO), others acknowledge the practical difficulties in verifying compliance, while others consider it useful to help obtain data on the number of third-country nationals present on their territory. The Commission is of the opinion that the implementation of this provision is difficult in practice and questions whether from a cost/benefit perspective this reporting obligation has any impact on identifying illegal immigrants. The Commission will thus propose an amendment to the Schengen Convention in order to rule out an obligation on third-country nationals to report their presence upon entering the territory of Member States.

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION TO REMOVE OBSTACLES TO TRAFFIC AT ROAD CROSSING-POINTS AT INTERNAL BORDERS (ARTICLE 22)

Under Article 22 of the SBC, *Member States shall remove all obstacles to fluid traffic flow at road crossing-points at internal borders, in particular any speed limits not exclusively based on road-safety considerations*. At the same time, Member States should provide for facilities for checks in the event that internal border controls are temporarily reintroduced in accordance with Articles 23–31 of the Code.⁸

⁸ Since Schengen Associated Countries are not members of the Customs Union, customs controls are still carried out at their borders with Schengen Member States, and these associated countries are allowed to maintain the appropriate infrastructure, including the resulting speed limits.

The Commission has received numerous complaints from citizens pointing to the continued presence of obstacles to fluid traffic flow at certain road crossing-points at internal borders, in particular old infrastructure (e.g. buildings, control booths, roofs over the road or mobile equipment such as plastic cones, barriers, reduction of the number of lanes, traffic lights or road signs) and consequent considerable limitations on speed.

In most cases, the majority of obstacles that could be immediately dismantled were removed by Member States just after internal border controls were lifted. Some obstacles have been removed gradually due to technical difficulties, and certain obstacles are still maintained. Member States who joined the Schengen area in December 2007 implemented this obligation in several phases according to the degree of difficulty involved in removing such obstacles (i.e. most obstacles such as road signs were removed immediately after the lifting of internal border controls, while the removal or adaptation of large-scale infrastructure is still ongoing). In general, costs, property rights constraints, the planning of future refitting or major works linked to the reorganisation of road crossing-points have been identified as the most frequent reasons for delays in implementing this obligation. The Commission regrets that this also applies to certain Member States who have been members of the Schengen area for a considerable time. In order to ensure the correct application of Union law, the Commission has launched one infringement procedure for failure to comply with Article 22. The procedure is still ongoing.

Some Member States (PT, CZ, EL, EE, FR, AT, FI, LT, LV, SI, LU) have kept the old infrastructure at certain road crossing-points in the event of the temporary reintroduction of border control. Some also maintain the infrastructure for the exercise of customs control or checks on lorries (LU),⁹ while others plan to use mobile equipment if border control is reintroduced (CZ, FR, LT, LV). Other Member States (DE, PL, DK, IT) have dismantled all infrastructure where possible and merely use mobile equipment for the temporary reintroduction of border control. The Commission considers that permanent infrastructure for the cases of a reintroduction of border control may be maintained to the necessary extent, as long as it does not represent an obstacle to fluid traffic flow and speed limits are not reduced. In any case, the Commission underlines that facilities for the reintroduction of border controls can also comprise mobile infrastructure and equipment, which might even be more cost-efficient than the maintenance of permanent infrastructure.

Most Member States assert that speed limits are based exclusively on road-safety considerations (e.g. technical state of the road, construction works on the road, or when the road crossing-point is situated in an urban area or in mountainous terrain). However, the Commission considers it unacceptable for some Member States, in particular when the old infrastructure is still present at crossing-points, to maintain speed limits (together with removable obstacles such as plastic cones or barriers), in some cases even as low as 10 km per hour, or to keep certain lanes closed for 'traffic security' reasons. The objective of Article 22 is to render the traffic flow fluid at road crossing-points at internal borders. For this purpose, apart from the obligation to remove speed limits not exclusively based on road-safety considerations, other measures have to be taken, in particular concerning the existing infrastructure. The Commission is of the opinion that the maintenance of large-scale infrastructure cannot be used as an argument for road-safety considerations. It is understandable that the infrastructure at former border crossing-points would not allow speed

⁹ The Commission stresses that customs checks on lorries must be carried out in compliance with Union law governing free movement of goods and transport.

limits to be increased to the maximum allowed on the given road category. However, after the abolition of internal border controls, the situation at former border crossing-points must be adapted. This also applies when larger projects are planned in order to refit the areas of former road border crossing-points while the old infrastructure is maintained in the meantime. The Commission stresses that, in these cases, Member States also have to take all necessary *temporary* measures in order to ensure fluid traffic flow.

Finally, while a Member State may use the remaining infrastructure at a former road border crossing-point at an internal border for police checks (cf. 3.1), these former border crossing points cannot be the sole location for carrying out such checks. In addition, the practical advantages of the location cannot be the determining reason for carrying out police checks.

5. TEMPORARY REINTRODUCTION OF BORDER CONTROL AT INTERNAL BORDERS (ARTICLES 23 – 31)

5.1. PROCEDURE

Since the entry into force of the SBC, twelve Member States have temporarily reintroduced controls on persons at internal borders both in view of foreseeable events and for reasons requiring urgent action (FR, ES, DE, AT, IT, DK, FI, EE, LV, MT, NO, IS). Neighbouring countries have submitted information on their cooperation during the reintroduction of border control (PT, PL, CZ, SK, SI, NL, LU, CH). None of the Member States has reported using the provisions for prolongation of a planned temporary reintroduction of internal border control. Annex I lists Member States' notifications of the temporary reintroduction of border control at their internal borders, including reasons and duration.

The Commission observes that the timeframe (between notification by Member States and *de facto* reintroduction of internal border control for foreseeable events) for issuing its opinion for the purpose of formal consultation between the Member States and the Commission is too short¹⁰. Moreover, the notifications often do not contain sufficient information to allow the Commission to issue an opinion. Hence, the Commission has so far not issued any opinion.

Furthermore, the information supplied on temporary reintroduction is often very general and does not allow for a full assessment of the effectiveness of the measures taken with regard to the threat to public policy or internal security. The Commission requests Member States to supply more substantial information as soon as available, as well as appropriate updates in order to allow it to fully assess the appropriateness of the envisaged measures. To this end, the Commission will provide a standard form for reporting on the temporary reintroduction of internal border controls. Nevertheless, on the basis of the available information, the Commission considers that Member States have not abused the possibility to reintroduce border controls.

During the implementation phase, the difficulties reported by Member States relate to the need to reallocate human, material or technical resources according to the situation at the borders. In most cases, the cooperation with neighbouring countries during the reintroduction of border control has been considered positive. In particular, early consultations and the coordination of planned measures (in particular for operational support) with neighbouring countries as well as regular contacts and exchange of information between authorities at all

¹⁰ In some cases the notification was only sent a few days before the reintroduction of border control.

levels contribute to the success of the operations. In some cases, operational cooperation starts already with a joint risk assessment and may take the form of joint checks using joint checkpoints or the deployment of liaison officers. Installations at the crossing points are also adapted to the reintroduction of border controls on both sides of the border (e.g. placement of speed limit signs or mobile barriers). However, some Member States have raised the need to be better involved in the process in order to be able, in particular, to inform the public.

5.2. APPLICABLE LAW

According to Article 28, where border control at internal borders is reintroduced, the relevant provisions of Title II are to apply *mutatis mutandis*. The applicable provisions have not been further detailed in order to allow Member States to address the situation and carry out border checks in a flexible way, with an intensity proportionate to the threat. Measures taken during the reintroduction of border control have to be restricted to what is necessary for the public policy or internal security of the Member State. Depending on the threat, not all persons need necessarily be checked at the borders. Checks must be carried out in a proportionate manner in terms of time and location and based on risk analysis and available intelligence information, and targeted on the reason for the reintroduction of border control.

Member States may decide to what extent they need to reintroduce border surveillance as well.

Decisions to refuse entry may only be taken for the reasons linked to the reintroduction of border control. The standard form set out in Part B of Annex V to the SBC cannot be given to EU citizens, as EU citizens may be refused entry solely on grounds of public order, public security or public health and subject to the procedural safeguards of Directive 2004/38/EC.¹¹ If third-country nationals are refused entry on account of illegal stay, procedures should be launched in accordance with Directive 2008/115/EC.¹² When border control is temporarily reintroduced, internal borders do not become external borders; thus, certain provisions like stamping of passports (Article 10 of the SBC) or carriers' liability do not apply. In addition, the Commission recalls that FRONTEX cannot be involved in operations during the reintroduction of internal border control, given that its mandate is limited to external border control.

5.3. INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

The Code provides for an obligation to fully inform the public on the planned reintroduction of border control at internal borders, without prejudice to security considerations. Member States implement this obligation differently according to the nature of the event (planned reintroduction or urgent action). An information campaign is launched in advance, depending on the time available and using all available media (e.g. TV, radio, newspapers, internet or press services of the national authorities involved). Citizens are mainly informed about the obligation to carry travel documents when crossing the border and on the reasons for and

¹¹ Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, OJ L 158 of 30.4.2004, p. 77.

¹² Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals, [to be transposed by Member States by 24 December 2010 at the latest], OJ L 348 of 24.12.2008, p. 98.

extent of the checks. In general, it appears that the public has been sufficiently informed in most cases. No Member State (except FI) has had recourse to the confidentiality clause under Article 31, although this provision is considered very important if the need for its application arises.

The Commission is of the opinion that in general, the current legal framework governing the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders is sufficient, but calls upon Member States to provide more substantial information on time.

6. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Commission regrets that the deadline for the submission of this report could not be met due to the late submission of information by several Member States.
2. The Commission has identified three specific issues of concern in the application of Title III:
 - 2.1. The setting up of an area without internal borders where the free movement of persons is ensured represents one of the most substantial and tangible accomplishments of the Union. Any restrictions, such as police checks in the vicinity of internal borders, are perceived by citizens as hampering their right to free movement. Persons cannot be checked solely because they are crossing an internal border, neither at the border nor in the border areas.

The Commission is concerned by the difficulties reported by travellers in connection with alleged regular and systematic checks carried out in certain internal border zones. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation in the internal border zones. For this purpose, it will continue to carefully assess citizens' complaints and address Member States in order to obtain explanations. In order to ensure the correct application of Union law, the Commission is ready to use all available means, including the launching of infringement procedures, whenever such action proves to be necessary.

Accordingly, the Commission will request Member States to provide statistics on police checks carried out throughout their territories and in particular in the internal border zones.

The Commission recalls that if the security situation calls for Member States to carry out regular and systematic checks, they shall envisage the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in accordance with Article 23 *et seq.* of the SBC.

In its proposal for a revised Schengen evaluation mechanism, the Commission envisages carrying out unannounced on-site visits in order to verify the absence of checks at internal borders.

The Commission also stresses that Member States whose national legislation confers specific competences on national police authorities within the internal border zones are requested to adapt it to the ruling of the Court of Justice in the Melki case as soon as possible.

- 2.2 Member States must remove all obstacles to fluid traffic flow at road crossing-points at internal borders, and in particular any speed limits not exclusively based on road-safety considerations. The Commission is of the opinion that the maintenance of large-scale infrastructure, frequently accompanied by significant speed limits, cannot be used as an argument for road-safety considerations.
- 2.3 The Commission insists on timely notification of any planned reintroduction of internal border controls and requests Member States to provide detailed information in accordance with Article 24 in order to allow the Commission, when necessary, to give its opinion, and in order to proceed to formal consultations between Member States and the Commission.

ANNEX I

Member States' notifications of the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders pursuant to Article 23 *et seq.* of the Schengen Borders Code

Member State	Duration	Reasons
France	21/10/2006, 08h — 20:00	<p>Youth Days of radical young Basques in Saint-Pée-sur-Nivelle and demonstration organised in Bayonne by the support committee of Philippe Bidart.</p> <p>FR-ES land border (border crossing point on the highway A63 in Biriadou, St Jacques bridge, Béhobie bridge, Hendaye station)</p>
Finland	9–21/10/2006	<p>Informal meeting of Heads of States and Government in Lahti.</p> <p>Controls mainly at Helsinki-Vantaa, Turku and Tampere-Pirkkala airports and the ports of Helsinki, Hanko and Turku, FI-SE and FI-NO land borders</p>
Finland	13–29/11/ 2006	<p>EUROMED meeting in Tampere.</p> <p>Controls mainly at Helsinki-Vantaa, Turku and Tampere-Pirkkala airports and the ports of Helsinki, Hanko and Turku, FI-SE and FI-NO land borders</p>
France	12–16/02/2007	<p>Conference of Heads of States of Africa and France in Cannes (13-16/2/2007).</p> <p>FR-IT border (detailed information provided in the notification)</p>
Germany	25/5–9/06/2007	<p>G8 Summit in Heiligendamm/Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania (6-8/6/2007)</p> <p>Land, air and sea borders</p>
Iceland	2–3/11/2007	<p>Participation of <i>MC Hells Angels</i> at the inauguration of the Icelandic Motorcycle club in Reykjavik (1-4/11/2007).</p> <p>Air borders (14 flights checked from SE, DK, FI, DE and NO)</p>

Austria	02/06/2008– 01/07/2008	European Football Championship EURO 2008, AT — CH (7/6-29/6/2008). Land and air borders
France	27/09/2008, 08h — 18:45	Demonstration on 27 September at 16:00 in Bayonne, supervised by Batasuna. Five FR-ES border crossing points (Hendaye: highway A63, St Jacques international bridge, Béhobie international bridge, Hendaye station, port of Hendaye)
Finland	24/11/2008– 5/12/2008	Meeting of Council of Ministers of OSCE in Helsinki (4-5/12/2008). Controls mainly at Helsinki-Vantaa airport and at ports of Helsinki and Turku
Iceland	05-07/03/2009	Visit of <i>MC Hells Angels</i> to the Icelandic Motorcycle club in Reykjavik. Air borders (16 flights checked from SE, DK, NL, FR, DE, and NO)
Germany	20/03/2009– 5/04/2009	NATO Summit in Strasbourg, Baden-Baden and Kehl (3-4/4/2009). Land, air and sea borders
France	30/03/2009– 5/04/2009	NATO Summit in Strasbourg (3-4/4/2009) Land and air borders with BE, LU, DE, CH, IT and ES
Italy	28/06/2009– 15/07/2009	G8 Summit in L'Aquila (10-12/7/2009) Land, air and sea borders
France	19/09/2009, 13h — 19:40	Demonstration by Batasuna in Bayonne. Five FR-ES border crossing points (highway A63, St Jacques international bridge, Béhobie international bridge, Hendaye station, port of Hendaye)
Spain	26-27/09/2009	Celebration of 'Basque Warrior day' in the Basque Country and Navarra (ES) and in Pyrénées-Orientales (FR) ES-FR land borders in the provinces of Guipuzcoa and Navarra

France	27/09/2009	50 th Anniversary of ETA. FR-ES land borders, BCP border complex from Hendaye to Arneguy (14 border crossing points).
Norway	27/11/2009– 12/12/2009	Nobel Peace Prize Ceremony in Oslo (10/12/2009). NO-DE, NO-DK borders and NO and other Schengen countries targeted flights
Denmark	1-18/12/2009	UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen (7-18/12/2009). DK-DE and DK-SE borders
Malta	5-18/04/2010	Visit of Pope Benedict XVI (17-18/04/2010) Malta International Airport and Valletta Sea Passenger Terminal
Estonia	17-23/04/2010	Informal meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers in Tallinn (22-23/04/2010). Land, sea and air borders (detailed information provided in the notification)
France	28/05- 02/06/2010	Franco-African Summit in Nice (31/05-01/06/2010). FR-IT border (detailed information provided in the notification)
Latvia	24/05- 01/06/2010	NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Riga (28/05-01/06/2010). LV-EE, LV-LT land borders, Riga port and Riga international airport