INNOVATION BORDER MANAGEMENT

EU-conference on Innovation Border Management

Copenhagen, Denmark 2 - 3 February 2012

CURRENT STATE OF PLAY in relation to innovated border management in the EU

Austria

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Since beginning of 2010 we are running an API-pilot-system.

Further information refer to point 2.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Austria is planning at test configuration for an e-gate (automated border control) at Vienna-Schwechat-airport by first quarter of 2012.

They will be only for EU-citizens (adults) with an e-passport. First we will use face recognition only.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

No

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

Data protection is one of the key issues. Also the infrastructure at airports causes problems (lack of space).

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Yes. Clear legal regulations could help a lot. Guidance material from EC for e-gates would be appreciated. Support from FRONTEX in practical cooperation would be also welcome.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Cope with increasing number of travellers without lowering the level of security. Not increasing waiting times too much because of new checking requirements (VIS, EES).

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

There are still some doubts about the benefits of such a program. The administrative burden should not be higher as the normal border control process. If such a program is introduced, it should be EU-wide and not single countries solutions.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

One of the most important benefits would be - if biometrics are taken - that third country nationals can be identified and more easily returned to there country of origin. Also overstayers can be more easily detected, but to find out there whereabouts in the Schengen-area will be still very difficult.

Bulgaria

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Bulgaria implements different innovation forms in the field of border management and control at air, sea and land borders. Since 8th December 2010 the Integrated sea surveillance system is operational and ensures a full picture of all vessels movement. Thus Bulgaria made a significant step towards the preparation for EUROSUR connection.

Since the beginning of 2011, Bulgaria actively carries out air surveillance on the external EU borders using the available 4 helicopters.

The Integrated border surveillance system at the Bulgarian-Turkish land border is in process of development.

The entire information from the Integrated sea and land border surveillance systems and from the air border surveillance will be collected and analyzed in the National Coordination Centre (NCC) situated at the Chief Directorate Border Police.

The NCC is functioning since the end of November 2010. At the moment the NCC receives on-line information from the Integrated sea surveillance system concerning the traffic of all vessels, their coordinates, destinations, names, call signs, type, size and the cargo of the vessels. The technical characteristics of the Integrated system allow localization and control on small vessels, having no automated system for identification.

Having started the EUROSUR system, the information received by the NCC will be exchanged with the centres of other Member States both on Internet and via FRONTEX.

A new AVL System for automated visualization of border patrols locations is established that allows receiving in the NCC an information on all border patrols, their movement and location. Bulgaria has an operational national system for border control, through which border checks of persons in real time are carried out in SIS, including checks of their travel documents and the vehicles used.For functioning of the system are used the most modern technologies and technical means such as devices for reading of data from travel document with integrated electronic chip; scanners for fingerprints and etc.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Currently we have no e-gates at our BCPs. Bulgaria has already planned to build e-gates and at the moment public tender procedures are launched for setting up of e-gates with automated border control at BCP-Sofia Airport.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Currently no, but we envisage to start a Project for preliminary registration of passengers on board of planes and ships.

Similar possibility is provided by the Bulgarian AIS "Border Control" that enables the use of passengers data related to previous travels without need to enter them again, which significantly speeds up the performing of the border checks.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

It is necessary to take into account the already gained experience with similar systems and to consider the possibility to develop these systems interconnected.

The introduction of high technologies for border control and surveillance and the development of integrated systems for entering, exchange and storage of data requires serious financial investments.

The reduce of the financial expenses regarding the innovation border management could be achieved by setting up and management of unified information system of the EU. In this case, significantly less funding will be required, compared to the financing that each Member State should provide in order to set up its own system for storing and processing of data related to persons entering or leaving the territory of the EU, as well as to ensure the information exchange with the national systems of the other Member States.

The possibility of financing under "External Borders" Fund should be considered while taking into account the specificities of the system and the geopolitical situation in the different Member States at the external EU borders, as well as the fact that many of them do not have land and sea BCPs. It also should be considered that the setting up and maintenance of the system on land BCPs is much more complex and economically inefficient in comparison with the air BCPs.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Bulgaria is on the opinion, that carrying out an active cooperation on an EU-level and the adoption of EU policies related to the "Smart borders" Communication will be extremely useful.

One of the biggest challenges is the recent global financial crises. The technical experts have to

make detailed analyses of the possibilities for cost efficient development of the systems.

A possible option for the realization of the "Entry/Exit" system and the Registered Traveller Programme is the extension of the functional scope of the Visa Information System. The information on visas issued of third country nationals may be supplemented with data for the time and the places of entry and exit to/from the Schengen area. Thus will be possible to estimate exactly the period of permitted stay and to avoid the duplication of huge amount of information regarding the same persons (including biometric data). Similarly, the Visa System can include data related to frequently travelling bona fide passengers under the Registered Traveller Programme Fully operational and deployed Visa Information System is a precondition for the implementation of the "Smart borders" initiative.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Both border checks and border control on the external EU borders should be as effective and convenient as possible for passengers.

The existing new technologies allow not only checks in the national data bases, SIS and the Visa System, but also registration of persons through a single control by the competent border police authorities of the Member States. Such a system containing travelling information and its use by the relevant competent authorities should be in compliance with the appropriate personal data protection tools and the national legislations of the Member States.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The implementation of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU will definitely facilitate the border control of preliminary checked passengers - third country nationals and it will also allow the use of an automated border control on them. In this way, quick and easy border crossings will be ensured, while the adequate level of security will be guaranteed too. Similar possibility is provided by the Bulgarian AIS "Border Control" that enables the use of passengers data related to previous travels without need to enter them again, which significantly speeds up the performing of the border checks.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The establishment and use of a common EU "Entry/Exit" System will allow the identification of any eventual overstay in the EU of third country nationals and it will also support the planning and the management of the border control as well as of the migration processes.

Cyprus

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

It should be noticed that Cyprus has air and sea borders only. Innovations have been mainly implemented at the air borders. In particular, new technical equipment has been established at the air borders (Larnaca and Pafos airports) regarding passport readers and scanners. Furthermore Cyprus has decided to launch an operational activity in cooperation with Frontex Agency. An ICC (international Coordination Center) has been established at the Aliens & Immigration Headquarters. The operational activity covers the coordination of activities at sea, air and inland as well.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

No e-gate system is established at sea or air borders and no plans in the near future to introduce such a system.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Cyprus authorities do not use any National Programme for registration of travelers

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

Bearing in mind the crisis in North African Countries, the movement of migrants that is caused by the crisis and consequently the pressure EU MS and SAC are facing, the biggest challenge Cyprus is facing concerns the establishment of a European common entry – exit system which all MS and SAC may have access and control of the arrivals and departures of third country nationals in EU. With such a system, migrants arriving in one MS or SAC, all MS and SAC will have access on the system and will be informed about the arrival. When a migrant is leaving the EU and SAC area, again all MS will be informed about his return, consequently there will be a clear number of the present of migrants in EU.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Practical co-operation on an EU-level may contribute to address these challenges and particularly, MS that have already registered departures or arrivals of migrants in their national systems that are pending, may share this information in order to point out the need to establish a common EU entry / exit system.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Our expectations of the smart border communication of the EC is that EU MS may follow common procedures regarding data protection, establishment of Registered Traveler programme and Entry/ Exit system. By establishing such systems border guards may speed up border checks for EU citizens and may enhance efforts on checking third country nationals with interviews or checking for false or falsified EU travel documents

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The introduction of a Registered Travel Program at BCP's of MS that are used on high level by EU citizens may comfort the daily work of border guards which consequently will give them the opportunity to enhance activities related to border checks.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The introduction of a common entry / exit system will lead to a more effective way of controlling third country nationals entering or leaving the EU and SAC area.

Czech Republic

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

CZ has only external air borders.
For air-traffic from certain third countries (with high risk of illegal migration), we have been using API since 2006.
CZ is running a pilot project on e-Gates. One e-Gate was installed at the Prague Airport in November 2011, with a view to extension of this project soon.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Regarding e-Gates, CZ is running a pilot project. One e-Gate was installed at the Prague Airport in

November 2011, with a view to extension of this project soon. Fingerprints and photo-image are used. So far, e-Gates can be used only by EU citizens with e-passports. No special rules on eligibility were adopted.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?
No.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?
1) Further development of e-Gates
2) Upgrade of API system (upgrade of its network/connectivity).

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?
Yes, such adoption would ensure uniform application of some problematic phenomena e.g. counting the length of a short stay visa-free travel of third country nationals. See also answer to question No 8.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?
We support especially the establishment of the

Entry/Exit System. We expect that this system will significantly contribute to combating illegal migration and document fraud.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
At the moment we are not convinced that RTP will bring significant benefits for all EU countries in terms of strengthening their security. We consider it rather as project on enhancing comfort of certain travellers and capacity of some airports. Taken into consideration the costs of RTP, which are enormous (according to the respective Communication of the Commission), this project does not have direct support of CZ.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
CZ supports establishment of the Entry/Exit System.
We expect that it will contribute to
- reliable verification of the period of stay of third country citizens in the Schengen territory
- reliable verification of return of third country citizens who were given a return decision
- reliable verification of identity of third country citizens (both at external borders and in the territory, if needed)
- decrease of document frauds.

Denmark

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?
Denmark has implemented a system called POLKON, through which passengers and crew / passenger lists can be checked automatically in the national databases, the SIS and the INTERPOL-databases.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?
Denmark does not currently have e-gates at any of the borders, but considerations of the relevance of such in Copenhagen Airport have recently been initiated.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?
No.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?
1) Financing
2) Uncertainty in regards to which products to choose.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?
A common EU policy and approach could prove helpful in order to set common standards in regards to the different systems, especially different types of e-gates.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?
A more effective management of the external borders, including better security, would be the likely outcome.
Comprehensive knowledge about the travel patterns of third country nationals, especially

in regard to overstayers, which can be useful for maintaining and developing relationships with third countries in regards to inter alia visa policies.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
Introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme can bring greater flexibility for the frequent travellers. At the same time the RTP can bring a redistribution of resources which means less waiting time for the rest of the travellers, and better conditions for the border crossing guards to be able to focus their attention on the potentially problematic travellers.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
The introduction of an Entry/Exit System is expected to improve the control and can contribute to the discovery rate in regard to overstayers.

Furthermore, it will establish easy access to reliable and comprehensive statistics on the travel patterns of third country nationals.

Estonia

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?
To manage the border crossing queue on land border BCP-s we have from 2011 in use the Electronic Border Queue Registration System for Trucks and private cars. Drivers can book in advance the exact time for border crossing via internet or phone (www.estonianborder.eu).
In green border we using from 2010 Smartdec guard monitoring system. It was also used and presented buy us in Frontex Rabit operation 2010-2011. System is designed to be rapidly installed and relocated, low need and costs for maintenance and all alarms are confirmed by several sensors and operator will have a picture from the spot.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?
We have ongoing project in Tallinn airport and the ABS gates should be ready to use by the end of year 2012. We're going to use finger prints and face recognition. No restrictions of eligibility

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?
No

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?
Innovation in border management is very expensive and time-consuming

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?
Yes, in the EU financial framework for 2014-2020

there is allocation for 1100 MEUR to cover the expenses and of course the cooperation and project management by the Commission is very important

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?
We would like to have the full package, integrated information systems and also access for law enforcement for criminal and other investigations. We expect to have a tool that in real will strengthen the internal security of the EU

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
RTP is meant for bona fide travellers and it helps to shorten the time for border crossing and also MS can plan their resources and focus on travellers who are not in this program.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?
EES is a tool for Internal Security of EU. EES should be used by all law enforcement authorities for fighting the smuggling, illegal immigration and cross border crime etc.

Finland

1. **Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?**

1. Implementation of e-gates;
2. Implemenation of mobile border check devices, including fingerprint verification for VIS;
3. Preparations for the API processing;
4. All supported by an integrated border check system and a search system offering services to the above and to other systems.

2. **Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?**

Current deployment level of e-gates in Finland is totalling to 25 at Helsinki-Vantaa airport and 5 at Vaalimaa border crossing point. During 2012 three gates will be deployed at the Port of Helsinki. The e-gates are based on facial recognition and restricted to the e-passport holders of EU Member States/EEA/CH. The implementation has taken into account the use of fingerprints in the future. Finland has not applied any restrictions on eligibility based on age, but the technical construction of the e-gates require a minimum height of 120 cm and a maximum height of 190. Also the width of the e-gate lanes does not support the usage by travellers using a wheel-chair.

3. **Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?**

Finland has not implemented a Registered Traveller Programme as such, but the Finnish Border Guard has the possibility to use its datasystem to enter a well-known passenger to the system. In these cases, the passenger using his/her own biometric passport, could use the e-gates and the status is verified by the system. Implementation in ABC requires a biometric passport and is based on facial recognition.

4. **Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?**

Lack of mostly human resources and lack of coherent approach at EU level. There are a number of on-going projects both nationally and internationally, but there appears to be a lack of harmonized and coherent approach in how the projects fit in to the overall architecture and procedures.

A vision or an overarching architecture on the future of border management in EU should be clarified and agreed to support the innovations and the use of new technologies, instead of time consuming preparation of different projects. Adjusting the legal framework to support the implementation.

5. **Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?**

Definitely. Practical cooperation exists within Frontex cooperation in order to create the best practices and guidelines to implement e-gates. In EU-level the legal proposals need to be agreed to support wider implementation and a coherent approach for the travellers. This process should not take too long, since the implementation is already on-going.

6. **Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?**

The idea of Smart Borders is an essential part of the development of the EU IBM concept and it widely meets the expectations Finland has concerning the future needs to elaborate the EU Integrated Border Management concept in the area of the border checks.

Expectations are connected to the establishment of an Entry-Exit System to function as part of the infrastructure, which would support the automation of third-country nationals border checks, either in a form of a Registered Traveller Programme or otherwise. The legislative changes to the Schengen Borders Code would need to be agreed to enable the developments in this respect.

7. **Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**

The most significant impacts of a Registered Traveller Programme would be the possibility to automate the border checks for third-country nationals. The implementation and proposal should, however, take into account the cost impacts and aim to take advantage of the existing travel documents as much as possible.

A Registered Traveller Programme would not serve in automated border checks, but also in the conventional manual checks as checking some of the entry requirements would be waived and thus the programme would serve in the overall facilitation. The treshold to enter the programme and the procedures should not be too complicated.

8. **Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**

Entry/Exit system will not only provide the security element but it will also facilitate the cross-border traffick. The border checks process should lean more and more on the use of modern technology in order to truly change the traditional mechanical process. The Entry/Exit, like the whole idea

introduced in the Smart Borders Communication would lead the way towards a next generation of border checks relying on new and effective use of technologies.

Part of the obligations of the authorities responsible for border checks and internal security is to monitor the compliance of the right to stay when it comes to third-country nationals. An Entry-Exit System would not only provide the tools to do this, but would also create the basic infrastructure to automate the border checks for third-country nationals and enable the abolishment of stamping.

Hungary

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Hungary has implemented its own specific national entry/exit system. This is capable of registering the data of third country nationals entering the country at the external borders, and automatically calculates and signals to the officer at exit check if the individual appearing for exit has exceeded the allowed maximum limit of stay. The system is especially useful in the control of local border traffic. However, it has its limitations, since it only works of the individual both entered and exited the Schengen Area through the Hungarian border.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

No, in Hungary currently there are no such gates yet - however, the Airport Police Directorate has carried out an impact assessment to establish such a system at Budapest Liszt Ferenc Airport (with the use of the External Borders Fund). It is foreseen to be implemented in 2012. The system would make possible the control of 300 passengers/hour, greatly decreasing waiting time. The primary aim of the project – besides maintaining a high level of security of border checks – is to increase the speed of passenger flows, without affecting the exercise of the right of free movement, and freeing up human resources. The system would be based on biometric identification (fingerprints).

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

No, having regard to the cost-benefit aspects of the system to be set up, we consider it too costly.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

In general, it is true that border control authorities all over Europe are nowadays faced with the problem finding the proper balance between facilitating freedom of movement and ensuring security. Even in the case of one MS, the situation at the external borders can be very complex. Such is the case for Hungary, where the potential threats, the current trends are diverse and require different answers. The border traffic reaches peak numbers in high season, causing a strain on the staff carrying out border checks.

However, the majority of this traffic is legitimate and is realised at road BCPs. Simultaneously, resources for border management are also required to strenghen border surveillance to counter illegal migration at the green borders.

In terms of innovation, considerable effort has been put recently into the use of VIS in border checks, which required investment in technology and equipment, for BCPs with highly specific needs (eg. railroad BCPs).

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

The objectives set out in the Stockholm Programme have paved the way for a substantial increase in the level of activity of the European Union in the field of IBM. Practical co-operation is possible for example with extended joint operations of several MS in the territory of their countries to screen third country nationals, or with the exchange of experiences and knowledge of best practices of the Member States. HERMES, MITRAS, and DEMETER operations against illegal migration shows, inland controls need to be increased in the area of free movement. We believe that ensuring that the future EES will be available for all migration authorities at the border and also in the territory of the country is crucial to make use of the full potential of the system. Possible interlinking with the VIS, and also alerts from the SIS also seems necessary.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

More efficient filtering out of overstayers to counter illegal migration. A European EES will facilitate calculating the authorised time of stay for border guards, even if the traveller entry or exit the schengen territory in two different states.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

While we would not underestimate the potential benefits - primary in business terms- of simplifying border crossings for frequent bona fide travellers, we consider that with the estimated cost of setting up such a system at European level its benefits do not justify the investment. Past experiences with

the development of large scale systems have shown that actual costs are always higher than expected; in addition, to make the system truly attractive, automated gates would also be needed. Regarding the Registered Traveller Programme in our view the passengers' pre-screening and preferring could be carried out by much simpler technical solutions as well, for example by recording the fact of preliminary check-in in the SIS.

8. **Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**
Hungary is responsible for a significant external Schengen border section, and therefore, is considered important the efforts aiming to introduce the use of modern technologies in the areas of border management and appropriate response to the 21st century security challenges (organized crime, terrorism, combating illegal migration). We strongly support the introduction of the Entry / Exit System - EES. (Hungary has a similar national system, and we have gained very good experience during the use of this.) The establishment of this EU system would satisfy a longstanding demand, screening the third-country nationals remaining illegally in the EU, it would be an effective measure in combating illegal migration, thus contributing to the security of the Schengen area.

Ireland

1. **Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?**
On 20 December 2011, the Minister for Justice and Equality, Mr. Alan shatter and Mr. Damian Green, Minister of State for Immigration at the UK Home Department signed a Joint Statement and committed to a joint programme to reinforce the commitment of both sides to maintaining the CTA and to tackling abuses which threaten its effective operation. the programme involved a number of actions in the areas of visas, data sharing, electronic border systems and operation aspects.

A pilot programme to release members of an Garda Siochana (police) from administrative functions at Immigration Control in Dublin Airport is about to be launched.

A prototype system for collecting and processing passenger data for the purpose of border management is due to commence in February 2012.

2. **Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?**
There are no e-gates in operation at the present time. However, the introduction of automated gates is envisaged as part of the roll of the the full programme of changing immigration control administration at ports of entry, the pilot of which is alluded to above.

3. **Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?**
We do not have such a programme.

4. **Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?**
In the current economic climate to develop a comprehensive electronic border control/ facilitation system.
To control the carousel of illegal immigration within the Common Travel Area.
To optimize the opportunities to attract visitors to the State.

5. **Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?**
Ireland, along with the UK, will not be taking part in the Smart Borders initiative.

6. **Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?**
See above

7. **Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**
See above

8. **Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**
See above

Lithuania

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Lithuania has working national Entry-exit system for more than 10 years at the moment at the air, sea as well as land borders. We are looking forward to legislative proposals, according to the Smart Borders Communication.

Lithuania is taking part in Visa information System (VIS) Pilot project in Northern Africa, gathering biometric data in our embassy in Cairo (Egypt) from October 2011.

Lithuania has also updated all the National systems, required for the implementation of SIS II, according to the latest technical specifications of the System.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Lithuania does not have e-gates at our borders at the moment. We are looking forward to legislative proposals, according to the Smart Borders Communication.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Lithuania does not have a programme for the registered travellers at the moment. We are looking forward to legislative proposals, according to the Smart Borders Communication.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

We are looking forward to legislative proposals, according to the Smart Borders Communication. The main challenge is to assure that the Initiative would not pose difficulties to bona fide travellers and would not complicate the border crossing procedures. Use of biometrics is vital, although it could delay border control - necessity to find balance.

It is clear that the cost of the system (EU and National co-financing) shall be one of the major challenges, as all the border control hardware as well as software shall be due for the renewal and etc. Due to the scope of the system, technical specifications and implications shall also pose a challenge. Security of personal data is of majour significance too.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Yes, the EU-level exchange of best practices and experience would facilitate the introduction of Smart Border innovations.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Clear technical requirements as well as the cost assessment for the implementation of the Systems are the main points. Possibility to use the existing best practices of national border control systems, experience from the implementation of SIS and VIS systems.

We support the use of biometric data in both EES and RTP systems, although the use of such data in EES should start at the later stage (due to the danger of delays and data security questions). What concerns RTP, the biometric data should also be implemented step by step (facial image as the first step, fingerprint data - at the later stage). Even already using RTP e-gates, MS should retain possibility to fall back to the conventional border checks in certain cases (e.g. flagged travellers). We would support the granting of access to RTP/EES data for the law enforcement institutions. Due to the scope and complexity of the systems, sufficient EU funding is vital.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The most important benefit would be the right balance between the measures, aimed at the control of illegal migration as well as the ones, facilitating the entry of bona fide travellers. Due to the importance of security we support the centralised RTP and EES systems.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The most important benefit would be the right balance between the measures, aimed at the control of illegal migration as well as the ones facilitating the entry of bona fide travellers. Due to the importance of security we support the centralised RTP and EES systems.

Malta

1. **Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?**

With regard to air and sea borders, Malta has an 'entry-exit system' at the national airport and at seaports/yacht marinas for third country nationals arriving from and leaving to third countries. Measures are currently being undertaken to enhance the existing border control system to incorporate biometric capturing devices (fingerprints) in immigration booths. This is related to the Visa Information System (VIS) project. Malta's immigration control system is also connected to the National Stop List and the Schengen Information System (SIS).

2. **Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?**

Currently Malta has no e-gates at its air and sea borders and has no plans to introduce these in the near future.

3. **Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?**

Malta does not have a registered traveler programme (RTP).

4. **Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?**

Malta is not facing any specific big challenges in relation to innovation border management. As stated above, its sea and air borders are already well equipped with border control systems, andsubject to the availability of funding, the systems are being enhanced as necessary.

5. **Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?**

Yes, Malta earnestly believes that practical cooperation and the adoption of EU policies in relation to smart borders is of utmost importance for Member States, as they could contribute to enhancing border management, thereby increasing security and facilitating movement. For this purpose, it is important to draw on the experience of Member States that already have such systems in place. The assessment of the costs and benefits of the systems are of utmost importance in determining whether smart borders should be introduced, as adequate return on investment is essential.

6. **Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?**

It is expected that the smart borders communication will lead to a faster, smoother and more secure system across all Member States, both for the travelers and the Member States themselves, with a justified return for the investment made.

7. **Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**

A registered traveller programme (RTP) is not a priority for Malta; but Malta is willing to explore this further and to consider it if it is an integral part of the smart borders system.

In view of the expenses involved in implementing such system, it is essential that sufficient EU funding is made available to assist Member States in this regard.

8. **Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?**

In principle, Malta is in favour of an entry-exit System (EES) for the EU. Malta already has an entry-exit system for third country nationals at a national level and this system is deemed a very strong tool for migration management and fighting illegal immigration. An EU level EES will enhance the value of such a system. It is also considered that an EES should be integrated with other national law enforcement systems. It is understood that this would require additional resources considering the magnitude of the proposal and there would be added value in granting law enforcement authorities' immediate access to the data, as this would facilitate investigations related to criminal offences.

It is also important to ensure that the establishment of an EES at EU level does not substitute the requirement for endorsement of passports on entry and exit, but complements it.

Netherlands

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

In the Netherlands, border management innovations are being implemented mainly at external air borders. These are essentially:

- A Registered Traveller Programme with automated border control at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol called Privium, open for EEA citizens.
- Automated border control by implementing e-gates at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol, starting in Spring 2012 (see question 2);
- A Registered Traveller Programme for third country nationals, comprising the FLUX and Orange Lane projects. FLUX (Fast Low Risk Universal Crossing) is a joint US-Dutch project between government authorities, open for third countries to join. Orange Lane refers to the initiative to allow participation of certain specific groups of third country nationals in the Registered Traveller Programme Privium;
- Within the Dutch Advance Passenger Information Project, passport data are collected from high-risk travel routes. They are checked against watchlists and risk profiles for the purpose of preventing illegal migration. From January 1st, 2012, 28 air companies flying on 24 high-risk routes are obliged to provide for passenger and flight data.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

The Dutch Automated Border Control 'No-Q' (No-queue) Project aims at realising automated border crossing for adult (18+) EEA citizens (EU + Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Switzerland) holding an e-passport. A biometric scan of the face is being compared to the picture in the passport. Spring 2012, 24 such gates will be opened at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol (Departure and Arrival), with 12 more gates to follow in due time (Transit).

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Started in 2001, Privium is the Dutch fee-based RT programme for frequent and/or business travellers, who travel to, from or via Amsterdam Airport Schiphol and who have the nationality of one of the EU member states. It offers border passage with automated border control and a priority lane for security. The gates are operated with a personalized token which includes a chip containing a scan of the iris. The enrolment in the program and the border passage takes place under the supervision of the border police.

In addition, PRIVIUM also provides a service program which includes the use of a lounge and priority parking.

The two other Dutch RT Programmes are FLUX and Orange Lane (cf. question 1) with the aim to expedite border control processing of pre-approved, low-risk trusted travelers by providing automated entry processes (based on a token with iris-scan). Membership is fee-based and connected to Privium (see above). Screening criteria for Flux involve the regular entry checks in conformity with the Schengen Border Code. In addition, criminal records are being checked. Each State is responsible for its own vetting and enrolment. Only membership status is synchronised. At regular intervals, the screening is repeated to confirm the 'ok'-status. Criteria for Orange Lane are similar to the entry conditions under the Schengen Border Code.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

Today, given the limited API data set in use, border control authorities only have limited opportunities for identifying risks. API data under national privacy laws do not allow for insight in travel history and suspect patterns or behaviour. API therefore has limited preventive effects. A more adequate set of data according to ICAO/WCO/IATA Guidelines would provide for better risk-assessment as to illegal migration ('API+'). The Dutch PARDEX (Passenger-related Data Exchange) project is currently developing an Information system to contain such passenger data from air carriers, checking against watchlists and profiles on behalf of the border services (as Border Police, Customs, Immigration Service, Seeport Police and Intelligence Service) taking part. It will run from 2014.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Practical co-operation at EU level might indeed very well contribute in meeting in the afore-mentioned challenges, e.g. by exchanging best practices in and knowledge of risk-assessment, as well as developing practical guidelines.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

1. The Smart Borders Communication is an important step forward in EU external border management policy, creating the conditions for solutions to urgent issues faced by Member States;
2. Developing an EU RTP (cf. question 7) may prove a very cost-effective means of improving security and mobility when compared with alternative border management innovations, with possible implications for prioritising accordingly;
3. Despite the Commission discarding for the moment the option of a an EU Electronic System for Travel Authorisation, the Netherlands are

in favour of keeping ESTA on the agenda, as it might constitute a major means of preventing illegal migration;

4. Retaining the obligation for manual stamping travel documents of third country nationals would rather undo the benefits of automated border control, requiring a solution comparable to small border traffic practices, which would also have the benefit of annulling the necessity of closely connecting RTP and EES.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

From a practical point of view, in the short term, a European RTP could start organically by bringing together some front-runner Member States with major transport hubs, applying bilateral or multilateral RTPs. Such joint co-operation might be based on interoperability and biometrical tokens rather than working with a centralised database, limiting costs and risks and providing for best practices in developing an EU-wide system.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The main purpose for an EU EES being to monitor respect of authorised stay of TCNs, controlling overstay, contributing to optimising border check procedures, enhancing security at crossing of external borders, as well as to increasing the effectiveness of return policies, these are no doubt considerable benefits to be achieved. The costs of the proposal however are considerable too (€ 623 mln.) and the question should be answered whether they are proportional to the investment. Along with most other Member States, the Netherlands therefore have called upon the Commission to thoroughly analyse impact and costs.

Norway

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Norway has not yet implemented innovation in border management related to the border checks.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Norway will have e-gates on entry at Oslo Airport, Gardermoen as of July 2012, the first 6 months as a pilot project.
Norway intends to have e-gates at Storskog, the only land BCP with Russia from 2013.
The introduction of e-gates in Norway foresees the option to use both fingerprints and facial recognition biometrics, but starting only with facial biometrics.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Norway has established NORVIS system, a communication and case handling system for visas, between the Directorate of Immigration, the Embassies/Consulates and the Police. NORVIS is under further development providing the platform for N-VIS.
Based on an agreement (not yet in force) between Norway and Russia on facilitation of travel for border residents, Norway is working on options for programme for registering travels under the agreement.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

Technological interoperability - further development of secure communication and case handling systems and platforms for law enforcement and migration purposes enabling communication with new infrastructur/equipment.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Standardization of systems and platforms within EU/Schengen provide for reliable communication and case handling systems.
Experiences have, however shown, that future processes for developing EU/Schengen wide system and platforms needs to be speeded up.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Further and future development and implementation of new technology for border control, particularly for border checks is the only way to ensure thorough control of an increasing number of persons when crossing the external borders.
Norway considers the automation of searches in available systems such as SIS and VIS combined with API and PNR to be important. However, it requires more extensive and reliable use of these systems.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

Norway supports generally establishment of EES and RTP, while considering the needs for closer looking into different options of systems to ensure operational added value.

Norway considers that added value of EES and RTP only can be achieved if systems and platforms can handle full automatic border check including recognition of overstayers and/or other violations related to border crossings. Still, whatever smart border systems would be further developed and implemented, Norway can not envisage adequate border checks without the presence of border guards.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

EES would when implemented to the extent possible (presence of border guards would still be needed) reduce the needs for future increasing of staff at external borders.

EES would if standards for border checks would be higher than physical checks by border guards (independence of qualification) on benefit security and facilitate travel.

Poland

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

On February 2011 the Border Guard in Poland implemented IT system "Odprawa" which replaced an earlier one and serves for the purpose of support for the procedures carried out in the first and second line of border control. It enables searches of objects and persons in different registers and ensures an exchange of information with external national and European systems e.g. VIS. The system also registers information on foreigners e.g. entries and exits from the territory of RP. The system covers information on entries and exits of foreigners who were both short stay visitors and longterm residents or traveled within the local border traffic regime. The information on entry and exit of foreigners had been also recorded in systems prior to "Odprawa" and for many years proved to be a useful evidence in various proceedings carried out by teh Border Guard and other relevant authorities (e.g. migration authorities in procedures related to the legalisation of stay or law enforcement ones).

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

Currently Poland does not use e-gates at border crossing points. However, the Border Guard is planning to take part as a partner in an international research development project in the field of automatic border control's solutions of new generation with use of second generation biometric passports. This project will be realized within the 7th framework program of the EU.

The objective of the project entitled "Enhancing the workflow and functionalities of Automated Border Control (ABC) gates" would be to create modular, integrated, optimal automatic solution of new generation for border control, which would enable secure, fast and comfortable border controls for EU citizens and frequent travellers from outside the EU. This solution would include new technologies and processes, which enable creation of coherent concepts for all border crossing points and all official electronic documents.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Currently Poland does not have a programme for registered travellers.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

The establishment of large-scale IT systems constitutes a challenge involving significant financial resources for their development, implementation and maintenance. It also requires investments in human resources and adaptation of the infrastructure of border crossing points. Moreover, it has an impact on organization of border control process. For these reasons it is easier to establish such systems one after another rather than at the same time. These changes should also address various technological issues e.g. the effectiveness of use of the biometric scanners at the border.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Systems similar to entry and exit or RTP have not been implemented in most of European countries. However, some countries have certain experience in that area at national level (e.g. Poland have registered entry and exits of foreigners for years but does not have any system comparable to RTP). Taking into account different experience in use of such systems the idea of cooperation on an EU level could be important (e.g. analysis of use of RTP system at different sorts of borders, influence on time of border check). Discussion on EU level and exchange of practice should take place not only after but also before establishment of these systems, so at the stage when we can still influence general shape of these systems. Such discussion should also help to answer the question of added value of these systems when they are established at European level instead of at national one.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Poland perceives this communication as another step towards preparation of concrete legislative proposals. These legislative proposals should address the issue of smart borders in particular as an important instrument supporting and facilitating border control, control of legality of stay, and detection and investigation of criminal offences. The legislative proposals should be preceded by an in-depth impact assessment, which in case of supremacy of advantages over costs should lead to assurance of EU finance of the projects. If necessary, the development of Entry Exit System should be given the priority over RTP.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

As Poland has no experience with national RTP it is difficult to precisely assess benefits of having such a system at EU level, in particular if only an optional one. If RTP were to be established by the EU, Poland would rather have it as a centralised architecture, able to store both alphanumeric and biometric data and operational after setting up ABC in most of EU countries.

It would be important to know before establishment of the system e.g. the estimates of the number of travelers potentially interested in the initiative, assessment of the impact on the time of border check or whether this system is to be implemented at all borders or only at specially dedicated border crossing points. More detailed information on functionality of the system and the institutions involved should also help to assess its added value.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

EES constitutes an important response to the growing needs of strengthening the governance of Schengen area. This system should also be based on centralized architecture and should be able to store both alphanumeric and biometric data of travelers. In our view this system in order to be complete should be used for registration of all authorized entries and exits and travel history for both short stay and long stay travelers.

Romania

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

Romania has implemented the Integrated Border Security System, which is the main tool for the integrated management of the Romania state border. It is a complex system that integrates a range of technical and operational subsystems, structured on a common platform for electronic communications.

This system includes a set of applications that allow real-time information exchange between national and international bodies with responsibilities in surveillance and border crossing control.

The integrated border security system is a complex, scalable, independent and open system which carries, through its component subsystems, a series of specific activities, which together concur to achieve its primary objective, namely to secure the borders.

Being open, the Integrated Border Security System is able to interconnect with other national and international systems. The common platform for communications of Integrated Border Security System is made in order to allow the interconnection and interoperability between the Romanian Border Management System (equipments and various national and international data bases which have useful information in this field) and other Member States, including Frontex.

The existing surveillance systems and realization / implementation of a management system of Romania's borders will enable the development and adoption of some innovative solutions regarding the border surveillance, according to the existing threats and those which prefigure at the external border.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

For the moment, Romania has not yet implemented a system of electronic gates at air, land or sea borders, but intends to make an operational pilot in the second half of 2012, at Henri Coanda Airport in Bucharest.

Given the fact that the existing passenger traffic is currently relatively low, an opinion on the usefulness and efficiency of this system will be made only after testing it, 6 months after it becomes operational.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

No.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

The harmonization of national systems with those to be implemented at European level and the cost / benefit report for the implementation of the systems are the biggest challenges Romania is facing regarding the innovative frontiers.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Romania considers that the adoption of the ,,Smart Borders'' Concept will help address the challenges Romania is facing in this respect.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Regarding Smart Borders, Romania looks forward to the legislative proposal detailing the architecture of this system, how the existing national systems will harmonize with those to be implemented at European level, the financing thereof and the criteria on which financial means will be allocated from the EU budget.

Romania considers that the most important results will be the fact that checking / automatic monitoring of compliance with the period of residence by a third country national on the MS territory and the calculation of the period of stay will be realized in a uniform and automatical manner with the help of the Entry / Exit system.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

As regards the Registered Traveler Program, Romania does not consider as proportional the report between the necessity of system at national level and the costs involved, thus expressing reservations about its implementation.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

Romania appreciates the Entry/Exit System to be useful, as the registration at the border crossing will help verify a third country national who entered the EU but does not have the entry stamp in the travel document. A problem in implementing these systems is the registration of the first entry in the EU,if it took place prior to the implementation of the system, and was not recorded in the database.

Slovenia

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

So far, Slovenia has not implemented any of innovations in border management. There are two basic reasons that have to be considered in this regard. Firstly, at the air border - the number of passengers is relatively low thus not justifying introduction from financial reasons. Secondly at the land border - there are no efficient technical solutions presented so far. On the other hand Slovenia follows technical innovations and equipping border police officers with latest equipment for border checks helping them to be efficient.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

At the moment we are not planning to introduce any of mentioned solutions.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

Currently we do not have a programme for registered travellers.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

The biggest challenge considers our external land border were app. 48 millions passengers cross every year and a challenge how efficiently, users friendly and taking into account cost-benefit perform border checks and contribute to the biggest possible way to the area of freedom and safety. However due to incoming membership of the Republic of Croatia in the EU is hard to justify additional financial investments at this border caused by introducing innovation in border management.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Although several member states have already crated its own solutions a common space for technical, legislative even organisational solutions should be at the EU level. At the same time policies and other measures should allow flexibility and individual solutions for individual member states.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Communications should present a thorough, realistic and comprehensive base for possible decision at the political level, but at the same time

clearly present aims and goals (added value) of the smart border package together with financial aspects.

7.
Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

So far a Registered Traveller Programme was thoroughly tested only at air border, main focus and needed solutions should be also don at the land borders were Slovenia/EU could benefit from such a programme.

8.
Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

Slovenia has been supporting the idea of Entry/ Exit System from the presentation of the core idea onward - to monitor better legal stay of third country nationals within EU space. Some basic preconditions of the idea should be met - basic systems of control of legal stay in the territory as well as broad access to the E/E data base for law enforcement agencies.

Spain

1.
Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

We are working with the API since 2007. API data is requested to airlines and shipping companies. Currently, an average of 220 air carriers and 10 sea carriers send information to the Spanish border control authorities.

API data is received in the Secretary of State for Security and transferred to the Spanish Police Data Centre where all passengers are checked through national and international police data bases. Those possible hits are sent to the airport where this passenger is going through the control booths. The whole process is totally automatic and takes about 8 minutes since the companies send the information until data with possible hits is received in the respective airports.

2.
Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

We implemented e-gates in Madrid-Barajas and Barcelona-El Prat airports in May 2010. The Spanish ABC System consists of two modules (identification and access) and two diferent configurations (one step-process or mantrap and two step-process or single door) both of them are reversible.
We make use of the two biometrics inserted in the chip of the UE/EEA/CH electronic passports and Spanish ID cards, facial and fingerprint recognition. UE/EEA/CH citizens, holders of e-passports and Spanish with eDNI, 18 or over years old are elegible to use the ABC system.

3.
Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

We do not have any RTP.

4.
Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

The main challenges for us in a near future will be the interoperability of all systems use for border checks, including VIS, ABC, API and manual booths.

5.
Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Cooperation is important when speaking about technical implementation. Working Groups on different issues, such as ABC or API are already defining guidelines and best practices in the use of these systems under the Frontex coordination. The idea is to standardize and harmonize these technical innovations in the interests of users.

6.
Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

Decisions at airports regarding admissible or not admissible third country nationals have to be taken in a short time, so the more information and the better communication between Member States have it would support border control authorities to have more elements when making such decision.

7.
Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The main purpose of RTP is to facilitate border checks to frequent and bona fide travellers. So in this regard, RTP could be an advantage for both passengers (no queues, less time for border checks) and border control authorities (low or no risk passengers and less human resources).

8.
Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

The most important benefit for the EU countries would be to have a common data base. Sharing this data base we would be able to know who is crossing our borders, where crossing took place, how many of them leave Schengen area and how many remain inside irregularly.

Sweden

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

No. The main reason for not implementing such innovations is that the passenger flow at Swedish BCP:s is not high enough that it would lead to increased effeciency or cost-benefit in order to motivate a reduced number of border police officers.

Another reason against is concern that the number of wrongly granted entries could rise among persons using falsified documents and among impostors.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

No. See answer to question 1.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

No.

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

See answer to question 1. One challenge is related to the difficulties to exchange PKI, i. e. to read the biometric information in the chip.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Yes. Practical cooperation is always useful. Exhaustive information on lessons learnt by the MS who have already introduced e-gates would be much appreciated.

However, the relatively small passenger flow mentioned in question 1 still remains unaffected.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

As already mentioned, Sweden sees little or no advantages in introducing for instance e-gates due to the relatively small numbers of travellers from third countries. As a consequence, if Sweden does not introduce them, parts of the effects envisioned in the smart border communication will not happen. However, again due to the minor flow, travellers eligeble for RTP not being able to use e-gates, will most likely not notice any difference.

See also answers to question 7 and 8.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

New systems must be based on actual needs, proportionate in relation to expected results, accompanied by adequate data protection including protection of personal integrity and cost effective. Most importantly, it must be clear that the systems will make border management more effective and that they are cost effective in relation to the added value. Bearing in mind the situation of the European economy, we must ask ourselves how to best use our limited resources.

Certainly there are benefits for travellers in RTP at major BCP:s (and for these Member States as well) being able to go through the process more swiftly. It will also have a positive effect on other travellers not having to wait for RTPs to go through the same controls as themselves. However, the passenger flow at Swedish BCP:s is not high enough that it would lead to increased effeciency or cost-benefit in order to motivate a reduced number of border police officers. See also answer to question 8.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

Sweden has a more positive view on this system. It could, among other issues, allow for an improved possibility to monitor if persons actually exits the Schengen area. It will also take care of the problems that arise today if a traveller, by any reason, lacks an entry or exit stamp.

But, Sweden is not sure that an entry/exit system and a registered traveler programme in practice will lead to more efficient operations, due only to the fact that we will know how many overstayers there are in the EU. Maybe there is a better way to spend that money.

See also answer to question 7.

Switzerland

1. Have you implemented innovations in border management at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to do this in the near future? If so, could you please specify these innovations?

The Kantonspolizei Zurich has implemented in Zurich airport a system to gather photos of presumed mala-fide passengers directly at the gates and to store them for 30 days in a database. This system helps to identify afterwards undocumented passengers (no documents and/or flight tickets) with facial recognition software.
By the end of 2011 the Federal Office for Migration has implemented an IT project to automate the processing of API data. Initially, only a few departure locations will be subject to the reporting procedure. Therefore, only certain air carriers will be obliged to report passengers. Once experience with the API system has been gathered, the duty to report will be gradually extended to other routes.

2. Do you currently have e-gates at air, sea or land borders within your country or are you planning to introduce these in the near future? If so, what type of biometrics do you make use of and are there any eligibility restrictions?

There are currently no e-gates at the external borders of Switzerland and there are no plans to introduce e-gates in the near future. At Zurich International Airport a six-month pilot project with ABC (automated border control) gates was conducted in 2010/2011 (1 December 2010 - 1 June 2011). This was a joint project between Kantonspolizei Zürich and Flughafen Zürich AG and open to citizens of Switzerland, the EEA and the European Union holding a valid electronic passport. The analysis showed that technology is not yet mature enough, that quite a number of gates is necessary for economies of scale and that it is better to await the developments and decisions among the Schengen states concerning smart borders before important investments are made.

3. Do you currently have a programme for registered travellers within your country? If so, please describe the programme including the specifications for enrolment and the type of biometrics used?

No

4. Please identify the biggest challenges your country is currently facing in relation to innovation border management?

Four challenges are important: ensure first of all a good coordination between the various competent services in Switzerland, promote secondly an interoperability between the existing systems (for examples SIS, VIS, already existing ABC gates) and the new instruments of the smart border initivative, three, to guarantee a high level of data protection. Finally ,according to the IBM concept, two out of four control filters take place abroad (i.e. consulates and airports). It means that the development of new technological instruments and systems will not only deploy some effects at the geographical external border of the Schengen area, but also in third countries, especially on the consular representations. The implementation of new technologies and systems abroad has to be closely coordinated with the national Ministries of Foreign affairs as well as in regard to the framework of data registration, security and transmission.

5. Could practical co-operation on an EU-level or the adoption of EU policies in relation to the smart borders communication in your opinion contribute to addressing these challenges? If so, please specify how?

Yes, precise rules on these questions are expected. As mentioned under 4., there is going to be necessary to determine which kind of system is allowed in which country concerning the registration of persons and the transmission of their data (RTP / data cryptography, Internet security, activities on the territory of third countries, etc.). We expect that some general studies and evaluations will be conducted at EU-level.

6. Please specify your expectations of the smart border communication of the European Commission, what do you envisage to be the most important outcomes for your country?

All questions open to divergent interpretations must be resolved to avoid difficulties during the implementation phase of the smart borders instruments. The envisaged projects are important and complex and therefore need very solid foundations.

7. Please specify your view on the introduction of a Registered Traveller Programme for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

Facilitate border crossings for bona-fide third country nationals and at the same time to guarantee a high level of security. This hopefully allows to concentrate limited border control resources on mala-fide passengers and to cope with the increasing number of border crossings in the next years.
Because of the very high development cost of the RTP, a solid cost-benefit analysis will be essential. Finally, it represent a concrete signal to third countries that the Schengen system is serious about the idea of facilitating the movement of persons ; it can help having the controlling side of the system accepted by the third countries concerned.

8. Please specify your view on the introduction of an Entry/ Exit System for the EU, what do you consider the most important benefits for your country and the EU?

An EES allows monitoring the authorised stay and a more evidence-based policymaking (for example with regard to visa policy and visa facilitation). But more important, it will help identify irregularly staying third country nationals within the territory of the Schengen states.