



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 16 June 2014  
(OR. en)**

**6015/14  
ADD 1 REV 2**

**LIMITE**

**SIRIS 9  
COMIX 77**

**NOTE**

---

From: Presidency

To: Working Party for Schengen Matters (SIS/SIRENE) / (Mixed Committee - EU/Iceland/Norway and Switzerland/Liechtenstein)

---

Subject: Categorisation of missing minors alerts in SIS II  
- Replies from Member States<sup>1</sup>

---

## **AUSTRIA**

In general we welcome the approach of extending the code table in respect of missing persons.

Since any change in the code tables also has a major impact on Member States' national arrangements, this step has to be planned very carefully and the added value it confers needs to be evaluated<sup>1</sup>.

1. As a first step we want a clear statement of who will be responsible for analyses and statistics at the European level. We would mention for example the statistics from the SIRENE forms, where the numbers will be gathered and put into a document, but no analyses made. This has no added value. We therefore want it to be stated who will be in charge of analysis in this matter.

2. We would like to present additional areas of our national application which could be also a point for the ongoing discussion:

- a) Person is missing from:
  - Place of work
  - Other country (abroad)
  - Hotel/accommodation
  - Hospital
  - School
  - Other
  - Welfare centres for minors/adults
  - Asylum seekers (unaccompanied)
  - Flat/house
  - Countryside
  - Lake/river
- b) Circumstances:
  - Other public places
  - Illness
  - Helpless
  - Human trafficking
  - Minor – taken from a third person
  - Minor – taken from a parent
  - Minor – request coming from an entitled person (in accordance with national law)
  - Minor – unauthorised absence
  - Minor –missing for an extended period
  - Other
  - Suicide suspected
  - Accident suspected
  - Criminal offence suspected
  - Adult – free will
  - Death (not a criminal case)

## **BELGIUM**

The proposal of the Greek Presidency was analysed by the Belgian missing persons unit. Their main concern is that in case of a high risk missing person information can be sent to other concerned countries in order to increase the chances of a hit. For this purpose we already have the M form for high risk missing persons (Manual point 5.5) in which the circumstances of the disappearance can be explained and by means of which active measures can be requested from some or all countries.

On the other hand, the Belgian SIRENE Bureau tried to compare the costs and benefits implications of the Presidency proposal.

On the benefits side, we agree that this proposal would help us to comprehend the reality of the situation in relation to missing minors (point 3), to detect modi operandi, to determine whether cooperation is needed at national, European or international level and to provide correct statistics (point 6). But we have doubts regarding how the addition of these categories in a field in SIS II can help us to make a reliable guess at where the missing children could be (point 3), to determine the type and extent of a search, to narrow down the area where a minor might be found or to narrow down the group of suspects (point 6). Unless we understand this proposal incorrectly, if the category of a missing minor is added into the SIS, this information will only be viewed at the moment of the hit, in other words when there is no longer any need to search for the person. Therefore in our opinion this proposal does not help during the phase before the hit (if for example active measures must be taken by certain countries, this can be requested in an M form). We also do not know in how many cases this would provide real help for the police officer making the hit, since he already knows the action to be taken (location or protection) and he must always contact the SIRENE office to receive more information. So the conclusion is that we understand the general overall benefits, but we find it less easy to see the benefits on a case by case basis.

We must therefore compare these benefits to the costs (financial and workload). Concerning foreign alerts, we cannot at present yet estimate what the financial costs would be of making these categories visible in our system when checked by a police officer in the field. As regards Belgian alerts for missing persons we have no automatic flow from our national database to the SIS, so our operators would have to categorise these minors manually in the SIS. Since we have a lot of alerts for missing minors (SIRENE Belgium receives notifications of every new national alert for a missing minor and is obliged by law to make an SIS alert for every one of them, even when the police service concerned does not actively request this SIS-alert) and since in many cases we do not have the information that would allow us to choose the correct category, this would mean quite an increase in the workload for our SIRENE operators.

The provisional conclusion for the Belgian SIRENE office is that we have reservations, that we would need to be more convinced of the benefits, and that they could outweigh the costs, before being able to support this proposal.

On the content of the different categories we have the following remarks to make. It is very important that each type of disappearance can be put into a category and into one category only. Otherwise there will be a different treatment by different operators, which would make statistics less correct. We must also be careful not to put minors into the wrong category, so the categories must be clear and well separated.

1. Please explain the category of ‘disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances’ in more detail. We have difficulty in understanding this. Can you give concrete examples? When a child gets bad grades at school and is afraid of his parents and runs away: is this a ‘psychological reason’ so that it falls in this category? (Or is it ‘intentional evasion’?) We suggest that the title of this category be changed so that it is immediately clear to every operator.
2. ‘Abduction by a relative’: we suggest that this category should be broadened to include every relative, and not only parents and grandparents, e.g. also uncle, aunt, biological father, etc.
3. ‘Abduction’: we do not understand the difference from ‘abduction by a relative’, since both categories aim at abduction by ‘persons entitled to look after the minor’. We would therefore like to know what is meant by this category. We would prefer ‘abduction’ to refer to ‘criminal abduction’, to provide a clear distinction. With the current categorization, we would like to ask in which category an abduction by a person who is totally unknown to the minor must be classified.
4. ‘Trafficking in human beings’: we would like to know why this is limited to ‘persons entitled to look after the minor’. Under the current categorisation, we would like to know in which category trafficking in human beings by a person who is totally unknown to the minor must be classified. Our suggestion is to broaden this to every type of perpetrator.
5. ‘Other’: we agree with this category, but there is a practical problem, because it would mean that this is a free field. Will it be in English? Is this intended to be visible in the field in every country or only visible to the SIRENE office?
6. We suggest that there is also a category ‘not enough certainty in the circumstances’. It can be dangerous to classify someone into a category when one is not totally certain that this is the right one.
7. We wonder whether it would be a good idea to have a separate category for foreign fighters. When a minor wants to go to Syria for example an alert for a missing person will have priority over an alert for discreet or specific checks.

## **CYPRUS**

Concerning the suggested categories, it must be ensured that in the categories of “abduction by a relative”, “abduction” and “other”, the level of risk to the safety of the minor is easily identified, so that the end user can proceed with the appropriate action depending on whether the case is High Risk or Low Risk.

For example there may be cases where there is “abduction” by a person who is not considered a relative and yet this person may be only acting in order to take the minor to the father or mother. If this is the case then there is a low risk to the safety of the child.

On the other hand there may be cases where there is “abduction by a relative” and yet the minor may be facing a high risk.

Furthermore, by using the “other” category there is a risk of downgrading the seriousness of the case and the level of the risk.

In conclusion, for the end user to know immediately whether the case is “High Risk” or “Low Risk” in relation to the categories of “abduction by a relative”, “abduction” and “other”, the action to be taken should include the indications “High Risk” or “Low Risk”.

## **DENMARK**

We can support the Presidency's initiative and we also agree that there may be a need to add more “Reasons” and “Action to be taken” codes to Article 32 alerts on missing minors.

With regard to the 6 new proposed categories we believe that the first category might be changed to “Disappearance owing to psychological reasons”.

If a minor disappears because of an accident or some kind of physical reason we would still consider that the disappearance arise from a mental imbalance caused by an accident or a physical reason.

## FINLAND

Regarding the document on categorization of missing minors the proposed change could improve the effectiveness of the alerts especially in cases where the disappearance of a minor is related to a crime. However it must be understood that the action to be taken as a result of a hit must be the same regardless of the category. The categorization should serve only as basis for **additional action** of the authorities of the executing country. For example categorizing a disappearance as "Other" should not lead to the alert being dealt with less urgency than the other categories. In this regard it should also be borne in mind that the basis for the initial categorization may well change as the case evolves. For example a case which at first seems "intentional evasion" may well turn out to be "trafficking in human beings" or vice versa. Editing existing alerts is naturally the duty of the alerting authorities but it should be clear also to the executing country that the categorization will often be based on the initial assessment of the case.

As to the proposed categories the difference between "Abduction by a relative" and "Abduction" could perhaps be described in more detail. The categories should be clear and involve as little room for interpretation as possible. If there is reason to suspect crime the possibility of linking alerts should be utilized more frequently.

## FRANCE

Within the European area of freedom and security, the issue of protecting missing minors is a sensitive matter that mobilises the law enforcement authorities both for searches and for dealing with located persons. Current statistics on the number of alerts in SIS II, as cited by the Greek Presidency in its proposal, show the scale of the issue.

The legal basis for alerts on missing persons, whether they are of age or minors, is Article 32 of Decision 2007/533/JHA, which distinguishes between two types of action: placing missing persons under protection or ascertaining their whereabouts.

On principle, the French authorities believe that protection measures should be applied when the missing person is located (reason for request 4, action to be taken 5) in all missing minor cases, regardless of the reason for issuing the alert.

At national level, alerts on minors are automatically transmitted from the wanted persons database to SIS II, without any action by the SIRENE Bureau in this regard.

The French wanted persons database only contains the following categories of minors:

- minors who have run away (with a distinction in relation to minors reported missing by the institutions which have custody of them);
- minors who have been kidnapped or abducted (no distinction as to whether or not this is carried out by a parent);
- minors recorded as prohibited from leaving the country. This category primarily concerns the civil phase of disputes relating to the custody of minors.

Only alerts in the category of kidnapped minors regularly lead to additional information being transmitted via M forms, which are only sent to the countries directly concerned. In France, such information is processed immediately by the Central Office for the Prevention of Violence against Persons (OCRVP) of the Central Directorate of the Criminal Police.

The alerts themselves contain very little useful information (no indication of how to proceed, information on location, etc.). Under these conditions, statistical analysis of alerts on minors in SIS II does not seem capable of providing operational guidance for law enforcement authorities. Categorising missing minors would not change this fact.

However, France strongly welcomes the Greek Presidency's proposal to use the ST007 table to specify the category of missing minors.

Such operational information would be useful to police services which locate a missing minor and would enable them to adapt their approach accordingly. This is precisely the aim of the "related remarks" section of table ST007.

The technical solution proposed by the Presidency seems easy to implement and has the advantage of being relatively inexpensive.

As indicated by the Commission at the SIS/SIRENE meeting of 5 February 2014, any categorisation system implemented must be simple enough to be adapted to the variety of national situations. **Thus, the French authorities propose that just two categories be created, distinguishing between minors who have run away and minors who have been kidnapped.**

This simple categorisation would offer police officers in the field a better understanding of the situation by immediately clarifying the background of the case.

More specific information on the context of the runaway or abduction case would have to be provided using M forms. This is the added value offered by the SIRENE Bureaux after a missing person has been located.

In conclusion, the French authorities support the Greek Presidency's proposal to use the "related remarks" section of table ST007 as a technical tool for categorising missing minors recorded in SIS II.

It is proposed that the following relevant categories be added to that table:

- minor who has run away
- minor who has been kidnapped

## **GERMANY**

The Greek Presidency asked the Member States to examine the possibility of categorising missing minors so that the competent investigating authorities, after consulting the Schengen Information System (SIS) and after a relevant hit, can be provided with possible indications which can lead them to ascertain the whereabouts of minors, isolate potential criminal groups or pinpoint their location.

A search in the German police information system (INPOL) revealed that there were alerts on around 11 000 missing people as of 31 December 2012. Some 2 400 of these alerts were also the subject of a SIS alert on minors. Statistical surveys from 2012 showed that almost all cases of missing persons between the ages of 14 and 17 – the majority of cases – were resolved within six weeks because the missing persons were picked up again. This proportion is constant compared with previous years.



In the final analysis, this means that of the above German SIS alerts for missing minors only about 10 remain stored as "long-term" missing persons.

Unfortunately, the INPOL police information system provides no background information on the missing person alerts in question. For that purpose the departments responsible would have to be contacted. This would involve a considerable effort in terms of evaluation and analysis, which, given the small number of unresolved cases, i.e. where the alert has existed longer than six weeks, would be out of proportion.

In any case, the competent authorities immediately contact the German SIRENE Bureau in all cases in which there are indications regarding the possible whereabouts of the missing minors, the circumstances of the disappearance are known and when they are presented with investigative lines of enquiry and information on the perpetrator or group of perpetrators. The German SIRENE Bureau forwards the details and information to the SIRENE Bureaux of the relevant Member States.

On the basis of this information on minors who are the subject of alerts in Germany the German delegation sees no compelling need to categorise SIS alerts on missing minors.

Subject to a cost analysis regarding the technical implementation (introduction of new code values), Germany would be prepared to consider the initiative provided that other States can derive added value and benefits from categorisation.

## **HUNGARY**

Referring to the document 6015/14 SIRIS 9 COMIX 77, the Hungarian delegation would like to support the proposal of the Greek Presidency. We believe that missing minors are highly endangered persons, having either run away from their homes or been abducted by their relatives. According to our national legislation, if a missing minor is found in Hungary she/he should be transported to a Child Care Institute and the Hungarian authorities should start organising repatriation as soon as possible. Of course these are not closed institutes, so unfortunately the minors can escape, but we have no other measures available in these cases. If new international rules (for example for the categories) are adopted, we will also have to amend our laws.

If there is any technical change in the central system, or the national system, which also needs development, we would like to attract the Presidency's attention to the incidental expenses which may occur, given that in Hungary, for example, we have a limited budget for development.

## **IRELAND**

An Garda Síochána categorises missing persons as high, medium or low risk. The level of risk is assigned when the investigator answers a series of questions on the PULSE (the main IT system for police incident recording). The risk category determines the response from An Garda Síochána. This risk level is fluid and is continuously reviewed. For example when a missing person is assessed as 'high risk', this indicates that there are significant reasons to believe that the missing person is in danger, either due to their own vulnerability or because it is suspected that they may have been a victim of crime. This category will be lowered as the perceived level of risk to the missing person decreases.

An Garda Síochána also records abductions on PULSE under three types of incident code;

- false imprisonment
- parental abduction
- abduction by stranger/other

We have approximately 8 000 reports of missing persons a year and about 5 000 of those are children. In 2013, there were 5 980 high risk, 694 medium risk and 1 079 low risk missing persons reported/investigated by An Garda Síochána. Last year there were 29 reports of abductions, of which a majority were parental abductions and resolved in a short period of time. There were 90 false imprisonments, but an analysis of the ages of the injured parties is not readily available so it cannot be confirmed how many were under 18 years of age.

The SIRENE Hellenic proposal is to introduce a number of categories for missing children notifications through the SIS II system as follows;

- intentional evasion
- disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances
- abduction of relative

- abduction
- human trafficking
- other

In general, Ireland does not have an issue with the concept of using a new category to improve the use of the SIS II system in dealing with missing children. However, as outlined above, the An Garda Síochána IT systems categorise missing persons in a different, less specific way, so no statistical information is available in the format required to support the rationale for specific category groups. We would expect that other Member States are in a similar position, so this could pose problems for some MS when trying to populate SIS II missing person records with this new data.

Having said that, we offer the following observations on the proposed categories in the hope that it will help your proposal further;

- **“intentional evasion”** - Speaking specifically about children, we believe this term would benefit from rewording. An innocent child may not have the capacity to 'intentionally evade' a scenario. We feel (if it's not too much of a colloquialism) 'runaway child' would be a more suitable term as it indicates that the child has left on his/her own accord.
- **“disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances”** - Again, speaking specifically about children, we think this term should be further clarified. What is the definition of an unforeseeable circumstance? Would suspicion of being lost at sea for example be regarded as an unforeseeable circumstance?
- **“abduction of relative”** - our legal system words this as 'abduction by a parent'. When anyone other than a parent takes a child it is considered under other legislation and would fit into the category “abduction by stranger/other”.
- **“abduction”** – we see this as corresponding to our own category of “abduction by stranger/other” so we see no problem with this.
- **“human trafficking”** - no issue with this.
- **“other”** - no issue with this, although we would recommend adding an explanatory note to a free text field on the alert if possible.

## **ITALY**

The Italian delegation strongly supports the content of the document presented by the Presidency. Italy is also in favour of a categorisation of missing minor alerts in order to provide a more detailed overview of the missing minor alerts stored in the system.

Italy considers that the list of categories presented in the document may need amendments but does not need to be supplemented.

Within the pilot project “VIGILA ET PROTEGE”, a first workshop is scheduled for June 2014 in Rome, where first results of study visits and an analysis of the EU scenario will be presented.

We believe it is worth sharing these results with the MS and relevant stakeholders in the EU institutions (COM – EU LISA –GSC), before giving a final comment on this proposal.

The future Italian Presidency would like to express its wish to continue the effort of the current Presidency in this sense, presenting a final, shared, proposal at the HOS meeting in Rome in the second semester of 2014.

## **LATVIA**

Please be informed that Latvia in general supports the document 6015/14 (Categorisation of missing minors alerts in SIS II) since categorisation of disappearances could be very helpful for the SIS end users in a case if minors are traced. However there are some details in the proposed categories which require further clarification.

We understand the category "abduction by a relative" to refer to a situation when there are no visible threats to the minor. In the categories "abduction" and "trafficking of human beings" there is a high risk of the child being harmed. In those cases, it is not important who is the abductor – an unknown person or a close relative.

Taking into account the above, we would like to propose that the definitions of "abduction" and "trafficking in human beings" be changed. The definitions should put more emphasis on the high risk to the child, without specifying who exactly the abductors are.

# LIECHTENSTEIN

- Whether the categories put forward meet the goal pursued or whether they should be amended and/or supplemented.

SIRENE Liechtenstein agrees that the topic of new categories could make an important and interesting contribution to police work.

Proposed categories:

- Disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances – ok
  - Intentional evasion – ok
  - Abduction by a relative – ok
  - Abduction – ok
  - Trafficking in human beings – ok
  - Other – remove this category
- A proposal for the technical procedure to be followed for adding the new categories to SIS II.
    - Technical solution – alternative measures to the proposal ST007 Person related remarks: Add the proposed categories (all categories are offences) to the list ST028 Type of offence.
    - Change the business rule for SIS 2, B-WP-R-01 ,Type of offence :  
Current version - mandatory attribute only if "Reason for request" refers to Art. 26 Decision) – add Art. 32 Decision, Code 004 missing person (minors)

# POLAND

Following the last SIS/SIRENE WP that took place on 5 February and the Presidency's request for comments concerning 6015/14 SIRIS 9 COMIX 77 on *Categorisation of missing minors alerts in SIS II*, we can say that Poland supports this initiative as well as the categories of disappearances suggested in the document; however, we have had some difficulty in understanding the categories of *Abduction* and *Trafficking in human beings* in relation to *Abduction by a relative*, in the context of our national law.

We wonder if in the explanation of *Abduction*, instead of "cases where minors are removed **by** their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them (...)" and in the explanation of *Trafficking in human beings*, instead of "the removal of minors **by** their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them", **there should be** "cases where minors are removed **FROM** their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them (...)" and "the removal of minors **FROM** their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them" respectively.

Or perhaps in the explanation of *Abduction* "their parents" should be deleted so that then we would have "cases where minors are removed by guardians or by persons entitled to look after them, and are wrongfully taken and retained, but which do not come under the category "Abduction by a relative" or "Trafficking in human beings".

We are a little bit lost and it would be appreciated if you could provide us with some additional information/examples that would make the explanations clearer for us and allow us to relate them to our national law.

## **PORTUGAL**

Following the presentation by Greece of a proposal on the categorization of missing minors alerts in SIS II (doc. 6015/14) and having the opportunity to read and analyze the contributions made by the other MS (set out in doc. 6015/14 ADD 1 REV 1) Portugal would like to contribute to the discussion on the issue with the following observations.

First of all PT welcomes and supports the Greek proposal on the "Categorization of missing minors alerts in SIS II" and considers it to be a good tool for collecting and analyzing uniform data concerning missing minors in all MS. It also regards it as a sound instrument for the SIS end-users when detecting hits on missing minors, helping them to better ascertain the action to be taken about the minor him or herself (as France also mentions). It also helps the relevant authorities to establish which person(s) may be involved with him/her, since the request for supplementary information from the exchange of forms between SIRENEs can take a long time.

Regarding the 6 categories of disappearance proposed by the abovementioned document<sup>1</sup>, PT considers that, from the explanation given, there is no big difference between “**Abduction by a relative**” and “**Abduction**”. All types of relative could be added in the “**Abduction by a relative**” category. So “**Abduction by a relative**” would be the removal of minors by their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them, including not only parents and grand-parents, but also uncle, aunt, biological father, etc., i.e. family in the wider sense. And “**Abduction**” would be used only in a criminal abduction, as the Belgian proposal mentions.

Also Portugal is of the view that “**Trafficking in human beings**” should not be limited to cases of “removal of minors by their parents, guardians or by persons entitled to look after them”. In our opinion, this particular classification has to do with the purposes of the removal, not the person who did it. These cases are classified as they are because the children are removed for purposes of work or sexual exploitation, or any other kind of activity that involves the exploitation of minors.

Regarding “**Intentional evasion**”, PT could foresee this classification covering cases where minors intentionally leave their parents’ house or the place where they live, including cases where minors run away from refugee or asylum seekers centres.

As regards the “**Disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances**” category, PT considers that this is not easy to understand.

Regarding the general “**Others**” category when creating this particular alert, all MS should describe them precisely in English.

And finally, PT would like this categorization also to provide for “**To prevent child abduction**” cases, as Switzerland proposes. This would, in our opinion, lead to a change to Article 32 of the SIS II Decision.

Another possibility, as proposed by Cyprus and Ireland, is in some cases to add the expression “**high or low risk**”.

---

<sup>1</sup> a) Disappearance owing to unforeseeable circumstances; b) Intentional evasion; c) Abduction by a relative; d) Abduction; e) Trafficking in human beings; f) other.

And, as mentioned by Finland, it is possible that the categorization of these kinds of existing alert may be changed according to how the assessment of the concrete case evolves.

So, PT is of the opinion that the categorization of minors agreed by all MS should be added to ST 007\_PERSONRELATEDREMARKS. Given the technical and the costs of the implementation of these changes, PT also agrees with the Swiss proposal for involving the MS N-SIS.

## **SLOVAKIA**

In recent years, the Slovak police authorities have searched for approximately 1 800 minors a year. Of this number, the great majority of children are tracked down in a short period of time. By way of illustration, as of January 2, 2014, when there were 36 111 missing minors recorded in the SIS, only 73 searches for children were created by Slovakia. This number represented 0.2 % of the total number of alerts of this kind in the SIS II.

In our filing system for searches for missing persons, searches for minors are divided into two categories – children aged from 0 to 14 years and juvenile persons aged from 15 to 18 years.

Our authorities responsible for searches for missing minors do not identify with the assertion that “a lack of precise and full knowledge of the nature of the disappearances means that the competent authorities are unable to take action or cooperate at national and European level to find the children and track down and arrest those responsible or the organised rings involved in criminal activities in this field“. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the competent Slovak authorities know the reason for the disappearance already from the outset of the search. On that basis the police are able to take adequate steps and measures in the search process in order to find the missing minors as soon as possible“.

As for categories of disappearances, the most frequent are cases of minors who intentionally leave their homes or, more precisely, the places where they live. In such cases, they are usually tracked down in a short period of time or they return home of their own free will. From our point of view, other categories proposed in the document are of a minor character.



Slovakia is of the opinion that introduction of the proposed categories would serve above all to provide unified statistical data within the Member States. In addition, introduction of the categories would require a technical intervention in our system which it is not currently possible to carry out due to a lack of financial means.

On the other hand, we can envisage use of the proposed categorisations on condition that insertion of categories into the system is not defined as mandatory and that categories will be added to individual alerts after consideration of the seriousness of the case.

## **SPAIN**

We consider the Greek proposal interesting and useful. We agree that there is a lack of information regarding cases of missing minors and it is obvious that there are different circumstances of disappearances and multiple ways of investigation, depending on each case.

As the Presidency stated during the meeting, the idea is first of all to discuss the usefulness and feasibility of the proposal and then, if there is common agreement among Member States, to start discussions on classification and categorisation. That is why for the present we are only expressing our support for this initiative and are not putting forward any ideas on categorisation.

## **SWEDEN**

The Schengen Information System (SIS) is an excellent tool for collecting information from the Member States concerning the reasons behind children's disappearances in order to get an overall view of the situation. Sweden therefore supports the suggestion that there should be a common categorisation in the SIS for missing children.

**Comments regarding categories:** Sweden is of the opinion that the distinction between “Abduction by a relative” and “Abduction” is unclear. In the category “Trafficking in human beings”, Sweden suggests including also persons other than those mentioned (parents, guardians, other persons entitled to look after them). Sweden would also like to discuss in more detail whether or not it is preferable to send M-forms if the category “Other” is recorded by a member state in the SIS. The M-form does not contribute to the statistics and the sending of M-forms is not in line with efforts which have been made to reduce the workload of the SIRENE offices.

Sweden suggests another two categories, i.e. disappearances due to honour-related crimes (this category requires a common definition) and children who have disappeared from refugee centres. Both these suggested categories can be included in the categories proposed by the Presidency. However, there might be a need for further breakdown of the categories in order to obtain even more relevant statistics. Sweden is of the opinion that there is a need for further discussions regarding which categories should be recorded in SIS.

Sweden supports the technical solution suggested by the Presidency.

## **SWITZERLAND**

In Switzerland, entering any Art. 32 alert related to unaccompanied minors is subject to the parental/custodial care and repatriation information (person in charge, repatriation cost covered) being obtained. Moreover, the competent authority entering such an alert is asked to provide information about any knowledge and details relating to the minor’s disappearance. SIRENE Switzerland will transmit this additional information to the Member States (via an M-form).

Any improvement for investigation purposes, or that helps to record and analyse such data in a uniform and harmonised way is highly appreciated. Switzerland supports the aim of the new classification and categorisation suggested by the Greek delegation. Yet the following questions and areas ought to be considered as well:

## **1. Categories of disappearances:**

### 1.1. Difference between “abduction by a relative” vs. “abduction” not clear:

Please specify what is meant (in the description of abduction) by “and are wrongfully taken and retained”.

### 1.2. “Alert to prevent child abduction” (e.g. child may not leave the territory of the issuing Member State) should also be considered and added to the categories of disappearance.

## **2. Change in categories:**

How will any change of category be accounted for statistically (e.g. if an alert is initially categorised as “intentional evasion” and, during investigations, proves to be “trafficking in human beings”)?

## **3. Measures to be taken ought to be defined per category as well:**

As mentioned above, the issuing Member State/competent authority is required to obtain the parental/custodial care and repatriation information (person in charge, repatriation cost covered) when issuing the alert.

## **4. Technical implementation and time-frame resulting from national implications:**

With regard to the technical implementation suggested by the Greek delegation, each Member State's N-SIS group ought to be involved in order to analyse the national implications.

## THE NETHERLANDS

The Dutch delegation is of the opinion that the Presidency's initiative in making a proposal for categorisation of missing minors recorded according to Article 32 of Decision 2007/533/JHA is a good addition to the SIS II system with a view to assisting law enforcement authorities in the decision making process.

In the Netherlands the aliens police also have a category of single minors of "third countries" who have applied for asylum and who then during the period of this procedure disappear from our country and seek asylum in (an)other (European) country(ies). They are "shopping" for asylum.

In the Netherlands we define this category as "the single asylum-seeking minor" and such minors are recorded in SIS II under Article 32 with the aim of the action to be taken being to ascertain their whereabouts.

Therefore another possible category of disappearance of minors could also be:

*"The Single Asylum seeking Minor" = Single minors of so-called third countries moving from one country to another, seeking asylum.*