



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 8 February 2002 (20.02)
(OR. dk,de,el,en,es,it,pt,sv)**

6084/02

LIMITE

**VISA 24
COMIX 95**

NOTE

from :	General Secretariat
to :	Visa Working Party
Subject :	Compilation of replies to the questionnaire on the database of visas (15577/01 VISA 158 COMIX 806)

Delegations will find attached the replies from Denmark, Germany, Greece, Spain, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom and Norway on the above-mentioned subject. (the numbering follows the numbering of the questionnaire)

The General Secretariat will draft a summary document once all contributions have been received.

DENMARK

2. Objectives

In Denmark's opinion, the primary aim of the database of visas should be to distinguish better between the identity of the holder and the carrier of the visa at the external border checkpoint or at immigration or police checkpoints. The database should also assist in the identification and documentation of undocumented illegals and therefore in the readmission of illegal residents, facilitate application of the Dublin Convention on asylum, contribute to combating terrorism and organised crime and contribute to the improvement of local consular cooperation.

3. Content

As a point of departure, the database of visas should cover both visas issued and visas refused. It would also be useful if it could include visas annulled, revoked or extended, the completed visa application form and details of the applicant's name, date of birth and place of birth. Finally, we consider it to be extremely important from the point of view of accurately identifying the visa holder that the database should contain biometric information, including photographs and fingerprints.

On the other hand, Denmark does not consider it necessary for the database to include visa-stickers misappropriated or lost, as these are already recorded in the Schengen Information System pursuant to Article 100 of the Schengen Convention.

Furthermore, in view of the large quantity of information contained in the database, Denmark considers that the headings of the application form should be used to state their order of importance in terms of need to be included.

4. Input into the database

Information should be entered into the database by both consular posts and central visa authorities in order to ensure that records are kept of all visas issued and refused.

5. Access for consultation

In Denmark's opinion, it is essential for the applicability of the database that all the authorities involved have an opportunity to consult it; this includes consular posts, central visa authorities, checkpoints at external borders, police departments, immigration departments and asylum offices.

6. Period during which data should be retained in the database before being archived (validity of the data)

Given the extremely large quantity of data involved, and with a view to monitoring visa shopping, consideration could be given to differentiating such data so that visas refused are retained for longer than visas granted.

Consideration could also be given to differentiating between nationalities, so that certain nationalities are retained for longer than others on the basis of a risk assessment; the same could be contemplated for those nationalities whose authorities pose difficulties for documentation.

However, at the same time it should be considered whether the use of modern storage and search techniques renders such a distinction superfluous.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

It would obviously be desirable for consular posts to have access to databases of genuine travel documents and false documents with a view to improving the basis for assessing documents which are submitted. However, this may be expected to increase the workload on such posts.

Denmark does not consider there to be any obvious need for consular posts to have direct access to the SIS list of inadmissible persons.

8. Communication system

The feasibility study should be extended to the communication system between consular posts and the database and between consular posts of the same city and country, with a view *inter alia* to consultation on visas with an immigration risk and the detection of false documents.

For the sake of security and identification, it would also be beneficial if the network could allow the transmission and receipt of images.

The communication system between consular posts and the database is currently the competence and responsibility of each State; this would also seem to be the best solution for a future joint database of visas.

9. SIS/Database of visas

In Denmark's opinion, the question of whether it would be most appropriate to incorporate the database into the SIS or to design it separately depends on a closer analysis of the content of the database and clarification of the functioning and capacity of a future SIS II. However, it obviously seems best to work within an existing system.

10. Data protection

As things stand at present, it is impossible to say whether special data-protection rules will be required, or whether adequate coverage is provided by the EU Directive on data protection (Council Directive 95/46/EC), or whether there should be a similar system as for the SIS.

However, in principle it must be ensured that the necessary technical and organisational safeguards are implemented in order to prevent data from being accidentally or unlawfully deleted, lost or damaged, or from being intercepted by unauthorised persons or misused. Similarly, employees who process data must comply with the security requirements concerning the handling of personal data.

11. VISION consultation network

Consideration should be given to combining a visa database with the VISION consultation network.

12. Comments on technical aspects

With regard to security requirements, the communication network should be encrypted.

Visa statistics for 2000 and 2001 are enclosed.

In response to the last question, we can inform you that Danish visa application forms in paper form are either stored at the representations or sent to the central aliens authorities to be stored for a minimum of five years. Electronic data contained in the national case-handling system is stored for ten years, as agreed with the Danish National Record Office.

Percentiler i sagsbehandlingstiderne for visumansøgninger

afgjort i perioden 01JAN2000- 31dec2000

Kørselsdato: 17jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Afghanistan	58	32	40	43	98	37
Albanien	35	12	227	10	262	10
Algeriet	83	20	53	22	136	21
Angola	.	.	11	21	11	21
Armenien	36	28	167	10	203	13
Australien	.	.	1	0	1	0
Azerbajdzhan	1	11	62	9	63	9
Bangladesh	69	37	116	19	185	25
Barbados	.	.	10	1	10	1
Belarus	10	10	318	3	328	3
Belarus SSR	.	.	1	15	1	15
Belize	.	.	2	4	2	4
Benin	15	47	25	17	40	29
Bhutan	1	0	1	0	2	0
Bolivia	.	.	4	4	4	4
Bosnien-herzegovina	408	21	372	21	780	21
Brunei	.	.	1	43	1	43
Bulgarien	35	79	342	15	377	21
Burkina Faso	2	9	14	3	16	3
Burma (Myanmar)	.	.	3	6	3	6
Burundi	25	73	19	13	44	47
Cambodia	.	.	4	77	4	77
Cameroun	52	65	83	12	135	32
Centralafrikanske Republik	.	.	1	0	1	0
Columbia	2	49	42	7	44	9
Comorerne	.	.	1	6	1	6
Congo	8	114	35	26	43	43
Congo (brazzaville)	2	6	6	9	8	8
Cuba	12	34	113	9	125	12
Djibouti	1	3	.	.	1	3
Dominica	.	.	6	7	6	7
Dominikanske Republik	3	5	12	10	15	9
Ecuador	.	.	1	0	1	0
Elfenbenskysten	22	29	19	18	41	24

Percentiler i sagsbehandlingstiderne for visumansøgninger

afgjort i perioden 01JAN2000- 31dec2000

Kørselsdato: 17jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Eritrea	13	13	38	6	51	8
Estland	1	13	1	29	2	21
Ethiopien	28	31	26	22	54	27
Fiji	.	.	3	0	3	0
Filippinerne	77	18	431	11	508	12
Finland	.	.	1	22	1	22
Folkerepublikken Kina	137	32	416	13	553	18
Frankrig	.	.	1	56	1	56
Gambia	50	20	77	16	127	17
Georgien	6	103	135	1	141	5
Ghana	79	42	110	20	189	29
Guinea	12	82	27	22	39	40
Guinea-Bissau	2	13	9	31	11	27
Guyana	.	.	7	14	7	14
Hong Kong	.	.	2	13	2	13
Indien	104	57	389	23	493	31
Indonesien	1	87	12	3	13	9
Irak	194	26	140	19	334	23
Iran	516	23	1920	15	2436	17
Israel	.	.	2	50	2	50
Italien	2	93	.	.	2	93
Japan	.	.	1	0	1	0
Jordan	74	25	162	14	236	17
Jugoslavien	724	21	968	14	1692	17
Kapverdiske Øer	.	.	4	0	4	0
Kazakhstan	1	36	54	4	55	5
Kenya	32	21	38	19	70	20
Kirgizstan	.	.	9	0	9	0
Kroatien	65	32	111	15	176	21
Kuwait	1	36	8	24	9	26
Laos	1	23	3	8	4	12
Letland	1	9	3	21	4	18
Libanon	166	19	337	12	503	14
Liberia	1	20	4	7	5	9
Libyen	4	35	157	8	161	8

**Percentiler i sagsbehandlingstiderne for visumansøgninger
afgjort i perioden 01JAN2000- 31dec2000
Kørselsdato: 17jan2002**

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Litauen	.	.	2	29	2	29
Madagascar	1	9	5	1	6	2
Makedonien	308	22	448	13	756	17
Malawi	2	131	7	9	9	36
Malaysia	.	.	1	6	1	6
Maldiverne	1	3	.	.	1	3
Mali	.	.	15	9	15	9
Marokko	371	25	579	19	950	21
Mauretanien	.	.	7	3	7	3
Mauritius	.	.	26	10	26	10
Moldova	2	8	100	9	102	9
Mongoliet	.	.	13	3	13	3
Mozambique	4	11	33	6	37	6
Namibia	.	.	2	6	2	6
Nepal	5	39	131	11	136	12
Nigeria	99	53	143	17	242	31
Pakistan	920	52	1392	36	2312	42
Peru	5	16	191	5	196	5
Polen	2	0	1	27	3	9
Rumænien	215	71	1178	15	1393	24
Rusland	62	34	2171	5	2233	5
Rwanda	3	10	23	47	26	42
Saudi Arabien	2	41	11	38	13	38
Schweiz	.	.	1	0	1	0
Senegal	21	49	43	11	64	23
Sierra Leone	17	38	43	11	60	19
Singapore	1	9	.	.	1	9
Slovakiet	1	189	13	4	14	17
Slovenien	.	.	1	0	1	0
Somalia	56	29	76	17	132	22
Sri Lanka	184	28	276	18	460	22
St. Lucia	.	.	3	2	3	2
St. Vincent og Grenadinerne	.	.	2	0	2	0
Statsløs	18	53	151	4	169	9
Statsløs Palæstinenser	321	18	463	18	784	18

Percentiler i sagsbehandlingstiderne for visumansøgninger

afgjort i perioden 01JAN2000- 31dec2000

Kørselsdato: 17jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Storbritannien	.	.	5	28	5	28
Sudan	22	27	20	12	42	20
Surinam	.	.	1	0	1	0
Sydafrikanske Union	2	5	21	5	23	5
Syrien	91	21	188	22	279	22
Tadzhikistan	1	34	1	0	2	17
Taiwan	.	.	4	0	4	0
Tanzania	34	40	44	17	78	27
Thailand	367	21	1013	13	1380	15
Tjekkiet	1	85	.	.	1	85
Togo	3	32	4	22	7	26
Trinidad og Tobago	1	40	17	2	18	4
Tunesien	217	12	109	16	326	13
Turkmenistan	.	.	10	0	10	0
Tyrkiet	853	28	1915	15	2768	19
Tyskland	2	42	.	.	2	42
Uganda	59	35	86	29	145	32
Ukendt	17	47	48	9	65	19
Ukraine	32	53	571	8	603	11
Usa	2	18	1	88	3	41
Uzbekistan	.	.	26	5	26	5
Vestsamoa	.	.	1	3	1	3
Vietnam	288	25	443	14	731	19
Yemen	12	20	12	5	24	13
Zambia	4	31	44	10	48	12
Zimbabwe	3	114	17	14	20	29
/Egypten	150	58	229	22	379	36
I alt	7954	31	20099	15	28053	19

*Tilladelser og afslag for 1. gangssager og nødvium behandlet i Styrelsen
samt den akkumulerede gennemsnitlige sagsbehandlingstid i visumsager
i perioden 01JAN2001- 31dec2001 fordelt på nationalitet*

Kørselsdato: 14jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Afghanistan	92	63	56	55	148	60
Albanien	31	68	196	11	227	19
Algeriet	113	84	68	64	181	77
Angola	.	.	1	42	1	42
Armenien	37	67	47	36	84	49
Australien	.	.	1	50	1	50
Azerbajdzhan	46	84	44	56	90	70
Bangladesh	84	57	91	37	175	46
Barbados	.	.	6	28	6	28
Belarus	21	56	285	21	306	23
Belarus SSR	.	.	2	13	2	13
Benin	6	59	11	64	17	62
Bosnien-herzegovina	478	52	360	39	838	46
Botswana	1	26	.	.	1	26
Brunei	1	445	.	.	1	445
Bulgarien	42	112	68	57	110	78
Burkina Faso	1	49	2	36	3	40
Burma (Myanmar)	1	126	28	4	29	8
Burundi	14	225	28	52	42	110
Cambodia	3	72	10	38	13	46
Cameroun	126	111	70	29	196	82
Canada	.	.	1	19	1	19
Columbia	3	141	19	17	22	34
Comorerne	1	1	2	63	3	42
Congo	46	201	11	98	57	181
Congo (brazzaville)	9	113	10	121	19	117
Cuba	5	115	54	38	59	44
Danmark	.	.	1	0	1	0
Demokratiske rep. Congo	11	38	29	36	40	37
Djibouti	.	.	1	0	1	0
Dominica	1	32	16	43	17	42
Dominikanske Republik	2	197	18	12	20	30
Elfenbenskysten	26	56	15	49	41	53

*Tilladelser og afslag for 1. gangssager og nødviumm behandlet i Styrelsen
samt den akkumulerede gennemsnitlige sagsbehandlingstid i visumsager
i perioden 01JAN2001- 31dec2001 fordelt på nationalitet*

Kørselsdato: 14jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Eritrea	10	65	13	27	23	43
Estland	10	17	8	19	18	18
Ethiopien	17	119	9	81	26	106
Filippinerne	117	61	839	14	956	20
Folkerepublikken Kina	250	65	549	37	799	45
Forenede Arabiske Emirater	1	90	.	.	1	90
Frankrig	1	57	.	.	1	57
Gabon	.	.	1	265	1	265
Gambia	82	52	23	52	105	52
Georgien	24	158	124	10	148	34
Ghana	144	66	145	17	289	41
Guinea	6	162	11	64	17	99
Guinea-Bissau	1	365	6	77	7	118
Guyana	.	.	11	12	11	12
Haiti	.	.	1	106	1	106
Hong Kong	.	.	1	7	1	7
Indien	186	85	425	35	611	50
Indonesien	5	145	125	0	130	6
Irak	123	85	101	39	224	64
Iran	806	63	1738	57	2544	59
Jamaica	.	.	5	0	5	0
Japan	.	.	1	0	1	0
Jordan	58	88	78	55	136	69
Jugoslavien	783	73	564	44	1347	61
Kapverdiske Øer	.	.	4	0	4	0
Kazakhstan	5	75	23	24	28	33
Kenya	40	79	47	53	87	65
Kirgizstan	.	.	4	19	4	19
Kroatien	23	145	21	54	44	102
Kuwait	.	.	1	67	1	67
Laos	1	41	1	32	2	37
Letland	1	16	2	10	3	12
Libanon	182	60	239	44	421	51
Liberia	2	73	1	0	3	49

*Tilladelser og afslag for 1. gangssager og nødvium behandlet i Styrelsen
samt den akkumulerede gennemsnitlige sagsbehandlingstid i visumsager
i perioden 01JAN2001- 31dec2001 fordelt på nationalitet*

Kørselsdato: 14jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Libyen	10	159	53	8	63	32
Litauen	2	65	1	0	3	43
Madagascar	1	78	1	32	2	55
Makedonien	315	50	308	46	623	48
Malawi	1	14	6	27	7	25
Mali	1	15	3	1	4	5
Marokko	278	57	235	41	513	50
Mauretanien	.	.	1	26	1	26
Mauritius	.	.	3	17	3	17
Moldova	31	66	160	30	191	36
Mongoliet	.	.	10	23	10	23
Mozambique	3	59	24	28	27	31
Namibia	.	.	1	44	1	44
Nepal	29	99	89	32	118	49
Niger	2	31	1	4	3	22
Nigeria	157	66	183	27	340	45
Nordkorea	1	187	3	16	4	59
Pakistan	1989	78	1176	71	3165	75
Palestinian nationality not recognized by all States (used in Germany)	1	105	1	0	2	53
Papua New Guinea	.	.	1	8	1	8
Peru	3	161	43	28	46	37
Polen	1	108	1	0	2	54
Rumænien	349	98	954	46	1303	60
Rusland	157	70	2084	20	2241	24
Rwanda	9	113	18	45	27	67
Saudi Arabien	.	.	4	57	4	57
Senegal	19	112	17	64	36	89
Sierra Leone	14	118	6	90	20	109
Slovakiet	3	176	2	402	5	266
Somalia	39	180	18	43	57	137
Sovjetunionen	1	47	6	41	7	41
Sri Lanka	231	66	203	53	434	60
St. Lucia	.	.	2	25	2	25
Statsløs	36	71	83	20	119	35

*Tilladelser og afslag for 1. gangssager og nødvium behandlet i Styrelsen
samt den akkumulerede gennemsnitlige sagsbehandlingstid i visumsager
i perioden 01JAN2001- 31dec2001 fordelt på nationalitet*

Kørselsdato: 14jan2002

Visumansøgninger	Afslag		Tilladelse		I alt	
	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid	Antal	Gns. sagsbehandlingstid
Statsløs Palæstinenser	265	66	382	55	647	59
Sudan	19	37	13	26	32	32
Swaziland	.	.	1	0	1	0
Sydafrikanske Union	3	208	24	9	27	31
Syrien	93	57	201	37	294	43
Tadzhikistan	.	.	4	32	4	32
Taiwan	2	62	7	16	9	26
Tanzania	30	49	13	38	43	46
Thailand	479	63	991	40	1470	48
Tibet	1	91	3	72	4	77
Togo	24	44	7	23	31	39
Tonga	.	.	1	38	1	38
Trinidad og Tobago	.	.	2	19	2	19
Tunesien	57	36	20	58	77	42
Turkmenistan	.	.	10	7	10	7
Tyrkiet	1132	49	1515	38	2647	43
Tyskland	1	89	1	5	2	47
Uganda	93	50	53	63	146	55
Ukendt	16	91	61	17	77	32
Ukraine	156	97	646	30	802	43
Ungarn	.	.	1	139	1	139
Usa	3	247	2	17	5	155
Uzbekistan	3	18	13	32	16	30
Vestsamoa	.	.	1	1	1	1
Vietnam	298	63	323	51	621	57
Yemen	10	90	11	27	21	57
Zambia	12	104	33	43	45	60
Zimbabwe	10	76	21	28	31	44
Ægypten	255	113	252	58	507	85
I alt	10724	71	16985	39	27709	52

GERMANY

Re point 2 (Objectives):

The following should be added:

- Check whether the visa exhibited on entry was actually issued.
- Contribute to prevention of "visa shopping".
- Cooperation of consular posts with the authorities of the home country responsible for matters relating to aliens and asylum, and of those authorities with each other.
- Simplify return of third-country nationals.
- Measures in cases of visa abuse (record persons issuing invitations, parties liable to pay the costs and insurers).

To be specified:

- "Convention on Asylum" should be "Dublin Convention" (*German version of note only*).
- What contribution to combating terrorism and organised crime is required?

Clarification is also needed with regard to the Community (legal) basis and the legal form for setting up the database.

Re point 3 (Content):

- Visas issued, indicating types: the entry should be made regardless of type of visa and date of issue.

- Visa-stickers misappropriated: the study should examine whether the input of data on stickers in the visa database is useful and how such data can be compared with alerts on objects present in the SIS (including data-protection considerations).
- Other content: the input of data based on UN and other sanctions lists is only useful if complete (i.e. containing date and place of birth, in some cases passport number etc.). It therefore needs to be considered whether the inclusion of such data is necessary.
- Data headings to be entered in the visa database: all data which identify the alien (surname, forename, date and place of birth, parents' name and all passport details). Consideration should also be given to the inclusion of photographs and possibly of biometric data as well as the reason for issue, travel destination and ancillary factors, to the extent that this can be represented by uniform codes. A critical view is taken of the recording of data on the contact person/ contact address in the country of destination, bearing in mind data protection and protection of economic interests.
- Additional remarks: it must be ascertainable from the text in clear (not only by code) which diplomatic representation of which Member State has processed the visa application.

Re point 4 (Input into the database):

- Transmission of data must be an obligation for all offices which can issue, refuse, cancel, withdraw and extend visas, i.e. all diplomatic and consular representations, border authorities and all internal authorities responsible for controls on individuals and for taking decisions on residence (in Germany this includes the Aliens Offices in the Länder).
- Input cannot be limited solely to "central" authorities.
- The Member States must be left a certain degree of discretion as to how they organise data input by their authorities.

Re point 5 (Access for consultation):

In accordance with the objectives set, all police and border-guard posts must be given access to the visa database.

Further points:

- Border and contact points at Schengen internal borders.
- Prosecuting authorities.
- Central and outfield administrative and security authorities involved in the visa procedure to be designated by the Member States.

Re point 6 (Data deletion dates):

- No differentiation between deletion dates for accepted and rejected visa applications.
- No differentiation between countries ("risk" and non-risk States).
- No differentiation between countries causing problems with returns and other countries.

Re point 7 (Access by consular posts to other databases):

There is access to the SIS according to Article 101(2) of the Schengen Convention.

Re point 8.1. (Communication system):

- Communication between consular posts and the database is only desirable where feasible without requiring additional resources in processing visa applications (see 8.2). This will presumably be possible only through automated communication effected between a central database and the consular posts.
- Communication system between consular posts in the same city etc.: desirable, but it requires the database to be used in real time by all users (no purpose is served if the data is only entered when the visa application is rejected weeks later – as is usually the case!).
- Reception of images should be possible.
- If direct communication between the foreign representations of the Member States cannot be arranged, communications systems between consular posts and the database will remain the responsibility of the individual Member States. This is also easier to set up.

Re point 8.2. (Implications for organisation of work):

User-friendliness and elimination of delay in processing of visa applications are the central requirements for the visa database. Ideally, it would be linked to national visa processing programmes (Visa 2000 in Germany), so that the national programme (within the Federal Administration Department in Germany) automatically interrogates, adds to and reports back to the visa information database, as at present.

If this is technically too difficult to achieve, the feasibility should be examined of a stand-alone system in which data is entered separately for those foreign representations whose databases are regularly but not invariably checked before issuing a visa.

The study must include a precise description of the working procedure.

Re point 9 (SIS/Database of visas):

- No incorporation of the visa database into the SIS. A detailed technical and financial study is required of the extent to which the visa database is capable of making use of the communications infrastructure of the SIS (SISNET). The extent to which the SIRENE can be used as management support also needs to be studied. Regarding hits obtained with the visa database in the case of authorities otherwise entitled to consult SIS (e.g. the police and border guard), the pattern of hits should be investigated through the SIRENE offices.
- The personnel requirements and other costs for a separate database should be looked into. It is assumed that any such measure will be financed from the Community budget, and the study should produce conclusions on that point also.
- A link-up with the SIS for investigation purposes should be considered.
- Also to be considered is the networking of existing decentralised databases in Member States which already contain information intended for the visa database.

Re point 10 (Data protection):

Comprehensive proposals are expected from the study.

Re point 11 (VISION):

The visa database must not be structured differently from VISION; it should be possible to integrate data from VISION into the visa database.

Re point 12 (Technical aspects):

- Database's physical structure: consideration should first be given to whether the visa database is to be designed with or without a central support unit (a central database or networking of Member States' existing databases). A web application might be contemplated.
- Security requirements: these should be based around Article 118 of the Schengen Convention. The study should investigate whether encryption of a level higher than or equal to that used in SIS is required.
- Communication network: a virtual private network could be contemplated; use of the SISNET should be looked into; a separate communication network could also be based on the SISNET.
- Technical requirements: as for SIS.

Re Notes:

Germany will provide visa statistics for 2000 and 2001 in a separate Note, together with the rules on archiving visa data (these are in fact identical at all foreign representations).

Keeping of data records at foreign representations in accordance with the Aliens Data Records Regulation

In response to the Spanish Presidency's question on national rules for the storage of visa data, Germany can provide the following information:

Under Germany's Aliens Data Records Regulation (Ausländerdateienverordnung – AuslDatV), foreign representations must keep both a **Visa Record (section 7)** and a **Visa Refusal Record (section 8)**.

These result in the following deletion times:

1. Issued visa

Under **AuslDatV, section 7**, an alien's data must be deleted **one year** after the end of the period of validity of the visa or transit visa issued to him or her.

2. Refused applications

Under **AuslDatV, section 8**, the visa refusal record must be kept **separately from the visa record**. At the end of **5 years**, or when the grounds for refusal no longer subsist, the record must be deleted.

In representations working with the IT-supported visa procedure, the visa record is kept within the visa programme in the computer.

Representations which still work without IT support maintain the visa record in the form of a bound register.

GREECE

2. Objectives

- We agree with all the objectives mentioned.

3. Content

- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
-
-
- Yes.

4. Input into the database

- Yes.
- Yes.

5. Access for consultation

- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- No.
- No.

6. Period during which data should be retained in the database before being archived

- We think it advisable to differentiate between visas granted and those refused, with data on the former being stored for 6 months and data on the latter being stored for at least 1 year.
- No.
- No.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

- No.
- Yes.
- Yes.

8. Communication system

8.1.

- Yes.
- Yes.
- The network could allow the transmission and receipt of images based on individual requests via digital camera.
-

8.2.

- Provided that the data for the database is entered at the same time as it is keyed in, there is no additional workload for the consular posts.

9. SIS/Database of visas

–

10. Data protection

–

–

– Yes.

– It is not clear who is the person concerned – the operator or the visa applicant.

11. VISION consultation network

– We believe that it should be structured differently, for reasons of security and to avoid overloading the VISION network.

– Yes.

12. Comments

– We believe that the structure of the visa database should be based on the architecture of VISION (existing analysis).

– The same requirements which apply to VISION.

–

– The same technical requirements as for the VISION network.

Notes

1. In 2000 the Greek consular posts granted 582 496 visas, of which 31 548 were national visas. In 2001 the Greek consular posts granted 481 464 visas, of which 27 157 were national visas.
2. With regard to the archiving of visas, Greece applies the provisions of Chapter VII.2 of the Common Consular Instructions on Visas, i.e. visa applications are kept for at least one (1) year, while cases of refused applications are kept for at least five (5) years.

SPAIN

3. Content

(Indicate any missing or unnecessary points in this respect.)

- **Visas issued, indicating types.**
- **Visas formally refused.**
- **Visas requested.**

At least these three categories.

- **Visas annulled, revoked, extended, indicating types.**
- **Visa-stickers misappropriated or lost.**

This data is desirable.

- Other content? (Visas to be examined in more detail or certain visa categories to be refused at the request of the UN, NATO, WEU, CFSP, etc.?)
- Data to be included from each visa: identification of the applicant and, where appropriate, of the visa-sticker and type.
- Use the headings of the application form to state their order of importance in terms of need to be included in the database of visas.
- **Identification of the applicant**
 - **(Headings from the visa application).**
 - **A link with the various applications made by this applicant in different countries.**

- **Identification of the visa**
 - **(Headings from the visa application).**
- **Stage of decision on visa**
 - **Reason for refusal?**
- **Data on the visa-sticker.**
- **Identification of the party issuing the alert (State, consular post).**

4. Input into the database

- **Consular posts.**
- **Central visa authorities, including visas at borders.**

(Even in the case of changes because of cancellations, revocations, etc., information may be entered into the database by the consular post or the competent central authority.)

5. Access for consultation

- **Consular posts.**
- **Central visa authorities.**
- **Checkpoints at external borders.**
- **Police departments.**
- **Immigration departments.**
- **Asylum offices.**

6. Period during which data should be retained in the database before being archived (validity of the data)

In view of the impact on the annual volume of visas to be incorporated and the volume of data per visa, is it advisable to:

- Differentiate between visas granted and those refused?

Retention for three years in the case of visas granted and five for those refused.

- Differentiate between nationalities according to the risk involved?

Five years for nationals subject to consultation or airport transit visa (ATV) (Annexes 3 and 5). Three years for the rest.

- Differentiate for countries whose authorities pose technical difficulties for documentation?

Desirable, but is under consideration.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

- **Genuine travel documents.**
- **False documents.**
- **Access to the SIS (list of inadmissible persons, visa-stickers and travel documents misappropriated or lost).**

8. Communication system

8.1. Should the feasibility study be extended to the communication system:

- Between consular posts and the database? **Yes.**
- Between consular posts of the same city, country or region? (consultation on visas with an immigration risk, exchange of statistics, detection of false documents, LTVs issued, etc.) **Yes.**
- Should the network allow the transmission and receipt of images based on individual requests? **Yes.**
- Should the communication system between consular posts and the database be the competence and responsibility of each State? **No. Some minimum standards of security, reliability, access formats, etc. should be established. The possibility of part-financing provided for in Community programmes (ARGOS, etc.) seems particularly interesting.**

8.2. Practical implications of the database (input, consultation of data and replies to consultations) with regard to the organisation of work in the consulates

From our point of view it would greatly facilitate the consular post's work.

- **(Input into the database would be automatic once the visa and the processing thereof were computerised.)**
- **(Consultation of the visa database could also be automated, i.e. when the applicant's particulars were typed in the computer would display the data on that person already contained in the database.)**

9. SIS/Database of visas

- Should the database be incorporated into the SIS? **Yes**. Should it be a special system within the SIS? **Yes**. What degree of autonomy should it have owing to its specific nature? **Attached to the competent central authority's capacity to take decisions**. What would be the SIRENE role as a management support? **It would be necessary to consider a network of support staff in each State, located in the competent central body for issuing visas. They would be directly responsible for entering data in the database within the States and, in addition, for managing the VISION network.**
- Should the database of visas be designed separately? If so, what are the implications in terms of time, expenditure and additional human resources, project management and project financing?

10. Data protection

- Are special rules required? **No**. Does the Community Directive give adequate coverage? **Yes**. Should there be a similar system as for the SIS? **Yes**.
- Access for persons concerned. **Yes**.

11. VISION consultation network

- Should it be structured differently in preparation for a database of visas?

The new utilities intended to be given to the network (consultation for information, results of processing, etc.) should in due course be incorporated into the database.

On the other hand, modifications geared to storage of the consultations conducted using the VISION network, would pave the way for setting up the visa database, as this network would act as a forerunner for the creation of such a database in the future.

- Could the data currently supplied be incorporated into a database of visas?

Yes.

12. Comments on technical aspects

- Design of the database's physical structure.
- Security requirements (protection, audit/logging, encryption, etc.).
- Communication network requirements.
- Technical requirements of the database.
- Etc.

The physical structure of the system could be similar to that of the current SIS.

The security requirements should also be similar to those of the current SIS (virtual private networks, encryption, digital attestation, etc.). This would all be determined on the basis of an exhaustive technical examination.

Notes

1. Delegations are asked to provide the visa statistics for 2000 and 2001, including LTVs.

The statistics for visas, including LTVs, issued by the Spanish consular posts in 2000 and in the first 11 months of 2001 are attached.

2. Delegations are also asked to provide information on the criteria and procedures currently used by each Member State for archiving data on visas and to state whether or not such procedures cover all the Member State's consular posts.

All the consular posts with responsibility for issuing visas are computerised, so that all visas processed at those posts are entered in the computers.

Likewise, all documentation on the visas making up the relevant files are kept in the corresponding archives.

Although all visa files since 1995 (year of entry into force of the Schengen Convention) are currently archived, relevant older information is transferred periodically, when necessary for reasons of space, to the administration's general archives.

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
ABIDJAN	-	31	706	50	787	-	-
ABU DHABI	2	32	2.658	14	2.706	51	1,88
ABUJA	7	20	825	119	971	-	-
ACCRA	31	126	517	86	760	56	7,36
ADDIS ABEBA	1	2	208	7	218	-	-
AGADIR	4	113	3.926	225	4.268	12	0,28
ALMATY	-	-	120	2	122	6	4,91
AMMAN	16	75	2.258	39	2.388	251	10,51
AMSTERDAM	-	1	9	24	34	-	-
ANDORRA	-	283	230	27	540	-	-
ANKARA	-	103	5.717	40	5.860	38	0,64
ARGEL	25	191	11.968	390	12.574	555	4,41
ASUNCION	-	-	37	117	154	1	0,65
ATENAS	-	6	67	3	76	1	1,31
BAHIA BLANCA	-	-	1	106	107	-	-
BANGKOK	-	161	3.216	83	3.460	-	-
BATA	14	115	844	174	1.147	97	8,45
BAYONA	1	-	-	13	14	-	-
BEIRUT	-	9	4.161	66	4.236	86	2,03
BELGRADO	2	51	4.222	119	4.394	16	0,36
BERLIN	-	1	41	14	56	33	58,92
BERNA	2	2	1.698	213	1.915	19	0,99

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
BOGOTA	120	8	627	3.926	4.681	1	0,02
BOSTON	-	-	457	842	1.299	8	0,61
BRASILIA	30	19	43	449	541	3	0,55
BRATISLAVA	-	5	92	177	274	-	-
BRUSELAS	-	1	14	50	65	-	-
BUCAREST	120	468	14.137	2.378	17.103	11	0,06
BUDAPEST	4	4	667	233	908	30	3,30
BUENOS AIRES	13	6	177	1.737	1.933	4	0,20
BURDEOS	-	-	9	12	21	9	42,85
CANBERRA	-	-	17	7	24	-	-
CARACAS	7	7	209	2.001	2.224	1	0,04
CASABLANCA	302	122	26.768	2.751	29.943	79	0,26
CHICAGO	-	22	904	2.760	3.686	4	0,10
CIUDAD DEL CABO	-	82	4.515	36	4.633	-	-
COPENHAGUE	1	110	1.160	127	1.398	201	14,37
CORDOBA	2	1	22	374	399	-	-
DAKAR	40	288	2.031	1.019	3.378	1	0,02
DAMASCO	7	65	2.761	116	2.949	82	2,78
DAR-ES-SALAAM	1	13	222	8	244	-	-
DUBLIN	-	7	505	16	528	-	-
DUSSELDORF	-	-	11	42	53	3	5,66
EDIMBURGO	-	9	674	6	689	8	1,16

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
EL CAIRO	5	727	6.669	94	7.495	4	0,05
ESTAMBUL	-	540	19.639	93	20.272	26	0,12
ESTOCOLMO	-	81	2.325	40	2.446	250	10,22
FRANCFORT	-	1	31	36	68	-	-
GENOVA	-	-	70	19	89	-	-
GINEBRA	4	4	749	162	919	26	2,82
GUADALAJARA	3	2	29	847	881	15	1,70
GUATEMALA	1	6	282	246	535	-	-
HAMBURGO	1	-	-	25	26	-	-
HANOI	-	3	124	6	133	-	-
HARARE	-	2	273	4	279	1	0,35
HELSINKI	-	37	730	22	789	2	0,25
HONG KONG	1	-	4.128	24	4.153	6	0,14
HOUSTON	1	17	458	756	1.232	4	0,32
ISLAMABAD	91	13	573	716	1.393	1	0,07
JERUSALEN	-	27	860	60	947	59	6,23
KIEV	12	1.203	38.211	1.352	40.778	19	0,04
KINGSTON	-	91	562	28	681	-	-
KINSHASA	11	14	136	56	217	-	-
KUALA LUMPUR	-	-	1.621	23	1.644	-	-
KUWAIT	1	2	4.065	4	4.072	26	0,63
LA HABANA	22	1.483	11.048	4.621	17.174	26	0,15

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
LA PAZ	7	2	66	294	369	1	0,27
LIBREVILLE	-	1	158	13	172	2	1,16
LIMA	680	536	7.730	6.980	15.926	29	0,18
LISBOA	7	13	146	70	236	78	33,05
LIUBLIANA	-	7	14	19	40	2	5,00
LONDRES	19	271	17.956	169	18.415	380	2,06
LOS ANGELES	-	5	682	1.844	2.531	6	0,23
LUANDA	11	138	639	70	858	-	-
LUXEMBURGO	-	-	2	4	6	-	-
LYON	-	-	1	12	13	-	-
MALABO	67	985	1.556	525	3.133	315	10,05
MANAGUA	3	30	96	115	244	-	-
MANCHESTER	-	14	2.531	9	2.554	188	7,36
MANILA	187	7.781	4.242	1.340	13.550	319	2,35
MAPUTO	4	37	245	33	319	4	1,25
MARSELLA	-	-	2	6	8	1	12,50
MELBOURNE	1	3	42	63	109	4	3,66
MENDOZA	-	-	18	189	207	1	0,48
MEXICO	2	4	256	2.420	2.682	-	-
MIAMI	1	76	1.818	982	2.877	5	0,17
MILAN	1	-	14	17	32	-	-
MONTEVIDEO	3	52	38	453	546	1	0,18

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
MONTREAL	-	5	230	169	404	12	0,29
MOSCU	9	3.847	31.723	1.175	36.754	344	0,93
MOSCÚ (VISATUR)	-	-	160.872	-	160.872	-	-
MUNICH	-	-	7	43	50	4	8,00
NADOR	374	107	3.977	5.498	9.956	6	0,06
NAIROBI	1	4	445	47	497	1	0,20
NAPOLES	-	-	1	12	13	-	-
NOUADHIBOU	-	4	310	4	318	-	-
NUAKCHOTT	5	139	2.991	113	3.248	63	1,93
NUEVA DELHI	86	657	2.826	807	4.376	8	0,18
NUEVA ORLEANS	-	4	107	190	301	-	-
NUEVA YORK	15	12	2.402	1.978	4.407	2	0,04
OPORTO	-	21	89	5	115	-	-
ORAN	9	37	11.259	138	11.443	4.050	35,39
OSLO	-	68	1.049	8	1.125	72	6,40
OTTAWA	-	-	63	49	112	-	-
PANAMA	7	41	621	162	831	-	-
PARIS	-	4	97	98	199	-	-
PEKIN	719	406	4.961	2.056	8.142	1	0,01
PERPIÑAN	-	-	-	18	18	-	-
PORTO ALEGRE	1	-	3	181	185	-	-
PRAGA	3	1	786	713	1.503	-	-

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
PRETORIA	2	323	9.510	46	9.881	5	0,05
PUERTO PRINCIPE	-	-	164	19	183	-	-
QUITO	765	1	69	11.640	12.475	2	0,01
RABAT	157	78	12.528	1.808	14.571	60	0,41
RIAD	-	-	5.411	438	5.849	206	3,52
RIO DE JANEIRO	7	27	32	343	409	2	0,48
ROMA	1	-	31	114	146	3	2,05
ROSARIO	2	-	24	272	298	-	-
SALVADOR-BAHIA	2	-	13	340	355	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	1	-	773	1.408	2.182	1	0,04
S. JOSE COSTA RICA	2	-	55	140	197	-	-
S. JUAN PUERTO RICO	2	7	253	154	416	-	-
SAN SALVADOR	3	1	10	193	207	-	-
SANTIAGO DE CHILE	34	33	189	1.802	2.058	-	-
SAO PAULO	6	102	172	759	1.039	2	0,19
SARAJEVO	-	1	2.051	14	2.066	-	-
SEUL	-	-	20	228	248	-	-
SHANGHAI	-	-	976	787	1.763	-	-
SOFIA	19	567	5.095	1.492	7.173	1	0,01
STO. DOMINGO	344	93	8.551	4.856	13.844	1	-
SYDNEY	1	8	92	143	244	-	-

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2000

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL S/ TOTAL
TAIPEI	-	13	7.958	159	8.130	472	5,80
TANGER	156	84	14.246	1.418	15.904	25	0,15
TEGUCIGALPA	6	7	314	142	469	1	0,21
TEHERAN	47	34	2.067	51	2.199	132	6,00
TEL AVIV	2	10	198	109	319	-	-
TETUAN	309	15	5.336	2.205	7.865	2	0,02
TOKIO	3	16	307	1.178	1.504	22	1,46
TORONTO	-	14	335	139	488	-	-
TRIPOLI	-	27	962	19	1.008	137	13,59
TUNEZ	2	528	4.962	73	5.565	2	0,03
VARSOVIA	61	12	632	1.199	1.904	1	0,05
VIENA	-	-	12	23	35	-	-
WASHINGTON	-	8	1.805	746	2.559	7	0,27
WINDHOEK	-	27	175	10	212	4	1,88
YAKARTA	1	1.392	1.047	45	2.485	2.391	96,21
YAUNDE	2	1	491	71	565	8	1,41
ZAGREB	1	1	140	97	239	5	2,09
ZURICH	1	10	3.809	396	4.216	6	0,14
TOTAL	5.066	25.564	545.920	94.399	670.949	11.529	1,71

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2001 (hasta 30 de noviembre)

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL s/ TOTAL
ABIDJAN	-	18	1.192	65	1.275	-	-
ABU DHABI	-	34	2.560	19	2.613	55	2,10
ABUJA	2	6	1.248	202	1.458	-	-
ACCRA	1	54	521	158	734	3	0,40
ADDIS ABEBA	-	7	134	17	158	1	0,63
AGADIR	-	110	3.044	268	3.422	10	0,29
ALMATY	-	1	1.359	43	1.403	22	1,56
AMMAN	3	38	1.968	68	2.077	161	7,75
AMSTERDAM	1	1	5	25	32	1	3,12
ANDORRA	-	346	195	17	558	18	3,22
ANKARA	-	122	2.941	68	3.131	33	1,05
ARGEL	-	66	11.387	507	11.960	219	1,83
ASUNCION	-	1	9	133	143	-	-
ATENAS	1	2	21	2	26	-	-
BAHIA BLANCA	2	-	5	245	252	-	-
BANGKOK	-	130	3.002	97	3.229	-	-
BATA	29	97	923	148	1.197	209	17,46
BAYONA	-	-	1	33	34	-	-
BEIRUT	-	9	4.978	73	5.060	82	1,62
BELGRADO	-	57	4.220	94	4.371	-	-
BERLIN	-	-	65	13	78	56	71,79
BERNA	-	1	1.658	156	1.815	211	11,62
BOGOTA	3	8	1.352	6.495	7.858	2	0,02
BOSTON	1	6	459	733	1.199	4	0,33
BRASILIA	-	21	20	334	375	3	0,80
BRATISLAVA	-	2	97	436	535	1	0,18
BRUSELAS	-	-	24	43	67	-	-
BUCAREST	1	573	14.933	6.122	21.629	9	0,04
BUDAPEST	-	7	692	284	983	1	0,10
BUENOS AIRES	-	3	126	3.037	3.166	-	-
BURDEOS	-	-	4	4	8	3	37,50
CAMBERRA	-	-	13	2	15	-	-
CARACAS	-	4	159	1.832	1.995	2	0,10
CASABLANCA	7	83	27.185	4.209	31.484	8	0,02
CHICAGO	1	39	789	2.003	2.832	3	0,10
CIUDAD DEL CABO	-	237	4.710	60	5.007	-	-
COPENHAGUE	-	19	122	195	336	16	4,76
CORDOBA	1	1	10	593	605	-	-
DAKAR	6	363	1.637	1.411	3.417	-	-
DAMASCO	2	63	3.216	143	3.424	240	7,00
DAR-ES-SALAAM	2	3	318	7	330	5	1,51

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2001 (hasta 30 de noviembre)

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL s/ TOTAL
DUBLIN	-	9	933	35	977	1	0,10
DUSSELDORF	-	-	6	39	45	1	2,22
EDIMBURGO	1	4	633	7	645	1	0,15
EL CAIRO	-	408	6.332	118	6.858	26	0,37
ESTAMBUL	-	329	11.386	93	11.808	13	0,11
ESTOCOLMO	-	19	295	50	364	21	5,76
FRANCFORT	-	-	8	48	56	-	-
GENOVA	-	-	98	10	108	-	-
GINEBRA	1	10	760	132	903	18	1,99
GUADALAJARA	-	1	37	944	982	9	0,91
GUATEMALA	-	1	236	180	417	1	0,23
HAMBURGO	-	2	-	23	25	-	-
HANOI	-	30	360	8	398	1	0,25
HARARE	-	7	320	12	339	1	0,29
HELSINKI	-	28	175	25	228	-	-
HONG KONG	-	-	1.718	20	1.738	32	1,84
HOUSTON	-	8	352	644	1.004	1	0,09
ISLAMABAD	2	4	392	809	1.207	6	0,49
JERUSALEN	-	20	778	39	837	61	7,28
KIEV	-	1.104	24.789	2.125	28.018	11	0,03
KINGSTON	-	49	633	16	698	-	-
KUALA LUMPUR	-	1	664	5	670	1	0,14
KUWAIT	-	-	4.342	22	4.364	45	1,03
LA HABANA	1	1.219	7.878	3.774	12.872	47	0,36
LA PAZ	1	-	40	505	546	-	-
LIBREVILLE	-	1	188	5	194	1	0,51
LIMA	3	519	6.894	8.529	15.945	20	-
LISBOA	9	48	82	56	195	20	10,25
LIUBLIANA	-	1	39	51	91	-	-
LONDRES	11	396	15.209	182	15.798	15	0,09
LOS ANGELES	-	-	626	1.583	2.209	2	0,09
LUXEMBURGO	-	-	1	5	6	-	-
LYON	-	-	1	9	10	-	-
MALABO	30	967	1.641	253	2.891	383	13,24
MANAGUA	-	20	47	106	173	2	1,15
MANCHESTER	-	26	2.530	20	2.576	48	1,86
MANILA	1	7.252	2.812	1.325	11.390	294	2,58
MAPUTO	7	30	308	27	372	1	0,26
MARSELLA	-	-	1	10	11	1	9,09
MELBOURNE	-	4	59	55	118	6	5,08
MENDOZA	-	1	10	309	320	-	-
MEXICO	2	9	259	2.639	2.909	-	-
MIAMI	1	55	1.583	719	2.358	3	0,12

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2001 (hasta 30 de noviembre)

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL s/ TOTAL
MILAN	-	-	3	13	16	-	-
MONTEVIDEO	-	63	25	851	939	-	-
MONTREAL	-	3	200	129	332	13	3,91
MOSCU	-	3.098	29.934	1.340	34.372	43	0,12
MOSCÚ VISATUR	-	-	188.372	-	188.372	-	-
MUNICH	-	-	3	53	56	3	5,35
NADOR	3	74	5.490	7.738	13.305	1	-
NAIROBI	3	6	366	39	414	6	1,44
NAPOLES	-	14	3	1	18	-	-
NUAKCHOTT	2	95	2.241	149	2.487	20	0,80
NUEVA DELHI	13	710	3.169	861	4.753	18	0,37
NUEVA ORLEANS	-	6	99	156	261	5	1,91
NUEVA YORK	43	4	2.648	1.632	4.327	10	0,23
OPORTO	3	280	114	6	403	-	-
ORAN	1	13	10.480	232	10.726	3.277	30,55
OSLO	-	8	140	5	153	1	0,65
OTTAWA	-	1	67	29	97	-	-
PARIS	-	-	100	104	204	-	-
PEKIN	37	286	4.329	1.769	6.421	-	-
PERPIÑAN	-	-	-	8	8	-	-
PORTO ALEGRE	-	-	4	158	162	-	-
PRAGA	2	1	863	481	1.347	1	0,07
PRETORIA/ CIUDAD DEL CABO	4	823	9.604	51	10.482	5	0,04
QUITO	4	2	55	19.730	19.791	-	-
RABAT	-	57	11.390	2.203	13.650	19	0,13
RIAD	-	1	5.665	855	6.521	194	2,97
RIO DE JANEIRO	-	11	23	325	359	1	0,27
ROMA	-	-	17	82	99	5	5,05
ROSARIO	1	-	36	564	601	-	-
SALVADOR-BAHIA	35	-	11	345	391	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	-	2	745	1.254	2.001	-	-
S. JOSE COSTA RICA	-	1	41	153	195	1	0,51
S. JUAN PUERTO RICO	-	5	183	157	345	-	-
SAN SALVADOR	3	-	25	189	217	3	1,38
SANTIAGO DE CHILE	8	27	182	2.071	2.288	1	0,04
SANTO DOMINGO	8	77	7.964	5.378	13.427	-	-
SAO PAULO	4	7	135	789	935	2	0,21
SARAJEVO	-	3	1.187	42	1.232	4	0,32

VISADOS EXPEDIDOS AÑO 2001 (hasta 30 de noviembre)

OFICINA CONSULAR	A	B	C	D	TOTAL	VTL	%VTL s/ TOTAL
SEUL	-	-	16	154	170	-	-
SHANGHAI	-	21	2.125	4.789	6.935	-	-
SOFIA	-	219	1.062	2.754	4.035	3	0,07
SYDNEY	-	57	107	132	296	1	0,33
TAIPEI	-	2	9.030	145	9.177	523	5,69
TANGER	-	51	13.301	1.743	15.095	-	-
TEGUCIGALPA	-	9	252	182	443	-	-
TEHERAN	30	12	2.268	43	2.353	90	3,82
TEL AVIV	-	14	153	113	280	1	0,35
TETUAN	1	15	4.816	2.915	7.747	1	0,01
TOKIO	-	10	318	1.082	1.410	-	-
TORONTO	-	4	276	109	389	-	-
TRIPOLI	-	8	764	16	788	54	6,85
TUNEZ	-	238	6.035	103	6.376	7	0,10
VARSOVIA	-	11	1.232	1.344	2.587	-	-
VIENA	-	10	5	18	33	-	-
WASHINGTON	-	4	2.275	744	3.023	8	0,26
WINDHOEK	-	34	257	2	293	-	-
YAKARTA	-	1.393	1.412	59	2.864	877	30,62
YAUNDE	-	1	485	53	539	11	2,04
ZAGREB	-	-	12	64	76	2	2,63
ZURICH	1	5	3.698	379	4.083	8	0,19
TOTAL	339	22.910	528.569	111.613	674.663	7.690	1,13

ITALY

Objectives

At the meeting on 3 December 2001 we very much hoped that a discussion would be launched at the earliest opportunity on the creation of a centralised database for visas as an effective tool contributing to combating terrorism and organised crime.

More generally, by the way in which its content is organised, the database should bring about a much-needed improvement both of central cooperation and of local consular cooperation, and so contribute significantly to the creation of an area of security within the European Union. The approach chosen for the project referred to by this questionnaire is in our view fully comprehensive and therefore appropriate for the purpose.

Content

We find it particularly necessary that the database should contain information on visas which have been formally refused, as these clearly indicate negative assessment of a request, especially with regard to the submission of false or falsified documents. We are also in favour of the exchange of information on visas issued, in which connection we have already communicated the statistics referred to in Note 1. It is however necessary to establish whether "type of visa" means the purpose of the visit, as in current usage when forms are exchanged between the partners, a term we feel is adequate at least at the stage of an initial study of the project.

With regard to "visas requested", we would favour including only those currently being processed. The database should contain information on misappropriated and lost visa stickers and on annulled or revoked visas. We feel that extended visas are a matter essentially relating to residence permits issued subsequently to the visa holder's entry into the Schengen State.

The SIS would appear to be the most suitable means of receiving the lists of names for certain categories of persons, at the request of the international organisations (UN, NATO, etc). In this context, the most recent such lists of names do not seem to have been taken account of with regard to the prohibition on entry into the Schengen area, by inclusion of the names in the SIS.

Lastly, concerning data to be included from each visa, we feel that this should be the essential data regarding both the applicant and the type of visa which are at present to be found in form A.

Input into the database

Input into the database is one of the major problems, as it involves a considerable effort both by the central authority (in terms of additional transmissions, etc.) and by the consular posts (with regard to the number and quality of the information to be entered).

Access for consultation

Consultation of databases, particularly where the database is a very extensive source of information on visa matters, should be possible for a large number of offices. Apart from the consular posts and the departments of the central visa authorities, access could be open to the other services referred to in the questionnaire (checkpoints at external borders, police and immigration departments, asylum offices), as well as – we believe – to the central security authorities.

Period during which data should be retained

In our estimation, it will be technically difficult to keep data for a period longer than five years. An assessment of the possible distinction between data to be retained or not can be carried out more effectively after looking into the question of the desirable periods for their retention. Data concerning refused visas and high-risk nationalities would however be given priority.

Other databases

Access to other databases by consular posts (travel documents and false documents) is of course desirable. There should be careful consideration of the possibility of direct access to the list of inadmissible persons, as some States have mainly centralised access to the SIS.

Communication system

The feasibility study should be extended to cover the communication system between consular posts and the database. A different question is that of communication between consular posts, which in part exists already in paper-based form as part of on-the-spot consular cooperation and is incorporated into the database on the suggested model of Visa-Net.

The idea of transmission and receipt of images based on individual requests is a good one. We feel however that the communication system between consular posts and the database should remain the competence and responsibility of each State.

Practical implications

Mention has already been made of the increased organisational demands on central authorities. To this must also be added the need to make provision for greater hardware support and to organise units able to cope with the longer times for processing visa applications as a result of the additional operations (checks and controls) required by the database.

SIS/Database

Integration of the database into the SIS is not in our opinion desirable at present, as different aspects are involved, but a link between the two systems is a good idea.

Financing of the project should be a matter for the EU.

Data protection

The data is sensitive and should be protected. The level of access will be determined according to the persons concerned.

VISION consultation network

The network will have to be structured in such a way as to allow access to the new database. Some data can be integrated into the database (e.g. LTV issue notifications), but not others (requests for consultation between partners).

Technical aspects

There needs to be a detailed study which will also take account of the choices to be made.

Notes

Data is currently archived in a centralised database and each central authority has its own database containing data relevant to its area of responsibility.

AUSTRIA

Re point 2 (Objectives)

In Austria's view the stated objectives are in general comprehensively described.

A further objective might also be:

Easier verifiability in respect of a possible extension of the visa.

Re point 3 (Content)

Under the first indent ("Visas issued, including types") there should also be a specific reference to visas issued at the border.

The third indent ("Visas requested") would appear superfluous, as the result of requesting a visa is that the visa is either issued or refused, and the first two indents cover all issued and refused visas in any case. Furthermore, the administrative burden would be disproportionate in relation to usefulness (frequent updating).

Data should be systematically retrievable via the SIS. This would be an ideal complement to the technical security standard of the visa-stricken and would make the data available not only to consular posts but also to the security authorities for efficient border control and in immigration authority checks.

Other important points:

- Details of the travel document.
- Reason for travel.

Re point 4 (Input into the database)

Data input should not only be possible for consular posts and central visa authorities, but also for the border crossing points (visas issued at the border).

Re point 5 (Access for consultation)

The list here is complete.

Re point 6 (Period during which data should be retained in the database)

Austria is opposed to any differentiation in the period for retention of data.

Whether a visa is issued or refused is of equal interest. For example, for the purpose of "identification of illegals" both sets of data are required, as it is just as likely that a person whose visa application is refused will enter the country illegally as that the holder of a visa will later become illegal.

There is no more reason to differentiate between high-risk nationalities and countries with technical deficiencies, because risks and technical difficulties may change.

In addition, such differentiations involve increased technical and administrative resources.

Re point 7 (Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts)

In the third indent "Access to the SIS" is qualified as "list of inadmissible persons".

Consular posts should however have access not only to alerts under Article 96 of the Schengen Convention but also to alerts under Article 95 and Articles 97-99. Where there are hits the consular posts could then inform the offices issuing the alerts.

Re point 8 (Communication system)

Austria takes the view that the visa database should be usable within the framework of the SIS. As the present questions have already been resolved for the SIS, they are no longer an issue.

Re point 9 (SIS/Database of visas)

As already stated repeatedly, the visa database must definitely be incorporated into the SIS. Apart from the increased cost of setting up and running a separate database, the necessary parallel consultations in separate systems would considerably add to the administrative burden.

Re point 10 (Data protection)

No comments.

Re point 11 (VISION consultation network)

No comments.

Re point 12 (Comments on technical aspects)

The item "training costs" should also be added to the points listed here.

Re Note 1

See the document attached to this e-mail (Annual Statistics 2000 and Mid-year Statistics 2001).

Re Note 2

All Austrian representations have been directed since 1993 to delete visa data only after five years.

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.	Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	Visa A	Visa B	Visa C	Visa D	Visa A-D	VRG	%VRG
ÖB Abidjan	66	89	109	49	313	264	18,6%	0	0	262	51	313	17	5,4%
ÖB Addis Abeba	49	70	90	88	297	228	30,3%	10	5	236	46	297	2	0,7%
ÖB Algier	107	109	152	76	444	108	311,1 %	0	2	432	10	444	63	14,2%
ÖB Amman	293	474	745	395	1.907	1.356	40,6%	68	417	1.324	98	1.907	112	5,9%
ÖB Ankara	1.444	2.009	2.457	1.986	7.896	6.404	23,3%	1	258	6.766	871	7.896	34	0,4%
ÖB Athen	6	7	26	39	78	27	188,9 %	0	1	69	8	78	1	1,3%
ÖB Bangkok	998	1.600	1.159	887	4.644	3.655	27,1%	0	159	4.313	172	4.644	0	0,0%
ÖB Beirut	0	0	0	12	12	0	0,0%	0	0	12	0	12	11	91,7%
ÖB Belgrad	8.064	8.441	10.752	8.128	35.385	20.561	72,1%	3	8.404	26.326	652	35.385	8	0,0%
GK Berlin	6	2	10	3	21	15	40,0%	0	1	2	18	21	0	0,0%
ÖB Bern	7.446	8.099	5.777	6.466	27.788	26.471	5,0%	0	26.223	1.548	17	27.788	110	0,4%
ÖB Bogota	18	10	21	15	64	69	-7,2%	0	0	3	61	64	0	0,0%
ÖB Bonn	0	0	6	7	13	0	0,0%	0	0	6	7	13	2	15,4%
ÖB Brasilia	36	19	32	15	102	88	15,9%	0	1	22	79	102	0	0,0%
ÖB Brüssel	3	3	1	0	7	2	250,0 %	0	0	2	5	7	0	0,0%
ÖB Budapest	2.904	2.826	3.415	3.101	12.246	17.220	-28,9%	33	978	10.837	398	12.246	19	0,2%
ÖB Buenos Aires	17	12	21	12	62	47	31,9%	0	1	19	42	62	0	0,0%

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.	Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	Visa A	Visa B	Visa C	Visa D	Visa A-D	VRG	%VRG
ÖB Bukarest	10.625	9.736	12.556	11.001	43.918	40.874	7,4%	4	7.806	35.861	247	43.918	19	0,0%
ÖB Canberra	49	62	86	81	278	236	17,8%	1	95	108	74	278	5	1,8%
ÖB Caracas	48	50	56	30	184	134	37,3%	0	1	158	25	184	0	0,0%
GK Chikago	138	466	296	374	1.274	870	46,4%	31	341	476	426	1.274	6	0,5%
ÖB Dakar	112	143	146	126	527	519	1,5%	0	3	490	34	527	0	0,0%
ÖB Damaskus	261	387	578	256	1.482	1.373	7,9%	10	313	1.101	58	1.482	152	10,3%
ÖB Den Haag	3	3	3	0	9	11	-18,2%	0	2	4	3	9	0	0,0%
ÖB Dublin	0	29	34	40	103	70	47,1%	2	10	57	34	103	0	0,0%
GK Düsseldorf	5	0	0	0	5	19	-73,7%	0	0	2	3	5	0	0,0%
ÖB Guatemala	2	17	6	3	28	27	3,7%	0	0	9	19	28	0	0,0%
GK Hamburg	1	35	16	3	55	10	450,0	0	2	49	4	55	32	58,2%
							%							
ÖB Hanoi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%
ÖB Harare	88	90	60	60	298	389	-23,4%	0	10	270	18	298	0	0,0%
ÖB Havanna	64	129	98	59	350	312	12,2%	0	1	243	38	282	0	0,0%
ÖB Heiliger Stuhl	0	0	0	0	0	3	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%
							100,0							
							%							
ÖB Helsinki	44	89	93	66	292	274	6,6%	10	68	205	9	292	0	0,0%
GK Hongkong	1.172	2.522	2.424	821	6.939	4.649	49,3%	0	35	6.885	19	6.939	114	1,6%

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1999/2000				Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	Visa					%VRG	
	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.				Visa A	Visa B	Visa C	Visa D	Visa A-D		VRG
ÖB Islamabad	97	266	291	164	818	498	64,3%	0	5	754	59	818	0	0,0%
GK Istanbul	7.167	4.937	4.536	5.618	22.258	17.009	30,9%	0	323	21.351	584	22.258	13	0,1%
ÖB Jakarta	244	428	498	217	1.387	1.085	27,8%	0	12	1.225	150	1.387	3	0,2%
ÖB Kairo	600	1.290	1.566	452	3.908	3.490	12,0%	1	782	2.866	259	3.908	3	0,1%
KA Kapstadt	900	861	589	1.289	3.639	3.096	17,5%	2	6	3.612	19	3.639	0	0,0%
ÖB Kiew	4.289	7.027	9.189	11.619	32.124	46.541	-31,0%	2	1.154	30.663	305	32.124	1.318	4,1%
ÖB Kopenhagen	115	583	140	107	945	1.069	-11,6%	5	634	305	1	945	50	5,3%
GK Krakau	54	42	87	46	229	263	-12,9%	0	24	118	87	229	7	3,1%
ÖB Kuala Lumpur	14	37	27	21	99	97	2,1%	0	15	70	14	99	5	5,1%
ÖB Kuwait	126	650	1.966	151	2.893	1.892	52,9%	0	1	2.886	6	2.893	7	0,2%
ÖB Lagos	205	275	230	230	940	1.127	-16,6%	0	1	894	45	940	2	0,2%
ÖB Laibach	158	169	189	171	687	598	14,9%	2	35	594	56	687	7	1,0%
ÖB Lima	97	170	242	128	637	633	0,6%	0	10	572	55	637	0	0,0%
ÖB Lissabon	6	4	10	6	26	34	-23,5%	0	5	17	4	26	1	3,8%
ÖB London	1.315	1.179	1.454	1.225	5.173	3.776	37,0%	9	146	4.993	25	5.173	238	4,6%
GK Los Angeles	155	406	313	194	1.068	1.189	-10,2%	9	91	906	62	1.068	7	0,7%
ÖB Luxemburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%
ÖB Madrid	7	13	11	5	36	19	89,5%	1	22	13	0	36	1	2,8%
GK Mailand	4	3	6	20	33	10	230,0%	0	3	24	6	33	13	39,4%
							%							

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.	Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	Visa A	Visa B	Visa C	Visa D	Visa A-D	VRG	%VRG
ÖB Manila	284	676	419	300	1.679	1.591	5,5%	0	0	1.561	118	1.679	1	0,1%
ÖB Maskat	20	86	102	50	258	174	48,3%	0	0	248	10	258	1	0,4%
ÖB Mexiko	22	10	49	16	97	77	26,0%	0	0	19	78	97	0	0,0%
ÖB Moskau	11.007	9.957	11.074	15.983	48.021	48.593	-1,2%	0	413	47.031	577	48.021	30	0,1%
GK München	107	45	44	93	289	372	-22,3%	0	3	182	104	289	168	58,1%
ÖB Nairobi	68	89	139	66	362	415	-12,8%	0	6	312	44	362	1	0,3%
ÖB New Delhi	682	1.796	1.360	776	4.614	4.226	9,2%	0	207	4.153	254	4.614	6	0,1%
GK New York	378	763	682	574	2.397	2.101	14,1%	38	1.011	1.271	77	2.397	9	0,4%
ÖB Oslo	32	51	50	27	160	188	-14,9%	3	15	140	2	160	9	5,6%
ÖB Ottawa	46	149	157	86	438	245	78,8%	10	134	202	92	438	1	0,2%
KA Paris	3	4	9	5	21	33	-36,4%	0	1	13	7	21	10	47,6%
ÖB Peking	1.583	2.513	3.871	3.551	11.518	9.915	16,2%	0	279	10.979	260	11.518	12	0,1%
ÖB Prag	900	1.119	1.313	1.026	4.358	3.269	33,3%	49	2.140	1.868	301	4.358	25	0,6%
ÖB Pressburg	466	479	499	416	1.860	1.865	-0,3%	0	390	1.057	413	1.860	47	2,5%
ÖB Pretoria	1.489	1.648	1.401	3.006	7.544	6.992	7,9%	0	190	7.313	41	7.544	6	0,1%
ÖB Rabat	97	143	198	85	523	427	22,5%	0	24	465	34	523	0	0,0%
ÖB Riga	129	147	153	159	588	792	-25,8%	0	56	514	18	588	0	0,0%
GK Rio de Janeiro	1	4	4	3	12	9	33,3%	0	0	7	5	12	0	0,0%
ÖB Riyadh	280	1.254	1.720	312	3.566	2.926	21,9%	0	2	3.515	49	3.566	27	0,8%
ÖB Rom/KA	1	4	4	2	11	19	-42,1%	0	0	7	4	11	2	18,2%

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1999/2000				Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	1999/2000				%VRG		
	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.				1999	1999/2000	1999/2000	1999/2000		1999/2000	
ÖB Santiago	6	3	13	2	24	25	-4,0%	0	0	10	14	24	0	0,0%
ÖB Sarajewo	6.411	7.209	7.888	5.764	27.272	28.154	-3,1%	4	6.729	20.094	445	27.272	39	0,1%
ÖB Seoul	28	20	34	18	100	198	-49,5%	0	0	8	92	100	0	0,0%
GK Shanghai	606	1.236	1.747	744	4.333	3.106	39,5%	0	12	4.285	36	4.333	0	0,0%
ÖB Skopje	666	1.336	1.364	1.142	4.508	3.506	28,6%	0	875	3.522	111	4.508	75	1,7%
ÖB Sofia	6.047	7.680	8.735	7.624	30.086	40.798	-26,3%	0	3.667	26.250	169	30.086	6	0,0%
ÖB Stockholm	88	198	160	91	537	674	-20,3%	8	38	489	2	537	1	0,2%
GK Strassburg	0	0	0	2	2	0	0,0%	0	0	0	2	2	0	0,0%
TB Taipei	1.459	4.518	5.415	1.809	13.201	9.123	44,7%	0	6	13.137	58	13.201	12	0,1%
ÖB Tallinn	54	58	58	50	220	5.417	-95,9%	0	15	183	22	220	124	56,4%
ÖB Teheran	1.676	2.162	3.138	1.959	8.935	5.987	49,2%	970	210	5.774	1.981	8.935	859	9,6%
ÖB Tel Aviv	33	49	84	29	195	225	-13,3%	0	5	175	15	195	31	15,9%
ÖB Tirana	412	753	1.055	604	2.824	2.556	10,5%	0	495	2.242	87	2.824	12	0,4%
ÖB Tokio	110	104	147	93	454	512	-11,3%	0	125	208	121	454	26	5,7%
GK Triest	7	6	2	6	21	36	-41,7%	0	1	6	14	21	0	0,0%
ÖB Tripolis	166	392	363	217	1.138	1.192	-4,5%	14	240	854	30	1.138	89	7,8%
ÖB Tunis	198	203	254	195	850	723	17,6%	0	62	751	37	850	1	0,1%
ÖB Warschau	156	155	155	205	671	639	5,0%	10	47	537	77	671	13	1,9%
ÖB Washington	159	381	301	256	1.097	905	21,2%	104	242	650	101	1.097	6	0,5%
ÖB Wilna	19	17	43	23	102	365	-72,1%	0	9	66	27	102	0	0,0%

SV-Statistik 2000

VERTRETUNG	1.Qt.	2.Qt.	3.Qt.	4.Qt.	Gesamt	1999	1999/2000	Visa A	Visa B	Visa C	Visa D	Visa A-D	VRG	%VRG
ÖB Zagreb	231	185	249	187	852	1.002	-15,0%	2	89	710	51	852	0	0,0%
ÖB Zürich	10.047	10.064	9.172	10.093	39.376	35.784	10,0%	0	37.161	2.188	27	39.376	21	0,1%
Summe	95.796	113.534	126.194	113.511	449.035	433.867	3,5%	1.416	103.305	333.011	11.303	449.035	4.052	0,9%

SV-Statistik 2001

VERTRETUNG		1.Qt.	2.Qt.	Gesamt	2000 1.HJ	2000/2001
ÖB	Abidjan	54	63	117	155	-24,5%
ÖB	Addis Abeba	57	86	143	119	20,2%
ÖB	Algier	186	257	443	216	0,0%
ÖB	Amman	395	586	981	767	27,9%
ÖB	Ankara	1.981	1.962	3.943	3.453	14,2%
ÖB	Athen	19	16	35	13	169,2%
ÖB	Bangkok	1.533	2.280	3.813	2.598	46,8%
ÖB	Beirut	220	336	556	0	0,0%
ÖB	Belgrad	7.972	7.932	15.904	16.505	-3,6%
GK	Berlin	5	3	8	8	0,0%
ÖB	Bern	7.810	9.642	17.452	15.545	12,3%
ÖB	Bogota	17	291	308	28	1000,0%
ÖB	Bonn	0	3	3	0	0,0%
ÖB	Brasilia	14	14	28	55	-49,1%
ÖB	Brüssel	2	5	7	6	16,7%
ÖB	Budapest	2.420	2.923	5.343	5.730	-6,8%
ÖB	Buenos Aires	20	13	33	29	13,8%
ÖB	Bukarest	10.310	13.562	23.872	20.361	17,2%
ÖB	Canberra	53	44	97	111	-12,6%
ÖB	Caracas	41	78	119	98	21,4%
GK	Chikago	157	524	681	604	12,7%
ÖB	Dakar	199	197	396	255	55,3%
ÖB	Damaskus	243	418	661	648	2,0%
ÖB	Den Haag	5	6	11	6	83,3%
ÖB	Dublin	32	39	71	29	144,8%
ÖB	Guatemala	16	13	29	19	52,6%
GK	Hamburg	2	2	4	36	-88,9%
ÖB	Hanoi	36	102	138	0	0,0%
ÖB	Harare	86	55	141	178	-20,8%
ÖB	Havanna	70	102	172	193	-10,9%

SV-Statistik 2001

ÖB	Heiliger Stuhl	0	0	0	0	0,0%
ÖB	Helsinki	36	7	43	133	-67,7%
GK	Hongkong	1.405	717	2.122	3.694	-42,6%
ÖB	Islamabad	157	216	373	363	2,8%
GK	Istanbul	5.204	3.661	8.865	12.104	-26,8%
ÖB	Jakarta	155	407	562	672	-16,4%
ÖB	Kairo	564	1.676	2.240	1.890	18,5%
KA	Kapstadt	806	437	1.243	1.761	-29,4%
ÖB	Kiew	7.891	9.272	17.163	11.316	51,7%
ÖB	Kopenhagen	79	0	79	698	-88,7%
GK	Krakau	44	46	90	96	-6,3%
ÖB	Kuala Lumpur	23	18	41	51	-19,6%
ÖB	Kuwait	212	778	990	776	27,6%
ÖB	Lagos	182	305	487	480	1,5%
ÖB	Laibach	186	229	415	327	26,9%
ÖB	Lima	87	159	246	267	-7,9%
ÖB	Lissabon	8	4	12	10	20,0%
ÖB	London	1.424	1.091	2.515	2.494	0,8%
GK	Los Angeles	140	264	404	561	-28,0%
ÖB	Luxemburg	0	1	1	0	0,0%
ÖB	Madrid	7	44	51	20	155,0%
GK	Mailand	4	6	10	7	42,9%
ÖB	Manila	298	468	766	960	-20,2%
ÖB	Maskat	61	202	263	106	148,1%
ÖB	Mexiko	23	21	44	32	37,5%
ÖB	Moskau	13.810	11.735	25.545	20.964	21,9%
GK	München	50	62	112	152	-26,3%
ÖB	Nairobi	74	129	203	157	29,3%
ÖB	New Delhi	692	1.971	2.663	2.478	7,5%
GK	New York	427	654	1.081	1.141	-5,3%
ÖB	Oslo	28	0	28	83	-66,3%
ÖB	Ottawa	90	166	256	195	31,3%
KA	Paris	10	11	21	7	200,0%

SV-Statistik 2001

ÖB	Peking	2.299	3.648	5.947	4.096	45,2%
ÖB	Prag	868	1.120	1.988	2.019	-1,5%
ÖB	Pressburg	404	410	814	945	-13,9%
ÖB	Pretoria	1.618	1.156	2.774	3.137	-11,6%
ÖB	Rabat	99	173	272	240	13,3%
ÖB	Riga	92	111	203	276	-26,4%
GK	Rio de Janeiro	1	3	4	5	-20,0%
ÖB	Riyadh	302	768	1.070	1.534	-30,2%
ÖB	Rom/KA	1	3	4	5	-20,0%
ÖB	Santiago	90	10	100	9	1011,1%
ÖB	Sarajewo	5.696	5.984	11.680	13.620	-14,2%
ÖB	Seoul	40	28	68	48	41,7%
GK	Shanghai	743	1.030	1.773	1.842	-3,7%
ÖB	Skopje	1.143	1.450	2.593	2.002	29,5%
ÖB	Sofia	13.657	1.229	14.886	13.727	8,4%
ÖB	Stockholm	62	0	62	286	-78,3%
GK	Strassburg	0	0	0	0	0,0%
TB	Taipei	1.917	5.245	7.162	5.977	19,8%
ÖB	Tallinn	51	59	110	112	-1,8%
ÖB	Teheran	2.395	2.119	4.514	3.838	17,6%
ÖB	Tel Aviv	40	42	82	82	0,0%
ÖB	Tirana	535	831	1.366	1.165	17,3%
ÖB	Tokio	80	134	214	214	0,0%
GK	Triest	1	2	3	13	-76,9%
ÖB	Tripolis	230	341	571	558	2,3%
ÖB	Tunis	242	222	464	401	15,7%
ÖB	Warschau	158	199	357	311	14,8%
ÖB	Washington	183	363	546	540	1,1%
ÖB	Wilna	13	10	23	36	-36,1%
ÖB	Zagreb	200	191	391	416	-6,0%
ÖB	Zürich	12.101	13.750	25.851	20.111	28,5%
	Summe	113.393	116.942	230.335	209.325	10,0%

PORTUGAL

2. Objectives

We agree with the objectives proposed.

3. Content

We agree with the list put forward, although we have reservations regarding the point "Other content? (Visas to be examined in more detail or certain visa categories to be refused at the request of the UN, NATO, WEU, CFSP, etc.?)", as the lists in question do not give sufficient information.

We propose the inclusion of reasons for refusal and details of lost passports.

We also agree with the inclusion of a photograph and biodata, which in the short term should be supplied in specific cases only.

The application form headings are:

- forename and surname;
- nationality;
- date of birth;
- parents;
- travel document, validity, issuing body and date of issue;
- type of visa;
- main destination;
- references within the country.

4. Input into the database

In Portugal, data will be input by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Aliens and Borders Department.

5. Access for consultation

All of the bodies listed apart from consular posts, which have access via the central body.

6. Period during which data should be retained in the database before being archived (validity of the data)

Under Portuguese law, the data in the database are all archived for two years or five years respectively, depending on whether visas have been granted or refused. As regards retaining visa data in the database, we suggest an average period of two to three years because, even for visas granted, it may be helpful to consult them for purposes such as asylum or refusal of admission for a stay in excess of the visa period. We also suggest that consideration be given to the feasibility of producing a table of visa refusal situations, ranked by seriousness of reasons.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

The feasibility of using VISANET should be explored.

8. Communication system

- 8.1.** Initially, information should be exchanged between Schengen partners' central authorities. The network should allow images to be supplied in specific cases.

8.2. As there is no direct link between consular posts and the national database, no significant change in the organisation of consular posts is anticipated.

9. SIS/database of visas

The database should not be incorporated into the SIS.

The database should be developed over a two-year period. Should the database be located at the various central authorities, there will be a need for new, more powerful equipment in keeping with the volume of information held in it.

Until all the contents and the volume of information have been determined, it will not be possible to estimate costs or additional human resources required.

10. Data protection

As regards the supply of Portuguese data, the National Data Protection Commission has already been consulted. On the coverage of the Community Directive, we would suggest that the Council Legal Service be consulted.

11. VISION consultation network

The VISION network should be structured in the same way as at present.

The data currently available can be incorporated into a visa database.

12. Comments on technical aspects

The VISION security arrangements should be retained, using the VISION communications networks.

Visa statistics for 2000 and 2001, including LTVs

2000		2001	
A:	269	A:	181
B:	3 261	B:	3 876
C:	108 645	C:	121 106
C1:	3 949	C1:	5 013
C2:	100	C2:	391
C3:	2 240	C3:	1 004
C5:	2 985	C5:	69
D:	10 406	D:	12 462
LTVs:	2 070	LTVs:	521

Note 2 concerns criteria and procedures for keeping visa data. We can report that the Portuguese system stores in a computerised database all data on all visa applications and visa stickers for all consular posts.

That database is automatically consulted whenever a visa is applied for.

FINLAND

3. Content

Finland consider important to include all visa sticker information:

Family name, first name, date of birth, number of passport, visa valid until, visa issued at, type of visa, number of entries, duration of stay, number of the visa sticker (FIN1234567), nationality.

In addition:

Visas requested, visas annulled, visas revoked.

4. Input into the database

All visa issuing authorities - consular posts, border authorities, police.

5. Access for consultation

All following authorities: consular posts, central visa authorities, border authorities, police, immigration authorities.

6. Period during which data should be retained in the database before being archived (validity of data)

Q: Differentiate between visas granted and those refused

A: No distinguish between issued and refused should not been made

Data should be retained for 5 years after last entry into the database.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

Access to other information than in the article 96 should be possible.

8. Communication system

8.1.

Communication system between consular posts and the database should be the competence and responsibility of each State.

The network should allow the transmission and receipt of images based on individual requests by competent authority.

8.2.

There is no major implications with regard to the organisation of work in the (Finnish) consulates.

9. SIS/Database of visas

Visa database/register should be placed outside present SIS-register, but for communication purposes use SIS-network.

10. Data protection

Data protection should be a similar system as for the SIS. Access should be for the authorities/persons concerned.

11. VISION consultation network

The possibilities to move the present Vision functions into the Visa-register should be studied.

The data currently supplied into the (Finnish) database could be incorporated into the database of visas.

12. Comments and technical aspects

No comments.

Notes

1. Visa statistics for 2000 and 2001

2000

393.200 visas

2001

A Visas 14

B Visas 12224

C Visas 394974

VLTV Visas 169

TOTAL VISAS 2001 407.381

2. Information on the criteria and procedures currently used by each Member State for archiving data on visas and to state whether or not such procedures cover all the Member State's consular posts.

Finnish database of visas is situated in the premises of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. All the data (visa applications) are archived into the database for five years. After five years it is archived into so called history database. The history database is archived for an indefinite period.

We enclose a copy of Finnish Visa System and Centralised Visa System.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs Finland

Visa administration in Finland

Ministry for Foreign Affairs

- is responsible in visa matters
- gives statements if applicant's nationality or type of passport is mentioned in annex 5A, 5B or 5C, or an embassy sends application for a statement for other reasons.
- administrates Visa and Vision-systems

Embassies

- can issue visas independently without a statement from MFA if applicant's nationality or type of passport is not mentioned in annex 5A, 5B or 5C.
- 60 embassies with on-line connection
- 27 embassies with off-line connection

Finnish Visa System

1. General

Centralised Visa System

Finland's Visa system has been running since 1996. It is a client/server system which workstations are distributed in embassies and data is stored centrally in the ministry.

Schengen features are added into the visa system and totally new Vision application for consultation management is developed from 25.3.2001.

1.1. Central Visa database

The whole Visa system uses one central database for storing all data. All the applications are connected online to this database.

The database consists of:

- application data
- decision data
- data of printed stickers
- security data
- statements
- system data and parameters

2. Visa application

Visa application at embassies

Visa application is used for applying Schengen Visas. System is used by embassies, ministry and other authorities.

The system supports following operations:

- application processing at embassies
- security checks based on national safety information
- SIS-checks
- storing application data in central database
- requesting online statements from other authorities
- passing information to authorities who need it
- statistics

3. Visa System used for application processing

Visa System is used for application processing at embassies and at local authorities in Finland which issue Visas.

The Visa System supports all the steps needed for applying the Visa. The operations are:

- SIS-check which will be done for all applications. The check will be online.
- Check if the Vision Consultation is required. System will alarm user if the check is not done before the decision.
- Sending the consultation request to the separate Vision application.
- Reading the consultation answer.
- Sending the Notification if VLTV is issued.
- Entering the application data into the system
- Automatic check of the previous applications and security data. System alarms if there is security information about the applicant in the system. Also all previous applications are showed automatically.
- Requesting the statement from other authorities if necessary. Requests of the statements and corresponding answers are managed by the system.
- Making the decision, system checks automatically that the data which is entered is correct and that all necessary information has been entered.
- Printing the sticker
-

4. Vision application

Visa system and Vision

Vision application is added into Finnish Visa System for the management of the consultation process. It is located in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and it will handle and manage all the consultation requests which come either from the embassies or from the other Schengen states.

The Vision application have the following functionalities:

- Receiving the consultation requests either from embassies or other Schengen states and answering those requests.
- Management of the consultation process between many Schengen States. (Annex 5B)
- Management of the consultation process when representing other Schengen state. (Annex 5C)
- Sending the X.400 messages using Sirene Phase II network (2001/8 SISNET)
- Maintaining the consultation rules (5A-C)
- Passing the notifications from embassies to all other Schengen states.
- Storing all consultations, answers and notifications.
- Statistics.
- Error handling

7. Technical specifications

All the data of the Visa (and Vision) system is stored in relational database system(Ingres II,Unix) in Helsinki in the premises of the Ministry for the Foreign Affairs of Finland. The workstations use Client Server technology in Visa and Vision applications. The network is based on Frame Relay technique. It is operated by two international network operators(Infonet Co and Sonera). The network is limited only for the use of the applications of the MFA of Finland. All data exchange between the Ministry and the other organisations (embassies and other authorities) is controlled by the firewall system.

SWEDEN

Point 3. As regards the **content** of a common database of visas, it is important that national legislation concerning secrecy and personal data can be taken into account. As already stated, Sweden attaches great importance to aspects of integrity. Under Swedish legislation on secrecy, for example, data relating to decisions on visa matters are subject to secrecy, and the disclosure of such data is therefore prohibited.

Point 4. The benefit of allowing e.g. border authorities to **input data into the database**, e.g. concerning persons entering and leaving the Schengen area, ought to be investigated. In order to avoid practical problems where necessary, responsibility for entering information should probably lie with a single central authority even if several authorities contribute data.

Point 5. The question of who should have **access to the database** should be considered in relation to the database's content. The benefits, requirements and objectives must be examined so that they can be balanced against aspects relating to integrity and costs.

Point 6. With regard to the **period during which data should be retained**, differentiating between nationalities could present difficulties from the point of view of discrimination, possibly leading to political problems. It is not clear what the last indent means, and therefore we cannot comment on it.

Point 8. It is important that the feasibility study is extended to the **communication system** between consular posts and the database and between consular posts at local level. A large number of Member States have already invested heavily in data systems which differ from one Member State to another, and this needs to be taken into account together with the fact that the speed of communications varies in different geographical areas. The question of whether the network should allow the transmission and receipt of images must be examined and costed. Advantages and disadvantages and legal aspects of the division of responsibility for the system should be considered.

The **practical implications** of work in the consulates should be examined, *inter alia* with regard to resources. The volume of cases may mean that even a lighter future workload could have significant implications.

Point 9. The possibility of integrating the **database** into the **SIS** should be examined as this could facilitate searches in the system and avoid searches in several different systems. However, integrating the database into the current SIS application would probably be extremely difficult as the current application suffers from serious shortcomings as regards flexibility and the possibility of making changes. This limits options and means that large amounts of money and time will have to be put aside for developing and testing. Opportunities for using SIS II should be investigated, as should the legal aspects.

Point 10. The feasibility study should also cover the serious issues relating to **data protection**.

Point 11. The feasibility study should also cover the possibility of using the data supplied to **VISION**.

Point 12. **Technical aspects**. Data contained in the database should indicate or attach a passport number in respect of visas issued. Photographs should be attached to both approved and rejected applications.

A counterpart to a common database of visas will be introduced in Sweden in April 2002. It will then be possible for the Swedish Migration Board's WILMA visa system to be accessed by the border control posts, which will be able to search the system directly and enter data concerning entry and departure dates. Although a European system is generally considered to be a good idea which is technically fully feasible, it will be both expensive and time-consuming.

Other

Sweden's embassies have access to the SIS via a CD-ROM which is updated every two weeks. Next year, 15 embassies will be connected to SIS on-line via the Wilma system described above.

Approved visa applications are archived for at least one year, while rejected applications are archived for at least five years.

Statistics for 2000 and 2001 are enclosed (cf. Annexes 1 and 2). It should be noted that the 2001 statistics are not yet complete. They will be completed once the data become available.

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

Collage

UNITED KINGDOM

1. The UK welcomes the forthcoming feasibility study to be carried out by the Commission into an EU Visa Data Base. It is important to recall the context in which such a proposal emerged and that the Special JHA Council on 20 September was motivated by the need to improve operational cooperation to combat terrorism and other serious crime in the wake of the attacks of September 11, and not simply to improve administrative visa issuing practices. The UK therefore agrees that the objectives of an EU Visa Data Base should be broad ones - as set out in Part 2 of the Spanish Presidency note 15577/02 VISA 158.

2. Although the UK does not take part in the Schengen visa issuing arrangements, we do play a full and active role in EU action to combat illegal immigration and the prevention of crime. We also take part in Schengen police and judicial cooperation measures, including these aspects of the Schengen Information System. It is clearly in the mutual interests of all 15 EU Member States (plus Norway and Iceland) to work closely together in these areas and to avoid creating unnecessary institutional obstacles to such cooperation.

3. The UK manages a network of 165 visa issuing posts worldwide - these handled 1,75 million visa applications in 2001. A significant number of these applicants are also likely to have applied for Schengen visas if they intended to travel beyond the UK, or may apply for Schengen visas in the future. Similarly, a number of applicants for Schengen visas may also have, or be intending to, apply for UK visas. While informal cooperation and information exchanges already exist at a consular level in many posts to screen particular individuals, the advantages and practicalities of a EU wide database seem worth exploring.

4. The UK has no strong views on whether such a system should be developed as part of SIS II or separately, but would note that developments in technology may make such questions academic. There is clearly an advantage to be had in avoiding the need for consular posts, ports of entry and national immigration / border services requiring a multiplicity of separate and incompatible IT systems. It would also make sense for the system to include information on visas applied for as well as issued and for users to be able to access the FADO system of information on travel documents. Consideration should also be given to how users of other databases - such as EURODAC and Europol - should be able to compare data with that held on the Visa Data Base, and whether information exchanges with certain third countries should be permitted - on a reciprocal basis and

respecting EU data protection principles.

5. The attached note responds to the request in 15577/02 VISA 158 for information on the UK's current and planned visa data systems. The UK is willing to offer the Commission any further assistance or support during its feasibility study.

Modernisation of the UK Entry Clearance (Visa) Operation

Introduction

1. The UK entry clearance (or visa) operation is managed by the Joint Entry Clearance Unit (JECU), a joint Home Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) department. This reflects the interest both departments have in the work of the UK immigration Control at home and abroad, as reflected in their published shared aim "to regulate entry to and settlement in the United Kingdom effectively in the interests of sustainable growth and social inclusion".
2. JECU manages a network of 165 visa issuing posts worldwide involving over 1 200 people: some 300 of these staff come from the FCO and the Home Office; the others engaged locally. Provisional figures for 2001 show a 5% increase on 2000: 1,75 million visa applications in 2001 compared with 1,65 million applications in 2000.
3. A significant modernisation programme is currently under way to improve the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) used to support the entry clearance operation. This modernisation also reflects the need to appreciate that the work of visa officers overseas is just the first step in the chain of the UK immigration control, which subsequently involves immigration officers at ports of arrival and Home Office caseworkers considering applications for extensions of stay.
4. The modernisation can be divided into 2 main work streams, the first of which sees the completion of current projects already underway, the second takes forward the main modernisation programme for which money has been specifically obtained from HM Treasury.

Tranche 1: current projects

5. The current visa issuing software is known as "Proviso Express", and is a visa application data capture tool which stores data, checks local alert lists, provides statistics and ultimately prints visas. A new version of the software ("Proviso 3") has been developed, this allows data to be captured more quickly (including the use of passport readers for the capture of data from Machine Readable Passports or visas), ensures statistics are accurate, can be configured to best suit applications and casework in the local environment and is simpler to use. The software has been successfully tested in Paris and Lagos and is currently being rolled out to British visa issuing posts across the world.

6. The "Warnings Index" is a Home Office owned system which lists people with adverse immigration histories or who are of other interest to the Government. Every visa applicant is checked against this database. Although the system is available on-line to immigration staff in the UK, security considerations have meant that overseas it can only be used on off-line laptops which are regularly refreshed with CD-Rom updates of the main database. Similarly visa officers do not have access to the background information behind the entries, when a "hit" is identified this information must be obtained from the UK by secure means.

7. The current "Warnings Index" hardware is now ageing and is to be replaced in the Spring. The new laptops will be more reliable and will be loaded with enhanced software to manage the increasing size of the database which is currently reaching the capacity of the old software. The new version will provide greater security and usability.

Tranche 2: modernisation projects

8. In the Spring of 2000, JECU obtained central government funding to modernise the ICT used in the entry clearance operation. Although the business case described how the modernisation would improve both public service and the operational integrity of the entry clearance operation, these benefits were hard to measure. The business case therefore was made on the basis of costed operation efficiencies, to the tune of around £8 million, which would derive from the modernisation by year 4.

9. The business case also described how the modernisation would take advantage of ICT investments already in place or underway within both the Home Office and the FCO. Specifically new systems will be based on "Firecrest" (a global FCO standard suite of desktop applications, including internet browsing, running on Compaq hardware) and will be enabled by the new Confidential level FCO Telecommunications network (FTN) running over lines and satellite. This new infrastructure has opened up opportunities which the new investment will exploit.

10. The cornerstone of the modernisation will be the replacement of, or addition to, the localised visa databases at each post overseas with one central entry clearance reference system containing data from all visa issuing posts. This system will run on the FTN. It will enable entry clearance officers in one post to see not just their own visa application records but also those from all other posts world wide. The system will also give JECU in London access to global management information statistics and to individual visa application records as necessary.

11. A further advantage of the centralised entry clearance reference system will be the ability to install onward connections to immigration records currently held in a Home Office data warehouse in the UK. The UK immigration control, as previously explained, is really one process from visa application overseas through to arriving in the UK and then making any subsequent application to extend stay. Providing a link between the centralised entry clearance reference system and Home Office records will allow entry clearance officers to see Home Office immigration records and immigration officers and Home Office caseworkers in the UK to see their applicants original entry clearance application. This will allow for quicker and better informed decision making by all involved in the process, it will also lead to more efficiencies and less bureaucracy through reduced need for sight of paper records

12. It is also intended to take advantage of the new confidential FTN to allow the "Warnings Index" to be provided at posts overseas on-line. There would no longer be a need for off-line updates and the database at all posts would be up to date. It may also be possible to provide the background information behind Warnings Index entries to posts on-line. This again would lead to efficiencies and faster, better informed decision making.

13. The British Prime Minister has set the target that all government services which could be delivered electronically should be available on-line by 2005. Visa information is currently available via the internet, as are visa application forms. However it is not yet possible to complete and submit forms on-line. The entry clearance modernisation programme will increase levels of e-service delivery and prototype software for web based visa applications is scheduled to be trailed at the British Consulate General in New York during the Spring.

14. Finally, the programme will also improve efficiency in handling telephone enquiries. Research indicates that in many posts several telephone calls are received for every application made. It is thought that many other calls may be missed or may not get through. The FTN will allow call automation to handle routine enquiries such as payments, opening hours and directions to the office; this will then free up telephone assistants to respond to more complicated enquiries which require personal attention. The FTN and the centralised entry clearance reference system together would permit calls to be diverted to regional call centres if that was considered desirable.

Further into the future

15. Although the entry clearance modernisation programme will deliver the above business change, it is also seen as an enabling programme upon which the business will be able to build further change in the future.

16. The European Union appears to be moving in the direction of placing a photographic image of the holder on to the Uniform Format Visa. The United Kingdom will continue to take an active role in these discussions.

17. There is also movement towards introducing some other biometric information on to the UFV. The UK Immigration Service is embarking on a trial whereby for a limited period frequent flyers from North America with British Airways and Virgin Atlantic Airways will be able to register an iris scan and thereafter enter the United Kingdom at Heathrow Airport via automatic gates rather than by seeing an immigration officer. JECU, in cooperation with the Immigration Service, is considering whether there is potential to use this technology within the entry clearance operation. A visa applicant would be interviewed and, if issued a visa, would be offered the opportunity to have their iris scanned. If they accepted they too would be able to use automatic barriers at Heathrow, thereby saving considerable resources at ports and airports of arrival in the UK and ensuring that the person arriving was the same person to whom the visa had been issued.

18. As well as looking at biometrics, it is likely that future modernisation may include the issue of electronic visas, similar to the Australian Electronic Travel Authority. However, unlike that system, visa applicants would still need to apply to the British mission and not to travel agents or at airline check-in. An electronic visa in conjunction with a biometric could do away with the need for a visa sticker or even with the need for a passport.

19. These are just ideas and possibilities at this stage, but it is certain that entry clearance modernisation will not finish with the end of the described programme in April 2004, rather that modernisation will be an on-going process, particularly as regards biometrics and e-service delivery.

NORWAY

2. Objectives

We concur with the objectives described in the document.

3. Content

In our opinion all information necessary to reach the objectives should be included. In view of the impact on the volume of visas, some restraint in the amount and amplitude of information stored would be advisable.

4. Input into the database

Both mentioned in the questionnaire.

5. Access for consultation

All mentioned in the questionnaire.

6. Period during which data should be retained

We feel it would be advisable to differentiate between visas granted and visas refused. It should be possible to archive visas granted shortly after the period of validity is expired. On the other hand, in the best possible way, to fulfil the objective of the base, visas refused should be retained for a longer period. We do not want to decide on the period, but a parallel to the SIS-base (automatic removal from the base after three years) seems natural.

7. Other databases which should be directly accessible to consular posts

In our view, consular posts should have access to databases of false documents and SIS. The majority of Norwegian consular posts are already on-line to SIS (Article 96) through a closed network of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Directorate of Immigration. The consular posts would equally benefit from a base of "acceptable" travel agencies and list over documentation needed on a local level.

8. Communication system

In our view the feasibility study should incorporate both the communication system and the practical implications with regards to database access/update at the consulates.

9. SIS/Database of visas

Factors like costs, time and resource requirements will exist irrespective of the preferred solution. A through evaluation should be carried in order to decide on which solution should be preferred.

10. Data protection

At the present time, it is not clarified to what extent Norwegian legislation permits such registers as mentioned above.

11. VISION consultation network

The method of structuring database will depend on the preferred solution ref. 9.

12. Comments on technical aspects

One should strive to make the technical solutions simple, so that the debugging operation, incorporating new functions, changing specification of the overall system can be carried out without much hassle.