



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 18 November 2008 (20.11)  
(OR. fr)**

**15934/08**

**LIMITE**

**SIRIS 152  
COMIX 842**

**NOTE**

---

from: Presidency  
to : SIS/SIRENE Working Party (EU/Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Liechtenstein  
Mixed Committee)  
Subject : Statistical analysis of the use of the Schengen Information System (SIS)

---

The French Presidency wishes to initiate the communication on a six-monthly basis of information for the Member States on the use of the SIS. The purpose of this statistical information is to improve the input into and use of the SIS by the Member States. Thus each Presidency could carry out an analysis based on the statistics edited by the C.SIS and in this way take part in the Council's information process.

**Statistical analysis of the use of the Schengen Information System (SIS)**

• **General observation**

The number of alerts entered in the system went from 9,7 million in 2000 to over 26 million on 1 July 2008.

This increase is due to two main factors:

- Firstly: an increase in the data entered in the system corresponding to an increase in the number of partner countries.

- Secondly: a significant increase in the number of data entered relating to objects and vehicles. Alerts relating to identity documents thus rose from 13,7 million on 1 January 2007 to 20,3 million on 1 July 2008, i.e. an increase of around 7 million data. By comparison, in the previous period from 1 January 2005 to 1 July 2006 there was an increase of 1,5 million data.

Overall input into the SIS remains uneven because a third of all alerts registered in the system are from Italy alone, namely 9,2 million out of 26 million (both persons and objects).

- **Statistical analysis by type of alert**

#### **Art. 95**

The number of data entered in the system doubled in the 2000-2008 period, going from 10 418 to 22 026. This increase would appear to correspond to the growing number of partner countries. In fact, the increase has been particularly significant since nine new Member States joined the Schengen area. Thus the entry of Article 95 alerts increased by 38 % (from 15 979 to 22 026) in the July 2007 to July 2008 period.

#### **Art. 96**

The number of Article 96 alerts went from 765 000 in 2000 to 726 000 in 2008. This drop appears to be the immediate consequence of the accession of new countries to the European Union, since it is not possible to enter an alert on a Union citizen in SIS for the purposes of refusing entry.

#### **Art. 97**

The input under Article 97 concerning incapable adults or adults sought in the interests of their families does not give rise to any particular comments.

On the other hand, the constant rise in the number of data relating to minors, which has doubled in eight years (from 12 114 in 2000 to 24 719 in 2008), is indicative of the importance attached by the Member States to an increased protection of minors in physical and psychological danger in the Schengen area.

## **Art. 98**

The number of Article 98 alerts has grown significantly in recent years, going from 30 000 alerts in 2000 to 69 000 alerts in 2008. There was also a substantial increase during the period from 1 July 2007 to 1 July 2008 (53 300 to 69 000).

## **Art. 99: Individuals**

### **Art. 99(2): Discreet check**

Input into the information system under Article 99(2) "discreet check" increased very significantly from 2006 onwards: 23 554 individuals underwent discreet checks in July 2006 as opposed to only 12 062 in January 2005. Thus in one and a half years the number of alerts relating to this article doubled and is now becoming stable.

It should be pointed out that two countries alone provide over 90 % of the data.

### **Art. 99(2): Specific check**

The input of Article 99(2) alerts relating to specific checks has been lower. In fact, in eight years the number of data relating to this category of alert has increased by only 25 % (6 0000 in 2000 and 8 000 in 2008).

The salient fact which emerges from the figures relating to the two Article 99(2) categories is that input peaked in 2006 and then stabilised in the following years. It is also interesting to note that three countries are entering over 95 % of this type of alert.

### **Art. 99(3):**

The number of data entered under this article is too low for any kind of statistical conclusion to be drawn, other than the fact that this situation reflects a marginal use of this article by all Member States.

## **Art. 99: Vehicles**

The increase in the input by the Member States of Article 99 alerts linked to vehicles has been virtually exponential over the last eight years both in terms of specific checks (+ 250 %) and discreet checks (+ 700 %).

### **Art. 100: Vehicles**

The efficiency of the information system is demonstrated by the constant and progressive input of alerts for vehicles stolen or sought in the Schengen area. In the 2000-2005 period, input on stolen or sought vehicles increased slightly (+ 200 000 alerts in five years). However, the number of data relating to vehicles doubled in the period from 2005 to 2008, namely by over a million additional data (2,2 million in 2008).

With regard to registration plates, input by the Member States only really started in 2006 following the Spanish initiative. It must, however, be underlined that four countries alone are entering 93 % of the data into the database.

### **Art. 100: Other objects**

As far as banknotes are concerned, the number of data in the system went from 800 000 in 2000 to 174 284 in 2008. This drop can probably be explained by the Member States' transition to the euro.

### **Conclusions:**

**This statistical analysis shows that the Schengen Information System is a key tool in combating crime in the European area.**

**According to the States which use it, this information system is the most effective tool in international police cooperation.**

**The statistical analysis shows that the total number of alerts has practically tripled in eight years, resulting in a corresponding increase in the workload of the SIRENE bureaux, but with no corresponding increase in staff.**

**The Member States could however optimise the operational contribution of SIS through greater and more systematic input.**