

Minor Interpellation tabled by Member Andrej Hunko *et al.* and the parliamentary group of The Left Party

Launch of the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur)

Bundestag printed paper 18/76

Questioners' preliminary remarks

The purpose of the Eurosur surveillance network is to coordinate the existing surveillance capabilities of the EU Member States. Images and data from other sensors are transmitted to the external borders, and the EU border agency Frontex in Warsaw serves as the headquarters of the Eurosur system. Information can either be forwarded to other states or be used by the EU Border Police for risk assessments and other measures. Eurosur is to be launched at the end of 2013, initially in 18 Member States, namely Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain. The other six Member States with external maritime borders, including Germany with its North and Baltic Sea coasts, will follow suit on 1 December 2014.

The decision to establish Eurosur was taken in 2008 and was enshrined in documents such as the five-year Stockholm Programme. According to an impact assessment presented by the European Commission, the total cost could amount to EUR 338.7 million; this bill would be increased by some EUR 100 million for the establishment of national coordination centres in 24 Member States. The Internal Security Fund will cover 75% of these costs. Numerous research programmes are supporting the equipping of surveillance measures such as the use of satellite technology for space-based location and observation. Besides radar systems, marine navigation systems and regular surveillance, drones are also part of the package. Projects in the Seventh EU Framework Research and Development Programme have already devised plans for areas in which unmanned aerial vehicles are to operate. Test flights in civil air space have also taken place. Their purpose is not to rescue shipwreck victims, for the project descriptions refer only to combating 'illegal migration' and 'smuggling' (<https://tem.li/bcizy>).

The main elements of Eurosur will be the maritime border surveillance systems that already exist in the frameworks of Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (BSRBCC), the Black Sea Littoral States Border/Coast Guard Cooperation Forum (BSCF) and the Seahorse Atlantic project. Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Cap Verde cooperate in Seahorse Atlantic, which was established under the aegis of Spain. In response to a Spanish initiative, the Seahorse Mediterraneo network, in which Libya also intends to participate, is currently being set up. Libya's border surveillance, which has also received a makeover from the European Union, will initially be linked to Italy through command centres in Tripoli and Benghazi. The European Union has exerted pressure on Tunisia, Egypt and Algeria to do likewise and has apparently been successful (Die Tageszeitung, 10 October 2013). According to media reports, these countries also intend to take part in the EU surveillance platform from 2014 (ANSA Mediterranean, 19 September 2013).

In early October, the European Parliament adopted the requisite Eurosur Regulation at first reading. Although Frontex and Eurosur activities primarily target border crossings by illegal migrants, they were summarily rebranded as rescue activities for shipwreck victims in announcements made by the European Commission in the wake of the hundreds of drowning fatalities off Lampedusa. The European Parliament has also emphasised that Eurosur must be used to rescue migrants when they are in danger. EU countries, it said, must always respect human rights, including the principle of non-refoulement. In the view of the questioners, however, it may be assumed that Eurosur is making the passage of asylum-seekers more and more hazardous and often impossible, for if migrants are detected on departure, they will not even reach international waters or the territory of EU Member States where they can apply for asylum. This assessment is also substantiated by the fact that Italy, France, Spain, Greece and Malta – all of them Mediterranean coastal states – are united in their rejection of new provisions on rescue missions (Council Document 14612/13). These had become necessary after the European Court of Justice, in 2010, annulled a Council Decision supplementing the Schengen Borders Code. An appropriate proposal is now on the table, but an agreement is not yet in sight. The governmental delegations describe the proposal as 'unacceptable', because Article 9 of the proposed Regulation establishing rules for the surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by Frontex, stipulates in its provisions covering search and rescue situations that refugees on the open seas must be rescued if it may be assumed that their ship is not sufficiently seaworthy to reach its presumed destination. The authorities are also to render assistance if the number of passengers is unduly high in relation to the type and condition of the ship or if there is a shortage of food on board. The same applies if passengers are in need of medical assistance or if there are pregnant women or children on board.

In the questioners' view, Eurosur represents a further strengthening of the Frontex border police force, a move that does nothing to create more parliamentary or public oversight. Instead of taking anticipated refugee movements seriously and promising people protection, the EU has reacted with distrust, defensiveness and stringency. In the questioners' opinion, Eurosur and Frontex are the cynical response of the European Union to the emancipation processes in the Arab world.

Preliminary remarks

In their preliminary remarks, the questioners make more than one reference to an EU border police force, ascribing that role to the EU agency Frontex, hereafter referred to as 'the Agency'. Guarding borders is a national sovereign responsibility which is exercised by the EU Member States. The Agency has no operational mandate. It essentially supports and coordinates the joint operational activities pursued by the competent Member States to protect their sections of the external borders of the EU.

The questioners also refer in their preliminary remarks to some cooperative bodies as components of the Eurosur system. Of these bodies, Germany is only involved in the Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (BSRBCC) Forum. At least with regard to this forum, the Federal Government wishes to emphasise that it is neither a border surveillance system nor a component of the Eurosur system. The BSRBCC

Forum serves to develop and intensify cooperation in the Baltic Sea region through the creation of a platform for sharing experience, devising joint training courses and coordinating joint operations within the realm of border policing duties.

1. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, which Member States have already established national coordination centres, where are these located, and which police authorities are responsible for each of them?

Reply to question 1

To the knowledge of the Federal Government, the national coordination centres of Member States Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain and of Schengen signatory Norway are connected to the Eurosur network. In terms of their organisational position, the vast majority of the NCCs are part of the competent border or police authorities.

2. The output of which civil and military surveillance capabilities of the EU Member States can be processed in Eurosur, and in what data format?

Reply to question 2

Being what one might call a 'system of systems', the Eurosur network pools Member States' existing national border surveillance systems. The range of capabilities of each system depends on diverse factors, particularly the national requirements and geographical locations of Member States. With regard to the sources from which a national situational picture can be compiled, please see Regulation (EU) No 1052/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur), hereinafter referred to as the 'Eurosur Regulation'.

3. What criteria are used to determine which information is passed on by national coordination centres to Frontex in Warsaw, and what rules or arrangements govern such decisions?

Reply to question 3

The way in which information is exchanged between the Member States' national coordination centres and the Agency and the range of such information is determined by the relevant provisions of the Eurosur Regulation and by the memorandums of understanding to be concluded between Member States laying down procedural details for these exchanges of information. Technical and operational guidelines, recommendations and examples of best practice will be set out in the Eurosur handbook, which is currently being drawn up by the European Commission in cooperation with the Agency and Member States.

4. What criteria does Frontex use to determine which information is to be shared with other EU Member States, and what rules or arrangements govern such decisions?

Reply to question 4

Information is conveyed to Frontex in confidence, and the sole right to disseminate it lies with the originating Member State. The same applies to the Agency with regard to the European situational picture and the common pre-frontier intelligence picture, in that the Agency does not determine which information from national situational pictures is to be shared with other Member States. For more details, please see the reply to question 3 above.

5. What criteria does Frontex use to determine which information is to be shared with states outside the European Union, and what rules or arrangements and/or bilateral or multilateral agreements exist, to the knowledge of the Federal Government, between one or more Member States on the one hand and non-EU countries on the other with regard to the sharing of such information?

Reply to question 5

Under Article 20 of the Eurosur Regulation, "Member States may exchange information and cooperate with one or several neighbouring third countries", in so far as this is absolutely essential. "Such exchange of information and such cooperation shall take place on the basis of bilateral or multilateral agreements", which must also fulfil the requirements laid down in Article 20 of the Eurosur Regulation. The Federal Government has no knowledge of the existence or content of such agreements.

6. As matters stand at present, to which states could information be transmitted?

Reply to question 6

Please see the answer to question 5 above.

7. What arrangements have been made for the transmission of data streams, and how are they made secure?

Reply to question 7

In the Eurosur network, data streams are transmitted in encoded form through the Internet. The Agency is responsible for the security and integrity of the communication network.

8. Which Council working parties or other bodies of the European Union are dealing with the establishment of Eurosur, and in what way is the Federal Government involved in each instance?

Reply to question 8

The Eurosur Regulation was handled primarily by the Council Working Party on Frontiers. Subsequent referrals to superior Council bodies were made in accordance with normal procedures.

The Federal Government participated in the process through representatives of the Federal Ministry of the Interior. The implementation of the Regulation has been and will continue to be prepared by means of working meetings, which take place as and when required and at which the Federal Government is represented by experts from the Federal Police.

9. To what extent is the Federal Government aware whether a phased timetable exists for the launch of Eurosur at the end of 2013, in other words whether the commissioning of the system by Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Spain will not occur simultaneously?

Reply to question 9

The phased introduction and extension of the Eurosur network is part of the implementation plan. The southern maritime borders and the eastern land borders are the initial priority areas for the introduction of the system – see recital 14 of the Eurosur Regulation. The Federal Government does not know whether there is any further staggering of commissioning dates within these priority areas.

10. Which directorates of which Federal Government authorities will be connected to Eurosur?

Reply to question 10

In Germany, only the Federal Police will be connected to Eurosur.

11. Which organisational and administrative measures or building work will be undertaken for this purpose, and how will such action be funded?

Reply to question 11

The German national coordination centre will be located in the Command and Control Centre of the Federal Police Headquarters in Potsdam. The specific task of overseeing the maritime external borders in the North and Baltic Seas will be performed through the Federal Police Regional Headquarters in Bad Bramstedt, where responsibility will lie with the Joint Maritime Emergency Reporting and Assessment Centre (GLZ See). No building work is required for the integration of the system. The requisite IT-related development is being funded by the EU, whose contribution can be topped up by resources from the Internal Security Fund. The present staff of the Command and Control Centre at the Federal Police HQ and of GLZ See will take care of Eurosur operations.

12. Where is the German national coordination centre located, and how is it staffed?

Reply to question 12

Please see the reply to question 11 above.

13. In this context, what tasks are entrusted to the Federal Police Headquarters (Bundestag printed paper 17/8277)?

Reply to question 13

The Federal Police Headquarters performs the tasks defined in Article 5 of the Eurosur Regulation for national coordination centres.

14. With what other national coordination centres does the Joint Maritime Emergency Reporting and Assessment Centre in Cuxhaven exchange information, and in what ways will this change in the Eurosur framework (Bundestag printed paper 17/8277)?

(a) How often will 'national situational pictures' be compiled?

(b) How often will regular assessments of national border surveillance measures be undertaken?

Reply to question 14

The Federal Police will continue to exchange information as necessary with its counterparts in the security domain in accordance with the pertinent provisions.

(a) The national situational pictures will be compiled on a regular or *ad hoc* basis.

(b) The assessment of national border control and surveillance measures takes place in the framework of procedures known as Schengen evaluations. The last such evaluation in Germany took place in 2009. In addition, these measures are subject to constant internal hierarchical and professional supervision within the border authorities.

15. To what extent are military capabilities included in the German 'national situational picture', and what are these military capabilities?

Reply to question 15

There is no provision for the inclusion of military capabilities in the German 'national situational picture'.

16. What projects for the use of satellite reconnaissance for internal security purposes are currently supported by the European Union, and what is the content of those projects (Bundestag printed paper 17/13187)?

Reply to question 16

Please see the Federal Government's reply of 23 April 2013 to question 15 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/13187. The Federal Government possesses no further knowledge of such projects.

17. What is the general aim and specific objective of the EU project SAGRES, and what contributions are to be made by the German participants – the Fraunhofer Society, the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) and the EADS company Astrium?

Reply to question 17

Service Activations for Growing Eurosur's Success (SAGRES) is an EU project for the assessment of service scenarios in support of Frontex's Eurosur system. See http://www.copernicus-sagres.eu/technical_details/scop.html.

In the SAGRES project, the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) is working as a subcontractor of the Spanish-based gmv company. The task of the DLR is to detect vessels on the high seas on the basis of satellite data. To this end, algorithms have to be constructed and optimised, and pre-operational system chains have to be developed.

18. In which other national and international research programmes devoted to the establishment of Eurosur and/or the provision of capabilities have German authorities and, as far as the Federal Government is aware, German businesses, universities and institutes been involved?

Reply to question 18

Under the Seventh EU Framework Research Programme, 26 European businesses, including Thales Defence Deutschland GmbH, are participating in the SeaBILLA project of the European Union. German authorities are not involved. The project has a budget of €15.5 million. European support funding accounts for €9.8 million of that amount.

19. What were the budgets of the relevant projects, and how were they funded?

Reply to question 19

Please see the reply to question 18 above.

20. Which land-based surveillance networks that already exist or are yet to be established and that are to be incorporated into Eurosur under the Eurosur Regulation are known to the Federal Government on the basis of information from EU Council working parties or other EU bodies?

Reply to question 20

The Federal Government possesses no such knowledge.

21. To the knowledge of the Federal Government or according to information from EU Council working parties or other EU bodies, which countries are part of the maritime surveillance system Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (BSRBCC)?

Reply to question 21

The BSRBCC Forum is not a border surveillance system but a cooperative body. Please see the Federal Government's preliminary remarks. All of the Baltic coastal states are members of the Forum. Norway and Iceland have observer status.

22. Through which command and control centres, coordination centres or comparable facilities are national authorities incorporated into the BSRBCC framework, and which are the participating national authorities?

Reply to question 22

In the BSRBCC circle, the command and control centre of the Federal Police Regional Headquarters in Bad Bramstedt serves as the national communication and contact point.

23. What information is collected, processed and passed on within the network?

Reply to question 23

For the areas in which cooperation takes place within the BSRBCC circle, please see the Federal Government's preliminary remarks.

24. Which BSRBCC meetings were attended by which Federal Government authorities in 2012 and 2013, and what items were discussed at each of those meetings?

Reply to question 24

Representatives of the Federal Police attended the annual BSRBCC conferences on behalf of Germany. The agendas of the two conferences essentially comprised discussion of the incumbent presidency's plan of action and annual report, presentations and discussions on BSRBCC activities and presentations by the Member States or associated agencies such as Frontex or EMSA.

25. In what ways is Frontex already cooperating with the BSRBCC network, and how will this change when Eurosur is launched?

Reply to question 25

Cooperation between the Agency and the BSRBCC circle has chiefly consisted in the joint preparation of in-service training courses on matters relating to border policing. The Federal Government is not aware of any plans to alter this cooperation or of any changes that will result from the launching of Eurosur.

26. To the knowledge of the Federal Government or according to information from EU Council working parties or other EU bodies, which countries are part of the maritime surveillance system Black Sea Littoral States Border/Coast Guard Cooperation Forum (BSCF)?

Reply to question 26

All of the Black Sea coastal states are members of the Black Sea Littoral States Border/Coast Guard Cooperation Forum (BSCF). Please see the Federal Government's preliminary remarks above.

27. Through which command and control centres, coordination centres or comparable facilities are national authorities incorporated into the BSCF framework, and which are the participating national authorities?

28. What information is collected, processed and passed on within the network?

29. In what ways is Frontex already cooperating with the BSCF, and how will this change when Eurosur is launched?

Reply to questions 27 to 29

The Federal Government has no knowledge of these matters.

30. To the knowledge of the Federal Government or according to information from EU Council working parties or other EU bodies, which countries are part of the maritime surveillance project Seahorse Atlantic?

Reply to question 30

Please see the Federal Government's reply of 28 December 2012 to question 21 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/11986. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this project.

31. Through which command and control centres, coordination centres or comparable facilities are national authorities incorporated into the Seahorse Atlantic project, and which are the participating national authorities?

32. What information is collected, processed and passed on within the network?

Reply to questions 31 and 32

Please see the reply to question 30 above.

33. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, to what extent have Mauritania, Morocco, Senegal, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Cap Verde also established, or begun to establish, coordination centres or comparable facilities (Bundestag printed paper 17/11986)?

(a) How is better operational collaboration being achieved in practice for the purpose of combating illegal immigration and creating a secure information network between prosecution authorities?

(b) Which authorities are responsible for the local contact points?

(c) To what extent and in what amount have EU funds been used for the technology that is needed to access the information network?

Reply to question 33

Please see the reply to question 30 above. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

34. In what ways is Frontex already cooperating with the Seahorse Atlantic project, and how will this change when Eurosur is launched?

Reply to question 34

Please see the reply to question 30 above. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

35. To the knowledge of the Federal Government or according to information from EU Council working parties or other EU bodies, which countries are part of the maritime surveillance project Seahorse Mediterraneo?

Reply to question 35

Germany is not part of the project group. For further information, please see the Federal Government's reply of 14 May 2013 to question 11 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/13462 and the Federal Government's reply of 28 December 2012 to questions 10 to 15 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/11986.

36. Through which command and control centres, coordination centres or comparable facilities are national authorities incorporated into the Seahorse Mediterraneo project, and which are the participating national authorities?

Reply to question 36

Please see the reply to question 35 above.

37. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, to what extent have Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt also established, or begun to establish, coordination centres or comparable facilities?

Reply to question 37

The Federal Government is generally aware of attempts by the European Commission and individual EU Member States to initiate cooperation with these

countries. The Federal Government has no knowledge of the current state of progress in this direction.

38. What information is collected, processed and passed on within the network?

Reply to question 38

Please see the reply to question 37 above.

39. In what ways is Frontex already cooperating with the Seahorse Mediterraneo project, and how will this change when Eurosur is launched?

Reply to question 39

Germany is not part of the project group. For further information, please see the Federal Government's reply of 14 May 2013 to question 11 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/13462 and the Federal Government's reply of 28 December 2012 to questions 10 to 15 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/11986.

40. What recent information has the Federal Government learned from the competent EU Council working parties or from its participation in the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) as to whether and, if so, where Libya has established, or begun to establish, coordination centres or comparable facilities (Bundestag printed paper 17/14417)?

Reply to question 40.

Please see the Federal Government's reply of 23 July 2013 to question 33 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/14417. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

41. Has the Federal Government now learned whether the Libyan command and control centres are to be connected to Italian facilities (Bundestag printed paper 17/14417)? If so, what information does it have about this?

Reply to question 41

Please see the Federal Government's reply of 14 May 2013 to question 11(b) of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/13462 and the Federal Government's reply of 28 December 2012 to questions 10 to 15 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/11986. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

42. What has the Federal Government now learned about bilateral Italian-Libyan projects for securing borders, for example on the production of an electronic border

surveillance system, as reported in the Libya Herald on 3 November 2013, and to what extent is EUBAM Libya based on these projects (Bundestag printed paper 17/14417)?

Reply to question 42

Italy's Prime Minister Enrico Letta and Prime Minister Ali Zaydan of Libya agreed this summer to continue the project for the surveillance of Libya's land borders with Italian technology. The project was begun back in 2010 and had been temporarily halted because of the upheavals in Libya.

The Italian-Libyan cooperation also encompasses training projects in the framework of Operation Cyrene, the aim of which is to train a total of 6,000 members of the Libyan security forces with a view to stabilising the country.

The training of 1,500 of these personnel is to take place in Italy. The operation also entails stepping up the surveillance of Libya's borders with neighbouring countries. This is being done through the use of Italian sensor technology in aerial surveillance.

The long-term goal of this Italian-Libyan cooperation is to develop a surveillance strategy for the purpose of integrated border management. The EU-funded bilateral Sahara-Med Project was due for renewal in March 2013.

The project included a component focused on the rule of law, in which the Italian Refugee Council was to assume responsibility for particular aspects of refugee management, namely the reception of refugees and asylum issues, in the refugee camps around Tripoli. The Libyan counterpart agencies, however, have so far refused to cooperate with the CIR – the Italian Refugee Council – and this part of the project is not yet operational.

43. What has the Federal Government now learned about the extent to which Italy is modernising patrol craft, vessel-monitoring systems and radar stations on the Libyan coast?

Reply to question 43

Italy is supporting Libya through the Guardia di Finanza, which is providing training and technical assistance. This includes the maintenance of the patrol craft that were delivered as assistance in kind prior to the upheavals in Libya. Two out of the total of six craft were destroyed and sunk in the conflict. The remaining four are still in use. The overall cost of this operation amounts to €2.9 million.

44. To what extent have the Libyan deliberations on border security now shed the highly tentative nature referred to in Bundestag printed paper 17/14417, and which new findings can the Federal Government report from these deliberations?

Reply to question 44

The Federal Government has no knowledge of any such developments.

45. What has the Federal Government now learned from the competent EU Council working parties or from its participation in the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) regarding the task assigned to the Mediterranean Border Cooperation Centres (MEBOCCs) in the Seahorse Mediterraneo Project or in the Eurosur system (Bundestag printed paper 17/11986)?

Reply to question 45

Germany is not part of the project group. Please see the Federal Government's reply of 28 December 2012 to questions 10 to 15 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/11986. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

46. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, how true is it that the EADS armaments group is involved, or was to be involved, in the establishment of a border surveillance system in Libya (Il Sole 24 ore, 5 November 2013)? Which export authorisations did EADS or subcontractors request for this purpose, and which of these have been granted and not granted?

Reply to question 46

In view of the constitutionally guaranteed right to trade secrecy of the companies concerned, the Federal Government cannot, as a matter of principle, comment on export authorisations that have been granted or refused or on any related business activities of those companies. In its annual report on its export policy with regard to conventional arms, the Federal Government reports in general terms on authorisations granted in respect of items contained in Part I, section A, of the export list annexed to the Foreign Trade and Payments Order (*Aussenwirtschaftsverordnung*).

47. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, how true is it that a contract worth €18 million for security personnel for the EU Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) was terminated by the European Union (Intelligence Online, 6 November 2013), and what does the Federal Government know about the grounds for termination?

Reply to question 47

In October 2013, the European Commission decided to relaunch the call for tenders for the conclusion of a one-year contract with a provider of security services for the manning of EUBAM Libya. The bids received in response to the first call for tenders had not been up to the required standard.

48. To the knowledge of the Federal Government, how true is it that current discussions on the new Regulation indicate that it might allow Frontex to halt refugees at sea and effect their refoulement (Tageszeitung, 3 November 2013), and what position has the Federal Government adopted on the practice of disembarkation on the high seas that may soon be enshrined in that instrument?

Reply to question 48

The proposal presented by the European Commission in April 2013 for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for the surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by Frontex has the same scope as Council Decision 2010/252/EU, which is currently the applicable instrument. The jurisdiction and operational command of the Member States' authorities responsible for border policing and the existing obligations under international and European law will remain intact. The EU agency Frontex will still have no operational mandate and will therefore be unable to exercise the powers of intervention that are vested in border police forces. Under Article 4 of the proposed Regulation, the protection of fundamental rights and the principle of non-refoulement, as enshrined in Article 19(2) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, are to be unconditionally respected.

When processing asylum applications, Member States will remain unconditionally bound by the established provisions on asylum, which reaffirm the validity of the fundamental rights and principles proclaimed in the Charter.

The proposal for a regulation is currently under negotiation at the level of the Council working parties.

49. What other more recent knowledge does the Federal Government possess – from the competent Council working parties, for example – on the possible involvement of Turkey in EU projects and initiatives for migration control, including the project for the establishment of a joint centre for police and customs cooperation with Greece and Bulgaria (Bundestag printed paper 17/5010)?

Reply to question 49

On the initiative of the Bulgarian Government, a trilateral joint centre for police and customs cooperation with Turkey and Greece is planned for the Kapitan Andreevo border crossing. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding these plans.

50. What is the content of the EU twinning projects that link Turkey with Germany and Finland, and what specific measures are being taken to achieve the aim of improving authorities' in-house training capacities for the Turkish National Police personnel who man border crossings (Bundestag printed paper 17/5010)?

Reply to question 50

From 2010 to 2012, the German Federal Police took part in an EU twinning project with Turkey entitled Training of Border Police. The aim of the project was

to improve, on the basis of the European Union's integrated management system for external borders, the authorities' in-house training capacities for Turkish National Police personnel who man border crossings. The content of the project included the production of a training plan for the new Border Police authority, the production of an internal in-service training plan for update training and the initial and continuing training of Turkish multipliers.

According to the terms of the twinning agreement, the knowledge and skills imparted through the project were to be incorporated into the training curricula of the Turkish National Police. To ensure the sustainability of the project, the Federal Police Academy and the Turkish National Police Academy agreed on a working partnership for 2013/14. For further information, please see Bundestag printed papers 17/14376 and 17/14402. The Federal Government possesses no information regarding EU twinning projects linking Turkey with Finland.

51. Which Member States were involved with the common pre-frontier intelligence picture (CPIP), what capabilities did they contribute, and what did the pilot phase comprise (Bundestag printed paper 17/7018)?

Reply to question 51.

Please see the Federal Government's reply of 20 September 2011 to question 21 of the minor interpellation tabled by The Left Party in Bundestag printed paper 17/7018. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

52. To what extent was Frontex involved in this pilot phase, what were its tasks, and how is the subsequent role of the Agency in the CPIP defined?

Reply to question 52

The Agency established a working group (Analysis Layer Users Group) to serve as a permanent forum and evaluation body, assessing the analytical tools in use and proposing adjustments or innovations. Its thematic priorities have so far been the creation of a blueprint for the division of the external borders of the EU into sections and the attribution of impact levels to those sections in accordance with Articles 14 and 15 of the Eurosur Regulation.

In addition, the Users Group is performing other analytical tasks arising from the implementation of the Eurosur Regulation.

The role of the Agency with regard to the common pre-frontier intelligence picture is prescribed by Article 11 of the Eurosur Regulation.

53. How was the testing of the technical feasibility of an interconnected information and communication platform linking the Member States and Frontex conducted during the pilot phase?

Reply to question 53

In 2010, the Agency was entrusted by the European Commission with the task of implementing a pilot project for the purpose of establishing a core network linking the national coordination centres of the piloting Member States – Finland, France, Italy, Poland, Slovakia and Spain. The pilot project was rolled out to 18 priority Member States from 2011 and to other interested Member States by 2012. The pilot project was accompanied by regular meetings of experts at which the Agency, the European Commission and Member States were represented.

54. To what extent has the roll-out to a total of 18 Member States from the southern external sea borders and the eastern external land borders of the EU now been completed, and what technical, organisational and administrative capacities have been deployed by those Member States (Bundestag printed paper 17/7018)?

Reply to question 54

The creation of the technical infrastructure through the establishment of national coordination centres in the 18 priority Member States of the EU has almost been completed. The Federal Government does not possess any substantiated knowledge regarding the technical, organisational or administrative capacities of individual Member States.

55. In what way had or has the Federal Police been performing its observer role in the CPIP framework and contributing to discussions within Frontex?

Reply to question 55

Please see the reply to question 51 above.

56. In what respects has the active participation of the Federal Police that had been envisaged for 2013 actually taken place (Bundestag printed paper 17/7018)?

Reply to question 56

The basic organisational preparations for Federal Police participation in the Eurosur network have been made. As things stand, the national coordination centre will be ready to operate by 1 December 2014.

57. What capabilities are being contributed or developed by Germany for this purpose?

Reply to question 57

As matters stand, the contribution of the Federal Police will be confined to surveillance of the German sections of the external borders of the Schengen area on the North and Baltic Seas and transmission of information from there. There are no plans at the present time for specific Eurosur-focused projects relating to surveillance or reconnaissance capabilities.

58. As far as is known at the present time, what technical processes and products will be used for the CPIP, and who are their manufacturers?

Reply to question 58

The structure and substance of the common pre-frontier intelligence picture are being devised in the first instance by an Agency working group. For more details, please see the reply to question 52 above. The Federal Government possesses no further information regarding this matter.

59. To what extent is the CPIP embedded in a 'European situational picture', and what is the nature of the link?

Reply to question 59

Information is presented and exchanged in near-real time in Eurosur on the basis of an integrated graphic user interface derived from reference geographical data. Relevant information is compiled in the national situational pictures, the European situational picture and the common pre-frontier intelligence picture.

The national situational pictures are produced by the Member States, whereas the European situational picture and the common pre-frontier intelligence picture are produced and updated by the Agency. Each of the situational pictures comprises an events layer, an operational layer and an analysis layer. The content of these layers is governed by the provisions of Articles 9 to 11 of the Eurosur Regulation.

60. What is the present position of the Federal Government with regard to the establishment of an EU-wide CPIP and to the Eurosur system of migration control in the light of the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, land-based robots and satellite reconnaissance as referred to in connection with the CPIP questionnaire (Council document CM 6157/10)?

Reply to question 60

With regard to the content of the common pre-frontier intelligence picture and the associated role of the Agency, please see the replies to questions 52 and 58 above. In addition, it must be emphasised that Eurosur is not a system of migration control but a common framework for information exchanges and cooperation between Member States and the Agency under Article 1 of the Eurosur Regulation.

Potential surveillance tools within the meaning of Article 12 of the Eurosur Regulation are coordinated and made available by the Agency. Which future services will be made available by the Agency and requested by individual Member States on the basis of national needs is not foreseeable at the present time. The current situation regarding national policing of the North and Baltic Seas would not provide any grounds for recourse to the described surveillance tools.

61. Which governments of EU countries will not be participating in Eurosur as things stand, and what does the Federal Government know about their reasons?

Reply to question 61

The Federal Government possesses no information regarding this matter.

62. It has come to the questioners' attention that some Member States have apparently threatened to exercise a veto or bring a legal action to prevent British and Irish participation in Eurosur. How true is this, and what are the precise circumstances?

Reply to question 62

At the meeting of the Council of the EU on 15 October 2013, one Member State made a statement to the Committee of Permanent Representatives, recorded in document 14801/13, to the effect that the Eurosur Regulation constituted a development of the Schengen acquis and that its Article 19 and recital 16 concerning the participation of Ireland and the United Kingdom contravened Protocol No 19 on the Schengen acquis, which was integrated into the framework of the European Union.