



Brussels, 9 June 2022
(OR. fr, en)

9937/22

**Interinstitutional File:
2021/0428(COD)**

**JAI 834
FRONT 235
MIGR 182
COVID-19 116
SAN 370
TRANS 361
CODEC 864
COMIX 302**

NOTE

From:	Permanent Representatives Committee (Part 2)
To:	Council
No. prev. doc.:	9713/22
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders - General approach

1. On 14 December 2021 the Commission presented a proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code)¹, accompanied by an impact assessment².
2. The proposal is part of a broader framework intended to make the Schengen area stronger and more resilient and to improve the overall governance of Schengen, including revision of the evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis³, which the Council has been invited to approve (as an ‘A’ item) at the Justice and Home Affairs Council meeting on 9 and 10 June 2022.

¹ COM(2021) 891 final
² SWD(2021) 462 final
³ 8130/22

3. The proposed revision of the Schengen Borders Code is structured around four main strands. First, it strengthens the legal tools available to the Member States to counter manoeuvres to instrumentalise migrants at the EU's external borders. Second, the revision draws on the lessons learned from the COVID-19 crisis and endeavours to provide a more solid legal foundation for measures imposing restrictions at the external borders in the event of a health crisis, by creating a framework at European level. Third, with regard to the internal borders, the new provisions being proposed strive to promote the use of alternative measures, in particular with a view to stepping up the use of technological measures. In particular, the revision creates a new mechanism for the transfer between Member States of persons who are in irregular situations. In parallel, the Commission has proposed amending Directive 2008/115 of the European Parliament and of the Council on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals (the Return Directive), allowing Member States to negotiate new readmission agreements or renegotiate existing ones⁴. Fourth and finally, the revision provides a response to persistent threats within the Schengen area by updating the framework for reintroducing and extending controls at the internal borders and by providing new safeguards to preserve the freedom of movement; it creates a new, specific mechanism in Article 28 to coordinate measures for re-establishing controls at the internal borders where a serious threat to public policy or internal security affects several Member States, putting the overall functioning of the Schengen area at risk.
4. Work on the proposal, which took place in the presence of the Associated States, began in the Council's Working Party on Frontiers under the Slovenian Presidency on 14 December 2021. Discussions continued under the French Presidency at eight Working Party meetings and two meetings of the JHA Counsellors⁵.

⁴ OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 98-107.

⁵ For its part, the European Parliament appointed Ms Sylvie Guillaume (S&D, FR) as rapporteur.

Further to the proceedings in the Council preparatory bodies, improvements have been made to the text, in particular by:

- clarifying the concept of instrumentalisation by simplifying the definition and adding text about the action Member States may take when faced with such situations. The special situation of Cyprus has also been taken into account;
- addressing, in Article 21a, the desire expressed by Member States for more flexibility on the travel and health-related restrictions that can be applied at the external borders, while respecting national competences on health. While keeping the principle of essential categories, the compromise proposed by the Presidency enables their definitions to be decided on whenever a new crisis occurs. In addition, the Member States may adopt stricter health measures, provided they do not have a negative impact on the functioning of the Schengen area. The situation of persons in transit has been clarified, as has that of border regions;
- clarifying use of the procedure for transfers between Member States in Article 23a by describing the police cooperation criterion in more detail and making it clear that use of this procedure, which takes place in a bilateral cooperation framework, is voluntary.

5. With regard to providing a framework for reintroducing and extending internal border controls, the Commission's proposal aims to address persistent threats Member States may face, while strengthening procedural safeguards. To ensure that this measure is a last resort, the Presidency has endeavoured to shore up those safeguards:

- by making the criteria and justifications advanced by Member States when reintroducing or extending controls more objective, in particular by having the Member State concerned conduct a risk assessment. This, combined with the escalation over time of Member States' obligations concerning justification, will enable the Commission to undertake a more thorough evaluation of the need for and proportionality of such controls;

- by making consultations between Member States mandatory when they are requested by the Member States directly affected;
- by making it a requirement for the Commission to issue an opinion where there is any doubt as to the need for or proportionality of the reintroduction or extension. That opinion must, in any event, be issued after 12 months;
- by ensuring that the special situation of border regions is taken into account for those border controls.

6. The Judgment of the Grand Chamber of the Court of Justice of the EU in joined cases C-368/20 and C-369/20⁶, delivered after publication of the Commission proposal, confirms that it is for the co-legislators to define the general framework for the reintroduction and extension of internal border controls in the Schengen Borders Code. The right balance must be struck between the free movement of persons on the one hand and the need to safeguard public policy and internal security in the Member States on the other. Moreover, the possibility of reintroducing internal border controls constitutes an exception, to be interpreted strictly, to the principle of freedom of movement.

The Presidency, taking this judgment into account, has endeavoured to provide a better framework for the provisions. While it was possible, under Article 27a(5) of the Commission proposal, to contemplate internal border controls for an unlimited period, the Presidency has proposed limiting these provisions to major exceptional situations and requiring a much more thorough risk assessment to be provided when an additional period of 6 months is notified. Furthermore, the compromise proposal provides that the Commission must issue a recommendation identifying the actions and conditions for lifting the controls whenever there are concerns about necessity and proportionality.

⁶ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 26 April 2022 in Joined Cases C- 368/20 and C- 369/20, ECLI:EU:C:2022:298.

Following the Coreper meeting on 1 June 2022, the Presidency inserted additional safeguards to further improve the framework for controls that may last more than two years and six months where no alternative measures are available. In such cases, the Commission will always be required to adopt a recommendation on whether the controls are proportional and necessary. The recommendation will have to specify a reasonable timeline for the controls to be lifted, and the Member State in question will have to take that deadline into account.

Coreper examined the amended text at its meeting on 8 June 2022 and decided to forward it to the Council. The Presidency has proposed further adjustments to recitals 27 and 44 and to Articles 27a and 28.

7. The Justice and Home Affairs Council is invited to examine the compromise proposal set out in the Annex to this note⁷ at its meeting on 9 and 10 June 2022, with a view to the adoption of a general approach on the proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders.

⁷ The amendments to the original text are indicated in **bold underlined** or [...].

2021/0428 (COD)

Proposal for a

REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders

THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular Article 77(2)(b) and (e) and Article 79(2)(c) thereof,

Having regard to the proposal from the European Commission,

After transmission of the draft legislative act to the national parliaments,

Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure,

Whereas:

- (1) In accordance with Article 3(2) of the Treaty on European Union (“TEU”), the Union comprises an area of freedom, security and justice that is free of internal border controls, in which the free movement of persons is ensured in conjunction with appropriate measures regarding external border controls, asylum, immigration and the prevention and combating of crime.
- (2) Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2016 (“Schengen Borders Code”)¹ lays down rules governing the movement of persons to and from the area without controls at internal borders (the “Schengen Area”) as well as between the Member States that participate in the Schengen Area.

¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2016 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code), OJ L 77, 23.3.2016, p. 1.

- (3) In recent years, the Schengen area has been subject to unprecedented challenges, which by their nature were not confined to the territory of any single Member State. Such challenges underscored the fact that the preservation of public order and security in the Schengen area is a shared responsibility requiring joined and coordinated action between Member States and at Union level. They also highlighted gaps in the existing rules governing the functioning of the Schengen area both at external and internal borders and the need to create a stronger and more robust framework allowing for a more effective response to challenges faced by the Schengen area.
- (4) Border control at external borders is in the interest not only of the Member State at whose external borders it is carried out but of all Member States which have abolished internal border control and the Union as a whole. Member States are required to ensure high standards in management of their external borders, including through enhanced cooperation between border guards, police, customs and other relevant authorities. The Union provides active support through the provision of financing support by the Agencies, the European Border and Coast Guard in particular and management of the Schengen Evaluation Mechanism. The rules applicable to external borders need to be reinforced in order to better respond to new challenges that have recently emerged at the external borders.
- (4a) European integrated border management, based on the four-tier access control model, comprises measures in third countries, such as under the common visa policy, measures with neighbouring third countries, border control measures at the external borders, risk analysis and measures within the Schengen area and return. Border control, including measures to facilitate legitimate border crossings, forms a key part of the European integrated border management. In order to prevent and detect cross-border crime at the external borders, in particular migrant smuggling, trafficking in human beings, and terrorism, Member States together with the European Border and Coast Guard Agency should implement the European integrated border management, based on the four-tier access control model.**

- (5) The COVID-19 pandemic has reinforced the need for the Union to be better prepared to respond to crisis situations at the external borders related to situations of diseases with an epidemic potential that are a threat to public health. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that threats to public health can require uniform rules concerning travel restrictions for travel into the European Union by third-country nationals. The adoption of inconsistent and divergent measures at the external borders to address such threats negatively affects the functioning of the entire Schengen area, reduces predictability for third-country travellers and people-to-people contacts with third countries. To prepare the Schengen area for future challenges of a comparable scale related to threats to public health, it is necessary to establish a new mechanism which should allow for a timely adoption and lifting of coordinated measures at Union level. The new procedure at the external border should be applied in a situation **of a threat to public health due to** an infectious disease with epidemic potential as **established** [...] by **the Commission, following the advice of** the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control **and taking into account information from the competent national authorities** [...]. This mechanism should complement the procedures proposed to be established in the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on serious cross-border threats to health² notably in case of the recognition of a public health emergency, and the revised mandate of the European Centre for Disease Control.³
- (6) The mechanism should provide for the adoption by the Council, upon a proposal by the Commission, of a regulation setting out **temporary** restrictions on travel, including restrictions on entry **and minimum temporary health-related restrictions** [...], and the conditions for lifting them. In view of the politically sensitive nature of such measures which concern the right to enter the territory of Member States, implementing powers should be conferred on the Council to adopt such a regulation, acting on a proposal from the Commission.

² COM(2020)727.

³ Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 851/2004 establishing a European Centre for disease prevention and control, COM(2020)726.

- (7) Importantly, in line with the applicable obligations under Union and international law, Union citizens and third-country nationals who, under agreements between the Union and its Member States, on the one hand, and those third countries, on the other hand, enjoy rights of free movement equivalent to those of Union citizens, as well as their respective family members should always be permitted to enter the Union. Residents in the Union should also always be permitted to return to the Union, **and in particular to the Member State in which they legally reside**. The act should lay down minimum temporary health restrictions to which these persons may be subject. **As regards third-country nationals legally residing in Ireland, Member States should on a reciprocal basis allow those residents to return to Ireland by transiting through the territory of the Member States. Ireland is invited to align its national policy with the restrictions on travel to the European Union.** The act should contain all necessary elements to ensure that restrictions on travel are effective, targeted, non-discriminatory and proportionate to the evolving epidemiological situation. It should **define** [...] **the** categories of **essential** travellers whose travel should be exempted from restrictions on entry **and lay down the conditions under which travel restrictions may exceptionnally be imposed on these travellers. These categories should include, for example, healthcare professionals, cross-border workers, transport personnel, diplomats or other international staff, passengers in transit, passengers travelling for imperative family reasons, seafarers, third-country nationals seeking international protection, seasonal workers, students and highly qualified workers whose employment is necessary from an economic, societal and security perspective and whose work cannot be postponed or performed abroad.** In addition, or alternatively, the act should [...] **determine** any geographical areas or third countries from which travel may be subject to specific measures **and define a procedure to periodically review the situation and the travel restrictions,** based on an objective methodology and criteria applicable thereto that should include, in particular, the epidemiological situation. The act could specify the conditions under which travel may be permitted such as testing, quarantine, self-isolation or any other appropriate measures, such as the need to fill in a passenger locator form or other contact tracing tool and having regard, in particular, to any Union systems developed to facilitate travel under safe conditions, such as digital certification systems. Where appropriate, the instrument could also set up a mechanism allowing to take additional measures in case the epidemiological situation dramatically worsens in one or more geographical areas.

- (7a) The effectiveness of restrictions on travel to the European Union is premised on applying uniform rules to third countries and third-country nationals. The application of uniform rules through the implementing Regulation should ensure the protection of public health and thus preserve the functioning of the area without internal border controls. Member States could adopt stricter temporary health and other related restrictions than those laid down in the implementing Regulation provided that such restrictions do not have a negative impact on the functioning of the area without internal border controls. Such measures may include restrictions on travel against other regions or third countries not covered by the implementing Regulation, if they are based on a national risk assessment and are proportionate. In addition, Member States may adopt restrictions on travel in the absence of a Council implementing Regulation. The implementing Regulation should take into account the specific situation of the Overseas Countries or Territories referred to in Article 355(2) TFEU and listed in Annex II thereto.**
- (7b) During the application of the Council implementing Regulation setting out temporary travel restrictions and in application of the entry conditions set out in Article 6 of this Regulation, only third-country nationals who are not subject to restrictions on entry and who comply with other health related entry conditions provided for in the implementing Regulation should be allowed entry.**
- (7c) Transit inside the EU for EU citizens and their family members as well as for categories of essential travellers should not be subject to temporary health related restrictions on travel in order to allow them to reach their final destination. Temporary health related restrictions, where imposed, should be applied upon arrival at the final destination.**
- (8) It is also necessary to reinforce the rules and safeguards in Union law in order to allow Member States to act swiftly to counter instances of instrumentalisation of migrants. Such instrumentalisation should be understood as referring to a situation where a third country **or non state actor** [...] encourages or facilitates the [...] **movement** of third-country nationals to the external borders **or to a Member State** [...], **with the aim of** [...] destabilising the Union [...] or a Member State, [...] where [...] such actions [...] **are** liable to put at risk essential [...] functions **of a Member State**, including [...] the maintenance of law and order or the safeguard of its national security.

- (9) Instrumentalisation of migrants can refer to situations where irregular travel of third-country nationals has been [...] encouraged or facilitated by a third country **or non state actor** onto [...] a territory to reach the external border of the Member States but can equally refer to the [...] encouragement or facilitation of irregular travel of third country nationals already present in [...] **a** third country. Instrumentalisation of migrants may also entail the imposition of coercive measures, intended to prevent the third country nationals from leaving the border areas of the instrumentalising third country, in a direction other than through a Member State. **Situations in which non state actors are involved in organised crime, in particular smuggling, should not be considered as instrumentalisation of migrants when there is no aim to destabilise the Union or a Member State. Furthermore, humanitarian aid operations should not be considered as instrumentalisation of migrants when there is no aim to destabilise the Union or a Member State.**
- (9a) As regards Cyprus, Council Regulation (EC) No 866/2004 of 29 April 2004 on a regime under Article 2 of Protocol 10 to the Act of Accession provides for specific rules that apply to the line between the areas of the Republic of Cyprus in which the Government of the Republic of Cyprus exercises effective control and those areas in which the Government of the Republic of Cyprus does not exercise effective control. Although the line does not constitute an external border, it follows that a situation where a third-country or non state actor encourages or facilitates the movement of third country nationals to cross the line should be considered as instrumentalisation.**
- (10) The Union should mobilise all tools from its toolbox of diplomatic, financial and operational measures to support the Member States confronted with instrumentalisation. Diplomatic efforts by the Union or the Member State concerned, should be given priority as the means of addressing the phenomenon of instrumentalisation. This may be supplemented, where appropriate, by the imposition of restrictive measures by the Union.
- (11) At the same time, in addition to these measures, it is equally necessary to further reinforce the current rules in relation to external border controls and border surveillance. To further assist the Member State facing an instrumentalisation of migrants, Regulation (EU) XXX/XXX complements the rules on border control by providing for specific measures in the area of asylum and return, while respecting the fundamental rights **of** the individuals concerned and in particular by ensuring the respect of the right to asylum and providing the necessary assistance by the UN agencies and other relevant organisations.

- (12) **Member States may**, in particular in a situation of instrumentalisation **of migrants or in other situations of emergency at the external border**, [...] limit border traffic to the minimum by **temporarily** closing some border crossing points **or limit their opening hours**, [...]. **Any** such limitations should take full account of the rights of Union citizens, third-country nationals who are beneficiaries of the right of free movement pursuant **to** an international agreement and third-country nationals who are long-term residents under national or Union law or are holders of long-**stay** [...] visas, as well as their respective family members **and third-country nationals seeking international protection**. **When a border crossing point is closed, such categories should use another border crossing point which remains open**. Furthermore, **Member States may, in particular in a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants, where third-country nationals attempt to force entry en masse by using violent means, take the necessary measures to preserve security, law and order**. [...] Such limitations **and measures** should [...] be applied in a manner that ensures respect for obligations related to access to international protection, in particular the principle of *non-refoulement*.
- (12a) **Without prejudice to the possibility to take measures under this Regulation in the context of instrumentalisation, the Member State concerned should** [...] take into account whether the European Council has acknowledged that the Union or one or more of its Member States are facing a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants
- (13) The European Border and Coast Guard Agency assists Member States with implementing the operational aspects of external border management, including information exchange, the provision of equipment, capacity building and training to national border guards, targeted information and risk analysis, as well as the deployment of the Standing Corps. The Agency's new mandate offers considerable opportunities to support border control activities, including screening and return operations and a launch of rapid border intervention and/or return intervention at the request and on the territory of the host Member State concerned.

- (14) By virtue of Article 41(1) of Regulation (EU) 2019/1896, the Executive Director of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency is required to recommend to a Member State that it request the Agency to initiate, carry out or adjust the Agency's support, in order to address identified threats and challenges at the external borders, where the conditions laid down in that provision are met. In particular, the need for Agency support may become apparent in situations where the European Border and Coast Guard Agency has carried out a dedicated vulnerability assessment in connection with the instrumentalisation of migrants. On the basis of the results of such a vulnerability assessment or where a critical impact level is attributed to one or more external border sections and taking into account the relevant elements in the Member State's contingency plans, the Agency's risk analysis and the analysis layer of the European situational picture, the Executive Director should recommend to the Member State concerned to request that the Agency initiate, carry out or adjust the Agency's support in accordance with Article 41(1) of Regulation (EU) 2019/1896. This competence of the Executive Director is without prejudice to the general support that the Agency may be providing to the Member States.
- (15) Moreover, in the event of instrumentalisation of migrants, the Member State concerned should reinforce border control, including, as appropriate, through additional measures preventing illegal crossings and the deployment of additional resources and technical means to prevent unauthorised crossing of the border. Such technical means could include modern technologies including drones and motion sensors, as well as mobile units, **and, where appropriate, all types of stationary and mobile infrastructure**. The use of such technical means, in particular, any technologies capable of collecting personal data, needs to be based on and exercised in accordance with clearly defined provisions of national law.
- (16) The Commission **may adopt an implementing act** [...] **concerning common minimum** standards for border surveillance, [...] taking into account the type of borders (land, sea or air), the impact levels attributed to each external border section in accordance with Article 34 of Regulation (EU) 2019/1896 and other relevant factors, **such** as **geographical particularities** and a specific response to situations of instrumentalisation of migrants.
- (17) In an area without internal border controls, persons should be able to move freely, and in security between Member States. In this regard, it should be clarified that the prohibition of controls at internal borders does not affect the competence of Member States to carry out checks on their territory, including at their internal borders, for purposes other than border control. It should, in particular, be clarified that national competent authorities, including health or law enforcement authorities, remain, in principle, free to carry out checks in the exercise of public powers provided for under national law.

- (18) While the prohibition of internal border controls also extends to checks having equivalent effects, checks by competent authorities should not be considered equivalent to the exercise of border checks where they do not have border control as an objective, where they are based on general information and experience of the competent authorities regarding possible threats to public security or public policy, including where they aim to combat **illegal migration** [...] and cross-border crimes linked to **illegal** [...] migration, where they are devised and executed in a manner clearly distinct from systematic checks on persons at the external borders, and where they are conducted at transport hubs, such as ports, train or bus stations and airports **as well as freight terminals** or directly on board of passenger transport services, and where they are based on **a risk assessment** [...].
- (19) While irregular migratory flows should not, per se, be considered to be a threat to public policy or internal security, they may require additional measures to ensure the functioning of the Schengen area.
- (20) The combatting of illegal **migration** [...] and of cross-border crime linked to **illegal** [...] migration such as human trafficking, migrant smuggling and document fraud and other forms of cross-border crime could in particular encompass measures allowing the verification of the identity, nationality and residence status of persons provided that such verifications are non-systematic and carried out on the basis of **a risk assessment** [...].
- (21) The use of modern technologies to monitor traffic flows, notably on motorways and other important roads determined by the Member States, can be instrumental in addressing threats to public policy or internal security. The prohibition of internal border controls should not be understood as preventing the lawful exercise of police or other public powers to carry out checks in the internal border areas. This includes checks that entail the use of monitoring and surveillance technologies which are generally used in the territory or that are based on a risk assessment for the purpose of protecting internal security. The use of such technologies for checks should therefore not be considered as equivalent to border controls.
- (22) In order to allow for such technologies to be effective, it should be possible to apply proportionate speed limits at road crossings.
- (23) The prohibition of border controls at internal borders should not limit the carrying out of checks provided for in other instruments of Union law. The rules provided for in this Regulation, should not therefore, affect the applicable rules regarding the carrying out of checks on passenger data against relevant databases in advance of arrival.

(24) It is necessary to ensure that checks carried out by Member States in exercise of national competences remain fully consistent with an area that is free of internal border controls. In accordance with the case law of the Court of Justice, the more extensive the indications are that checks conducted by Member States at their border areas have an equivalent effect to border control, having regard to the objective of such checks, their territorial scope and possible differences compared to checks carried out in the remainder of the territory of the Member State concerned, the greater the need for strict and detailed rules and limitations laying down the conditions for the exercise, by the Member States, of their police powers in a border area.

(24a) The exercise of police or other public powers by the competent authorities of the Member States in their territory, including in their border areas, should not have a disproportionate impact on fluidity of movement across the internal borders, notably by leading to excessive waiting times. In a spirit of dialogue and cooperation, Member States should inform the neighbouring Member State of their actions, in particular when the action is expected to have a more significant effect on cross-border traffic.

(25) Measures need to be taken to address unauthorised movements of illegally staying third-country nationals in an area without internal border controls. In order to strengthen the functioning of the Schengen area, Member States should be able to take additional measures to counter irregular movements between Member States, and combat illegal stays. Where national law enforcement authorities of a Member State apprehend illegally staying third-country nationals **in [...] border[...] areas during checks conducted by the competent authorities within a bilateral cooperation framework, which may include in particular joint police patrols**[...] it should be possible for those authorities to refuse such persons the right to enter or remain in their territory and to transfer them to the Member State from which they entered. **In a context of preserving and promoting multilateral police cooperation between Member States, checks conducted by the competent authorities in a multilateral cooperation framework are also covered.** The Member State from where the person came directly should in turn be required to receive the apprehended third-country nationals. **The transfer should not apply to persons making an application for international protection or to persons who may be taken back by a Member State under the conditions laid down in Article 24 of Regulation (EU) 604/2013.**

- (26) The procedure by which a Member State may transfer apprehended illegally staying third-country nationals to a Member State from where the person came directly should take place swiftly but be subject to safeguards and carried out in full respect of fundamental rights and the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in Article 21 of the Charter, to prevent racial profiling. It should be possible for the authorities to carry out a verification of relevant information immediately available to the authorities concerning the movements of the persons concerned. Such information may include objective elements that would allow the authorities to conclude that the person had recently travelled from another Member States, such as the possession of documents, including receipts or invoices, evidencing recent travel from another Member State. Third-country nationals subject to the transfer procedure should be provided with a reasoned decision in writing. While the decision should be immediately enforceable, the third-country national should be afforded an effective remedy to appeal against or seek review of the transfer decision. This remedy should not have suspensive effect.
- (27) The transfer procedure provided for under this Regulation **is optional and** should not affect the existing possibility for Member States to return **illegally staying** [...] third-country nationals in accordance with bilateral agreements or arrangements referred to in Article 6(3) of Directive 2008/115/EC (the “Return Directive”), where such persons are detected outside of the vicinity of [...] border[...] **areas**. **Without prejudice to national competences, Member States may define practical modalities under their bilateral cooperation frameworks, including with a view to limiting the use of this transfer procedure when internal border controls are reintroduced or prolonged.** In order to facilitate the application of such agreements, and to complement the objective of protecting the area without internal border[...] **controls**, the Member States should be afforded the possibility to conclude new agreements or arrangements and update existing ones. The Commission should be notified of any such modifications or updates of new agreements or arrangements. Where a Member State has taken back a third-country national under the procedure provided for in this Regulation or on the basis of a bilateral agreement or arrangement, the Member State concerned should be required to issue a return decision in accordance with the Return Directive. In order to ensure consistency between the new procedures provided for in this Regulation and existing rules on the return of third country nationals, a targeted modification of Article 6(3) of the Return Directive is [...] necessary. **This is without prejudice to the application of Article 6(2).**
- (28) In exceptional cases, addressing threats to the Schengen area may require the adoption, by the Member States, of measures at the internal borders. Member States remain competent to determine the need for the temporary reintroduction or prolongation of border controls. Under the existing rules, the reintroduction of controls at internal borders is provided for in circumstances where a serious threat to internal security or public policy manifests itself in a single Member State for a limited period of time. In particular, terrorism and organised crime, large-scale public health emergencies or large-scale or high profile international events such as sporting, trade or political events can amount to a serious threat to public policy or internal security.

- (29) Furthermore, a serious threat to public policy or internal security can also result from large-scale unauthorised movements of **third-country nationals** [...] between the Member States where this creates a situation putting a **substantial** strain on the overall resources and capacities of the responsible national services, where the other means provided for under this Regulation are not sufficient to address these inflows and movements. In this context, Member States should be able to rely on objective and quantified reports on unauthorised movements whenever available, in particular, when produced on a regular basis by the competent Union agencies in line with their respective mandates. It should be possible for a Member State to use the information provided by the agencies to demonstrate the exceptional character of the identified threat caused by unauthorised movement in the risk assessment, in order to justify the reintroduction of internal border controls on this ground **as a measure of last resort**.
- (30) While action at Union level is provided for in circumstances where the nature of a threat derives from persistent serious deficiencies at the external borders, there is no Union-wide mechanism that would apply to situations where, within the Schengen area, a serious threat to internal security or public policy area is affecting **several** [...] Member States, putting at risk the well-functioning of the Schengen area. The gap should be filled by putting in place a new Schengen area safeguard mechanism permitting coordinated solutions to protect the interests of persons entitled to benefit from the area without controls at internal borders, by maximising the effectiveness of the measures taken while minimising their negative side-effects.
- (31) The new Schengen area safeguard mechanism should allow the Council to adopt, upon a proposal by the Commission, a decision authorising the reintroduction or prolongation of internal border controls, where this is justified by a particular threat, identified on the basis of notifications received from individual Member States, or other available information, in particular a risk assessment, in case of prolongation of internal border controls beyond six months. Given the politically sensitive nature of such a decision which regulates the possibility for Member States to reintroduce or prolong internal border control in particular circumstances, implementing powers to adopt a decision should be conferred on the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission. **This decision should include any appropriate mitigating measures.**
- (32) In determining whether a reintroduction or prolongation of internal border controls by the Member States is justified **and proportionate**, the Council should take into account whether any other measures that could ensure a high level of security within the territory, such as reinforced checks in the internal border areas by the competent authorities, are available. In the event that a prolongation of the controls is not considered justified **and proportionate**, the Commission should, instead, recommend the use of other measures deemed more appropriate to address the identified threat.

- (33) The establishment of the new Schengen area safeguard mechanism should not affect the right of Member States to have prior recourse to unilateral measures in accordance with the Regulation, where the situation so requires. However, once adopted, the Union measure should become the single basis for a coordinated response to the threat identified.
- (34) In order to ensure compliance with the principle of proportionality, the decision of the Council should be adopted for a limited period of time of up to six months that may be prolonged subject to regular review upon a proposal from the Commission, as long as the threat is found to persist. The initial decision should include an assessment of the expected impact of the measures adopted, including its adverse side-effects, with a view to determining if controls at internal borders are justified or whether less restrictive measures could be applied in their place in an effective manner. Subsequent decisions should take account of the evolution of the identified threat. The Member States should immediately notify the Commission and the Member States of the reintroduction of internal border controls in accordance with the decision of the Council.
- (35) Reintroduction of internal border controls should also remain possible where serious deficiencies in the management of the external borders persist, putting at risk the overall functioning of the area without internal border control. Periods where the border controls were introduced by Member States because the urgency of the situation required it or where the Council takes a decision to recommend the reintroduction because a threat affects **several** [...] Member States, should not be included in the two years' period applicable to reintroductions based on serious deficiencies at the external borders.
- (36) The reintroduction of border controls at internal borders, whether on the basis of unilateral decisions of the Member States or at a Union level, has serious implications for the functioning of the Schengen area. In order to ensure that any decision to reintroduce border controls is only taken where necessary, as a measure of last resort, the decision on temporary reintroduction or prolongation of border controls should be based on common criteria, putting an emphasis on necessity and proportionality. The proportionality principle requires that the reintroduction of internal border controls be subject to safeguards that increase over time.
- (37) In the first instance, Member States should assess the appropriateness of internal border controls having regard to the nature of the serious threat identified. In this context, the Member States should pay particular attention to and assess the likely impact of internal border controls on the movement of persons within the area without internal border controls and the functioning of the cross-border regions. This assessment should be part of the notification that Member States are required to transmit to the Commission. In case of prolongation of internal border controls for foreseeable events beyond an initial period of six months, the Member State should also assess the appropriateness of alternative measures to pursue the same objectives as internal border controls, such as proportionate checks [...] carried out **in the context of checks within the territory** [...] or through forms of police cooperation as provided for under Union law, **including** [...] the possibility to use the transfer procedure, **or common measures regarding temporary travel restrictions.**

- (38) In order to limit harmful consequences resulting from the reintroduction of internal border controls, any decision to reintroduce internal border controls should be accompanied by mitigating measures if needed. Such measures should include measures to assure a smooth operation of transit of goods and transport personnel and seafarers by the establishment of ‘green lanes’. In addition, and to take account of the need to ensure the movement of persons whose activities may be essential for preserving the supply chain or the provision of essential services, Member States should also apply the existing guidelines on cross-border workers⁴. Against this background, the rules for the reintroduction of border controls at internal borders should take account of the guidelines and recommendations adopted throughout the COVID-19 pandemic as a solid safety net for the Single Market, for the purpose of assuring that they are applied by the Member States, where appropriate, as mitigating measures during reintroduced internal border controls. Measures should in particular be identified with a view to ensuring the uninterrupted functioning of the Single Market and safeguarding the interests of cross-border regions and of ‘twin cities’ including for instance authorisations or derogations for the inhabitants of cross-border regions.
- (39) The notification to be provided by the Member States should be decisive when assessing compliance with the criteria and conditions for a temporary reintroduction of internal border controls. In order to ensure a comparable set of information, the Commission should adopt a template for the notification of reintroduction of border controls at internal borders in an implementing act. Member States should be entitled to classify all or parts of the information provided in the notification, without prejudice to the functioning of appropriate and secure [...] channels.
- (40) In order to ensure that internal border controls are [...] a last resort measure applied only for as long as necessary and in order to allow for assessing the necessity and proportionality of internal border controls to address foreseeable threats, Member States should prepare a risk assessment to be submitted to the Commission when internal border controls are prolonged beyond an initial six months in response to foreseeable threats. The Member States must in particular, explain, the scale and evolution of the identified serious threat, including how long the identified serious threat is expected to persist and which sections of the internal borders may be affected, as well as their coordination measures with the other Member States that are impacted or likely to be impacted by such measures.
- (41) The Commission should be entitled to request additional information based on the notification received, including on the risk assessment or cooperation and coordination measures with the Member States affected by the planned prolongation of border control at internal borders. Where the notification does not comply with the minimum requirements, the Commission should discuss the notification with the Member State concerned and request additional information or **request this Member State [...] to complete its initial [...] notification.**

⁴ 2020/C 102 I/03.

- (42) In order to ensure a sufficient degree of transparency of the actions affecting travel without internal border controls, the Member States should also inform the European Parliament and the Council about the main elements concerning the planned reintroduction of border controls. In justified cases, Member States may also classify such information. Every year, pursuant to Article 33 of the Schengen Borders Code, the Commission should present to the European Parliament and to the Council a report on the functioning of the area without internal border control ('State of Schengen report') which should pay particular attention to the situation as regards the unauthorised movements of third country nationals, building on the available information from the relevant Agencies and data analysis from relevant information systems. It should also assess the necessity and proportionality of the reintroductions of border controls in the period covered by that Report. The State of Schengen report shall also cover the reporting obligations resulting from Article 20 of the Schengen Evaluation Mechanism⁵.
- (43) The mechanism for the temporary reintroduction of border controls at internal borders in urgent situations or to address foreseeable threats should provide for a possibility, for the Commission, to organise consultations between Member States, including at the request of any Member State. **This consultation should be organised by the Commission when a Member State requests it.** Relevant Union Agencies should be involved in this process in order to share their expertise, where appropriate. Such consultations should look into the modalities of carrying out internal border controls and their time-line, possible mitigating measures as well as the possibilities of applying alternative measures [...]. Where the Commission or a Member State has issued an opinion expressing concerns regarding the reintroduction of border controls, such consultations should be mandatory.
- (43a) **In an area where persons may move freely, without internal frontiers, which constitutes one of the main achievements of the European Union in accordance with Article 3(2) TEU, the reintroduction of internal border controls should remain an exception and should only be effected as a measure of last resort. Exceptions to and derogations from the free movement of persons are to be interpreted strictly. In order not to compromise the very principle that there is to be no internal border control, as enshrined in Article 3(2) TEU and reiterated in Article 67(2) TFEU, the reintroduction of internal border controls on account of the same threat should not be for an unlimited period.**

⁵ Council Regulation (EU) No 1053/2013 of 7 October 2013 establishing an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis and repealing the Decision of the Executive Committee of 16 September 1998 setting up a Standing Committee on the evaluation and implementation of Schengen, OJ L 295, 6.11.2013, p. 27.

- (44) The Commission and Member States should retain the possibility to express any concern as regards the necessity and proportionality of a decision of a Member State to reintroduce internal border controls for reason of urgency or to address a foreseeable threat. In case controls at internal borders are reintroduced and prolonged for foreseeable threats for combined periods exceeding [...] **twelve** months, it should be a requirement for the Commission to issue an opinion assessing the necessity and proportionality of such internal border controls. **In the area without internal border control a serious threat to public policy or internal security in a Member State is not necessarily limited in time. In such a situation**, where a Member State considers that there [...] **is a major** exceptional situation[...] justifying the continued need for internal border controls for a period exceeding two years, **additional safeguards should be set in terms of risk assessment. The notification by the Member State concerned should include the measures it intends to adopt, in cooperation with other Member States where appropriate, enabling the threat to be met as well as a presentation of the means, actions, conditions and timeline considered with a view to lifting the internal border controls in order for the principle of free movement to be maintained after the final period of prolongation.** The Commission should issue a **new** [...] opinion. **Where this opinion expresses concerns on the necessity and the proportionality of the prolongation, the Commission should adopt, without undue delay, a recommendation to be addressed to the Member State concerned, identifying means, actions, conditions and a timeline with a view to lifting the internal border controls. Where there is a continued need for internal border controls and an additional period of six months is not sufficient to ensure the availability of effective alternative measures to address this major exceptional situation due to the persisting threat, the Member State concerned should notify without delay the Commission of its intention to prolong its internal border controls and specify the date on which it considers that the controls shall be lifted at the latest. The Commission should adopt without delay a recommendation on the compatibility of such final prolongation, including its date and scope, with the principles of necessity and proportionality in line with the principle of absence of controls at the internal borders set out in Article 3(2) TEU and referred to in Article 67(2) TFEU. The recommendation should also identify, where appropriate with other Member States, effective compensatory measures to be implemented and a reasonable timeline with a view to lifting the internal border controls. In addition, the Council should, in accordance with its rules of procedure, hold an exchange of views on the invoked persisting threat justifying for the Member State concerned the continuous need of internal border controls. This procedure is thus intended to strike a fair balance between free movement and prolonging internal border controls for a limited period of time, taking into account the available appropriate alternative measures with respect to external border controls, asylum, immigration and the safeguarding of internal security.** Such **a procedure** [...] is without prejudice to the enforcement measures, including infringement actions, which the Commission may take at any time against any Member State for failure to comply with its obligations under Union law. Where an opinion is issued, the Commission should launch consultations with the Member States concerned.

- (45) In order to enable the *post factum* analysis of the decision on the temporary reintroduction of border controls at the internal borders, Member States should remain obliged to submit a report on the reintroduction of border control at internal borders to the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission once they lift the controls. Where the controls are kept in place for prolonged periods of time, such a report should also be submitted after twelve months, and every year thereafter if exceptionally controls are maintained and for as long as the controls are maintained. The report should outline, in particular, the initial and follow-up assessment of the necessity of internal border controls and the respect of the criteria for reintroduction of [...] controls at internal borders. The Commission should adopt in an implementing act a template and make it available online.
- (46) When implementing this Regulation, Member States shall not discriminate against persons on grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.
- (47) The competent authorities shall use their powers to carry out checks within the territory and apply relevant procedures in full respect of the rules on data protection under Union law. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council or Directive (EU) 2016/680 of the European Parliament and of the Council apply to the processing of personal data by competent national authorities for the purposes of this Regulation, in their respective field of application.
- (48) The objective of this Regulation is to strengthen the functioning of the Schengen area. This objective cannot be achieved by Member States acting alone. Therefore, an amendment of the common rules established at Union level is necessary. Thus, the Union may adopt measures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity as set out in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union. In accordance with the principle of proportionality, as set out in that Article, this Regulation does not go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve those objectives.
- (49) In accordance with Articles 1 and 2 of the Protocol No 22 on the position of Denmark, as annexed to the Treaty on European Union and to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Denmark is not taking part in the adoption of this Regulation and is not bound by it or subject to its application. Given that this Regulation builds upon the Schengen *acquis*, Denmark shall, in accordance with Article 4 of that Protocol, decide within a period of six months after the Council has decided on this Regulation whether it will implement it in its national law.

- (50) This Regulation constitutes a development of the provisions of the Schengen *acquis*, in which Ireland does not take part, in accordance with Council Decision 2002/192/EC⁶; Ireland is therefore not taking part in the adoption of this Regulation and is not bound by it or subject to its application.
- (51) As regards Iceland and Norway, this Regulation constitutes a development of the provisions of the Schengen *acquis* within the meaning of the Agreement concluded by the Council of the European Union and the Republic of Iceland and the Kingdom of Norway concerning the latter's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen *acquis*⁷, which fall within the area referred to in point A of Article 1 of Council Decision 1999/437/EC⁸.
- (52) As regards Switzerland, this Regulation constitutes a development of the provisions of the Schengen *acquis* within the meaning of the Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen *acquis*⁹ which fall within the area referred to in Article 1, point A of Decision 1999/437/EC¹⁰ read in conjunction with Article 3 of Council Decision 2008/146/EC.¹¹

⁶ Council Decision 2002/192/EC of 28 February 2002 concerning Ireland's request to take part in some of the provisions of the Schengen *acquis*, OJ L 64, 7.3.2002, p. 20.

⁷ OJ L 176, 10.7.1999, p. 36.

⁸ Council Decision 1999/437/EC of 17 May 1999 on certain arrangements for the application of the Agreement concluded by the Council of the European Union and the Republic of Iceland and the Kingdom of Norway concerning the association of those two States with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen *acquis*, OJ L 176, 10.7.1999, p. 31.

⁹ OJ L 53, 27.2.2008, p. 52.

¹⁰ Council Decision 1999/437/EC of 17 May 1999 on certain arrangements for the application of the Agreement concluded by the Council of the European Union and the Republic of Iceland and the Kingdom of Norway concerning the association of those two States with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen *acquis*, OJ L 176, 10.7.1999, p. 31.

¹¹ Council Decision 2008/146/EC of 28 January 2008 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen *acquis*, OJ L 53, 27.2.2008, p. 1.

- (53) As regards Liechtenstein, this Regulation constitutes a development of the provisions of the Schengen acquis within the meaning of the Protocol between the European Union, the European Community, the Swiss Confederation and the Principality of Liechtenstein on the accession of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis¹² which fall within the area referred to in Article 1, point A of Decision 1999/437/EC read in conjunction with Article 3 of Council Decision 2011/350/EU¹³.
- (54) This Regulation is without prejudice to the application of Directive 2004/38/EC¹⁴.
- (55) This Regulation respects fundamental rights and observes the principles recognised in particular by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
- (56) Regulation (EU) No 2016/399 and Directive 2008/115/EC should therefore be amended accordingly,

¹² OJ L 160, 18.6.2011, p. 21.

¹³ Council Decision 2011/350/EU of 7 March 2011 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Protocol between the European Union, the European Community, the Swiss Confederation and the Principality of Liechtenstein on the accession of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Agreement between the European Union, the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on the Swiss Confederation's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis, relating to the abolition of checks at internal borders and movement of persons, OJ L 160, 18.6.2011, p. 19.

¹⁴ Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 and repealing Directives 64/221/EEC, 68/360/EEC, 72/194/EEC, 73/148/EEC, 75/34/EEC, 75/35/EEC, 90/364/EEC, 90/365/EEC and 93/96/EEC (OJ L 158 30.4.2004, p. 77).

Article 1

Regulation (EU) No 2016/399 is amended as follows:

(1) Article 2 is **amended** [...] as follows:

a) point 12 is replaced by the following:

12. ‘border surveillance’ means the surveillance of borders between **border** crossing points and **the surveillance** of border crossing points outside fixed opening hours, including preventative measures, **to prevent or detect** [...] unauthorised border crossings or the circumvention of border checks.

b) the following points 27 to 30 are added:

27. ‘instrumentalisation of migrants’ **means** [...] a situation where **a third country or non state actor** [...] encourages or facilitates the movement of third country nationals to the external borders **or to a Member State**, [...] **with the aim of destabilising** [...] the Union or a Member State [...] **where such actions** [...] **are** liable to put at risk essential [...] functions **of a Member State**, including [...], the maintenance of law and order or the safeguard of its national security;

28. ‘essential travel’ means travel in connection with an essential function or need, taking into account any applicable international obligations of the Union and of the Member States [...];

29. ‘non-essential travel’ means travel for purposes other than essential travel;

30. ‘transport hubs’ means airports, sea or river ports, train or bus stations **as well as freight terminals.**’

(2) In Article 5, **the following** paragraph 4 is added:

‘4. **Member States** may, **in particular** in a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants **or in other situations of emergency at the external border**, [...] **temporarily close specific** [...] border crossing points as notified pursuant to paragraph 1, or **limit** their opening hours where the circumstances so require.

Member States may, in particular in a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants, where third-country nationals attempt to force entry *en masse* by using violent means, take the necessary measures to preserve security, law and order.

Any **measures** [...] pursuant to the first **and second** subparagraphs shall be implemented in a manner that is proportionate and that takes full account of the rights of:

- (a) the persons enjoying the right of free movement under Union law;
- (b) third-country nationals who are long-term residents under Council Directive 2003/109/EC¹⁵, persons deriving their right to reside from other instruments of Union or national law or who hold national long-[...] **stay** visas, as well as their respective family members;
- (c) third-country nationals seeking international protection.’

(3) Article 13 is replaced by the following:

‘Article 13

Border surveillance

1. The main purpose of border surveillance shall be to **prevent or detect** [...] unauthorised border crossings, to counter cross-border criminality and to take measures against persons who have crossed the border illegally. **In addition, border surveillance shall contribute to raising situational awareness and carrying out risk analyses.**

A person who has crossed a border illegally and who has no right to stay on the territory of the Member State concerned shall be apprehended and made subject to procedures respecting Directive 2008/115/EC.

2. The border guards shall use **all necessary resources, including** stationary or mobile units, to carry out border surveillance.

That surveillance shall be carried out in such a way as to prevent and discourage persons from unauthorised border crossings between border crossing points **or** [...] from circumventing the checks at border crossing points.

¹⁵ Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents (OJ L 16, 23.1.2004, p. 44).

3. Surveillance between border crossing points shall be carried out by border guards whose numbers and methods shall be adapted to existing or foreseen risks and threats. It shall involve frequent and sudden changes to surveillance periods and other methods or techniques, so that unauthorised border crossings are effectively **prevented or detected** [...].
4. Surveillance shall be carried out by stationary or mobile units which perform their duties by patrolling or stationing themselves at places known or perceived to be sensitive, the aim of such surveillance being to prevent unauthorised border crossings or apprehend individuals crossing **or having crossed** the border illegally. Surveillance may also be carried out by technical means, including electronic means, equipment, [...] surveillance systems **and, where appropriate, all types of stationary and mobile infrastructure**.
5. [...] Member States [...] shall intensify border surveillance as necessary in order to address the increased threat, **notably when they face a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants**. In particular, [...] Member States shall enhance, as appropriate, the resources and technical means to prevent [...] unauthorised **border crossings** [...].

[...].
6. Without prejudice to the support that the [...] Agency may provide to the Member States, in the event of a situation of instrumentalisation of migrants, the Agency may carry out a vulnerability assessment as provided for in Articles 10(1), point (c), and Article 32 of Regulation (EU) 2019/1896 of the European Parliament and Council¹⁶, with a view to providing the necessary support to the Member State concerned.

On the basis of the results of that assessment or any other relevant vulnerability assessment or the attribution of a critical impact level to the border section concerned within the meaning of Article 35(1)(d) of Regulation (EU) 2019/1896, the Executive Director of the [...] Agency shall make recommendations, in accordance with Article 41(1) of that Regulation to any Member State concerned.

¹⁶ Regulation (EU) 2019/1896 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2019 on the European Border and Coast Guard and repealing Regulations (EU) No 1052/2013 and (EU) 2016/1624, OJ L 295, 14.11.2019.

7. The Commission **may** [...] adopt [...] **an implementing act** [...] concerning [...] **common minimum** standards for border surveillance. [...] **These common minimum standards shall take into account** [...] the type of borders, the impact levels attributed to each external border section in accordance with Article 34 of the Regulation (EU) 2019/1896 and other relevant factors **such as geographical particularities**. **That implementing act shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 38(2).**'

- (4) Chapter V is renamed as follows: "Specific measures relating to the external borders"

[...] **The** following Article [...] is inserted:

"Article 21a

Restrictions on travel to the European Union

1. This Article shall apply to situations **of a threat to public health due to** the existence in one or more third countries of an infectious disease with epidemic potential as defined by the relevant instruments of the World Health Organization where the Commission, **following the advice of** the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control [...], **and taking into account information from the competent national authorities, establishes** [...] **that such a threat may have a negative impact on the area without controls at internal borders.**
2. The Council, on the basis of a proposal by the Commission, may adopt an implementing Regulation, providing for temporary restrictions on travel to the Member States **applied at the external borders.**

[...] **Temporary** restrictions on travel may include restrictions on entry to the Member States and [...] **minimum temporary health related restrictions** which are [...] necessary for the protection of public health in the area without controls at internal borders, such as for instance testing, quarantine, and self-isolation. **Temporary restrictions on travel shall be proportionate and non-discriminatory.**

Member States may, where justified on public health grounds, adopt stricter temporary travel restrictions than those laid down in the implementing Regulation to be applied on their territory. Any such stricter restrictions shall be proportionate and non-discriminatory. Adoption of stricter restrictions shall not have a negative impact on the functioning of the area without controls at internal borders.

3. The following categories of persons shall be exempted from the restrictions on entry, independent of the purpose of their travel:
 - a) persons enjoying the right of free movement under Union law;
 - b) third-country nationals who are long-term residents **as defined in** [...] Directive 2003/109/EC, persons deriving their right to reside from other instruments of Union law or national law or who hold national long-[...]stay visas, as well as their respective family members.
4. The implementing Regulation referred to in paragraph [...] **2** shall, where appropriate:
 - a) **determine** [...] any geographical areas or third countries from which [...] travel may be subject to restrictions or exemptions from restrictions, **and define a procedure to periodically review the** [...] situation of the areas or countries concerned **and the restrictions on travel imposed** on the basis of objective methodology and criteria, including, in particular, the epidemiological situation;
 - b) define **the** [...] categories of persons undertaking [...] essential travel to be exempted from [...] restrictions **on entry** applicable to travel;
 - c) lay down the conditions under which travel restrictions may be imposed, [...] on persons undertaking essential travel, [...]. ;
 - d) **lay down minimum temporary health related restrictions to which persons referred to in paragraph 3 a) and b) may be subject;**
 - e) lay down the conditions under which non-essential travel [...] may be restricted or exempt from restrictions including proof to be presented to support the exemption and the conditions relating to the duration and nature of stay in the areas or countries referred to in point (b);

5. Restrictions on **entry on persons undertaking** essential travel [...] may [...] **only be imposed exceptionally, for a strictly limited period of time, until sufficient information about the disease referred to in paragraph 1 or a new variant thereof is available and until other health related restrictions, to be applied to those persons, necessary to protect public health, are identified and adopted by the Council.**

- (5) Article 23 is replaced by the following:

“Article 23
[...]

Checks within the territory

The absence of border control at internal borders shall not affect:

- a) the exercise of police or other public powers by the competent authorities of the Member States in their territory, including in their internal border areas, as conferred on them under national law, insofar as the exercise of those powers does not have an effect equivalent to border checks. **The exercise of powers may include, where appropriate, the use of monitoring and surveillance technologies generally used in the territory, for the purposes of addressing threats to public security or public policy.**

The exercise by competent authorities of their powers [...] **shall** not, in particular, be considered equivalent to the exercise of border checks when the measures **fulfil each of the following conditions:**

- i) do not have border control as an objective;
- ii) are based on general information and experience of the competent authorities regarding possible threats to public security or public policy and aim, in particular, to:
- combat cross-border crime;
 - combat [...] **illegal** migration; or
 - contain the spread of an infectious disease with epidemic potential, **the existence of which has been established** [...] by **the Commission, following the advice of** the European Centre for Disease Control, **and taking into account information from the competent national authorities;**

- iii) are devised and executed in a manner clearly distinct from systematic checks on persons at the external borders, including where they are conducted at transport hubs or directly on board of passenger **transport** services and when they are based on **a risk assessment** [...];
- iv) [...]
- b) the possibility for a Member State to carry out security checks on persons [...] at transport hubs by the competent authorities **or by carriers** under the law of each Member State, [...], provided that such checks are also carried out on persons travelling within a Member State;
- c) the possibility for a Member State to provide by law for an obligation to hold or carry papers and documents;
- d) the possibility for a Member State to provide by law for an obligation on third-country nationals to report their presence on its territory **and the obligation for managers of establishments providing accommodation to see to it that third-country nationals complete and sign registration forms** pursuant **respectively** to the provisions of Articles 22 **and 45** of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders ('the Schengen Convention');
- e) checks for security purposes of passenger data against relevant databases on persons traveling in the area without controls at internal borders which can be carried out by the competent authorities under the applicable law.”

(6) The following Article [...] is inserted:

“Article 23a

*Procedure for transferring **illegally staying third-country nationals** apprehended **in** [...] [...] border[...] **areas***

1. This Article **lays down the procedure for the transfer** [...] of **an illegally staying** third-country national **apprehended** in [...] **border areas as referred to in Article 23**, in circumstances where [...] the following conditions are fulfilled:

[...]

[...]

a [...] the third country national is apprehended [...] during [...] **checks conducted by the competent authorities within a bilateral cooperation framework, which may include in particular joint police patrols, where the Member States agree to use such a procedure in that bilateral cooperation framework, and**

b [...] there are clear indications that the **illegally staying** third country national has arrived directly from the other Member State, on the basis of information immediately available to the apprehending authorities, including statements from the person concerned, identity, travel or other documents found on that person or the results of searches carried out in relevant national and Union databases.

2. The competent authorities of a Member State may [...] **after having apprehended** [...] **an illegally staying** third country national **in the border areas** [...], decide to immediately transfer the person to the Member State from which the person entered or sought to enter, in accordance with the procedure set out in Annex XII. **This transfer is without prejudice to bilateral agreements or arrangements as referred to in Article 6(3) of Directive 2008/115/EC.**

3. Where a **transferring** Member State applies the procedure referred to in paragraph 2, the receiving Member State shall be required to take all measures necessary to receive the third country national concerned in accordance with the procedures set out in Annex XII. **Practical modalities can be agreed upon under the bilateral cooperation framework in line with the procedure set out in Annex XII.**
4. From [*one year following the entry into force of the Regulation*] and annually thereafter, Member States shall submit to the Commission the data recorded in accordance with point 3 of Annex XII, regarding the application of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.”

(7) [...] **The** first paragraph of Article 24[...] is replaced by the following:

“Member States shall remove all obstacles to fluid traffic flow at road crossing-points at internal borders, in particular any speed limits not exclusively based on road-safety considerations or required for the use of the technologies referred to in Article 23, point (a) [...].”

(8) Article 25 is replaced by the following:

“Article 25

General framework for the temporary reintroduction or prolongation of border controls at internal borders

1. Where, in the area without internal border controls, there is a serious threat to public policy or internal security in a Member State, that Member State may exceptionally reintroduce border control at all or specific parts of its internal borders.

A serious threat to public policy or internal security may be considered to arise from, in particular:

- (a) activities relating to terrorism or organised crime;
- (b) large scale public health emergencies;
- (c) an **exceptional** situation characterised by large scale unauthorised movements of third-country nationals between the Member States, [...] **putting a substantial strain on the overall resources and capacities of the responsible national services as evidenced by information analysis and all available data, including from EU agencies.**
- (d) large scale or high profile international events [...]

2. In all cases, border controls at internal borders shall **only** be reintroduced as a measure of last resort. The scope and duration of the temporary reintroduction of border controls shall not exceed what is strictly necessary to respond to the serious threat identified.

Border controls may only be introduced pursuant to Articles 25a and 28 where a Member State has established that such a measure is necessary and proportionate, taking into account the criteria referred to in Article 26(1), and, in case such controls are prolonged, also the criteria referred to in Article 26(2). Border controls may also be reintroduced in accordance with Article 29, taking into account the criteria referred to in Article 30.

3. Where the same threat [...] persists, border controls at internal borders may be prolonged in accordance with Articles 25a, 28 or 29.

The same threat shall be considered to exist where the justification advanced by the Member State for prolonging border controls is based on the determination of the continuation of the same threat that had justified the initial reintroduction of the border controls.”

- (9) A new Article 25a is inserted after Article 25:

“Article 25a

Procedure for cases requiring action due to unforeseeable or foreseeable events

1. Where a serious threat to public policy or internal security in a Member State is unforeseeable and requires immediate action, the Member State may, on an exceptional basis, immediately reintroduce border controls at internal borders.
2. The Member State shall, at the same time as reintroducing border controls under paragraph 1, notify the Commission and the other Member States of the reintroduction of border controls, in accordance with Article 27(1).
3. For the purposes of paragraph 1, border controls at internal borders may be immediately reintroduced for a limited period of up to one month. If the serious threat to public policy or internal security persists beyond that period, the Member State may prolong the border control at internal borders for further periods, leading to a maximum duration not exceeding three months.
4. Where a serious threat to public policy or internal security is foreseeable in a Member State, the Member State shall notify the Commission and the other Member States [...] in accordance with Article 27(1), at the latest four weeks before the planned reintroduction of border controls, or **as soon as possible** [...] where the circumstances giving rise to the need to reintroduce border controls at internal borders become known less than four weeks before the planned reintroduction.

5. [...] **Where** paragraph 4 **applies**, and without prejudice to Article 27a(4), border control at internal borders may be reintroduced for a period of up to six months. Where the serious threat to public policy or internal security persists beyond that period, the Member State may prolong the border control at internal borders for renewable periods of up to six months.

Any prolongation shall be notified to the Commission and the other Member States in accordance with Article 27 and within the time limits referred to in paragraph 4. Subject to Article 27a(5), the maximum duration of border control at internal borders shall not exceed two years.

6. The period referred to in paragraph 5 shall not include periods referred to in paragraph 3.”

(10) Article 26 is replaced by the following:

“Article 26

Criteria for the temporary reintroduction and prolongation of border control at internal borders

1. To establish whether the reintroduction of border control at internal borders is necessary and proportionate in accordance with Article 25(2), a Member State shall in particular **assess** [...]:
 - (a) the appropriateness of the measure of reintroducing border controls at internal border, having regard to the nature of the serious threat identified and in particular, whether the reintroduction of border controls at internal borders is likely to adequately remedy the threat to public policy, or internal security;
 - (b) the likely impact of such a measure on:
 - **the** movement of persons within the area without internal border controls and
 - the functioning of the cross-border regions, taking into account the strong social and economic ties between them.
2. Where a Member State decides to prolong the border control at internal borders pursuant to Article 25a(5), it shall also assess in detail whether the objectives pursued by such prolongation could be attained by:
 - a) the use of alternative measures such as proportionate checks carried out in the context of [...] **checks within the territory** [...] as referred to in Article 23 point (a);

[...]

[...]b)[...] **forms of** police cooperation as provided for under Union law, **including the procedure referred to in Article 23a**[...];

[...]c) common measures regarding temporary restrictions on travel to the Member States as referred to in Article 21a(2).

3. Where border controls at internal borders have been reintroduced or prolonged, the Member States concerned shall[...] ensure that they are accompanied by appropriate measures that mitigate the impacts resulting from the reintroduction of border controls on persons and the transport of goods, giving particular consideration to the **strong social and economic ties between** cross-border regions, **and to persons undertaking essential travel.**”

(11) Article 27 is replaced by the following:

“Article 27

Notification of temporary reintroduction of internal border controls and risk assessment

1. Notifications by Member States of the reintroduction or prolongation of internal border controls shall contain the following information:
 - (a) the reasons for the reintroduction or prolongation, including all relevant data detailing the events that constitute a serious threat to its public policy or internal security;
 - (b) the scope of the proposed reintroduction or prolongation, specifying at which part or parts of the internal borders border control is to be reintroduced, or prolonged;
 - (c) the names of the authorised crossing points;
 - (d) the date and duration of the planned reintroduction or prolongation;
 - (e) the **assessment of** [...] the necessity and proportionality referred to in Article 26(1) and, in the case of a prolongation, in Article 26(2);
 - (f) where appropriate, the measures to be taken by the other Member States.

A notification may be submitted jointly by two or more Member States.

Member States [...] shall [...] **submit** [...] the notification **using** [...] a template to be established [...] and [...] made available online by the Commission. [...]

2. Where border controls have been in place for six months in accordance with Article 25a(5), any subsequent notification for the prolongation of such controls shall include a risk assessment. The risk assessment shall present the scale and anticipated evolution of the identified serious threat, in particular how long the identified serious threat is expected to persist and which sections of the internal borders may be affected, as well as information regarding coordination measures with the other Member States impacted or likely to be impacted by such measures.
3. Where **Member States** reintroduce or prolong border controls [...] **because of a situation** referred to in Article 25(1) point (c [...]), the [...] assessment **required by paragraph 1(e) of this Article** shall also provide **a risk assessment and** information on the scale and trends of such unauthorised movements, including any information obtained from the relevant EU agencies in line with their respective mandates and data analysis from relevant information systems.
4. The Member State concerned shall upon request by the Commission provide any further information, including on the coordination measures with the Member States affected by the planned prolongation of border control at internal borders as well as further information needed to assess the possible use of measures referred to in Article 23 and 23a.
5. Member States submitting a notification under paragraphs 1 or 2 may, where necessary and in accordance with national law, decide to classify all or parts of the notified information.

Such classification shall not preclude access to information, through appropriate and secure [...] channels, by the other Member States affected by the temporary reintroduction of border controls at internal borders.”

6. **The Commission shall adopt an implementing act to establish the template referred to in the third subparagraph of paragraph 1. That implementing act shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 38(2).”**

(12) The following Article 27a is inserted:

“Article 27a

Consultation with the Member States and opinion of the Commission

1. Following receipt of notifications, submitted under Article 27(1), the Commission may, **on its own initiative, or shall, at the request of a Member State directly affected,** establish a consultation process[...] including joint meetings between the Member State that is planning to reintroduce or prolong border control at internal borders, and the other Member States, especially those directly affected by such measures and the relevant Union agencies.

The **objective of the** consultation **is to examine** [...] in particular the identified threat to public policy or internal security, the [...] **necessity and proportionality** of the intended reintroduction of border controls taking into account the appropriateness of alternative measures, as well as the ways of ensuring implementation of the mutual cooperation between the Member States in relation to the reintroduced border controls.

The Member State planning to reintroduce or prolong border control at internal borders shall take **into** [...] account [...] the results of such consultation when carrying out border control at the internal border.

2. Following the receipt of notifications, submitted in relation to the reintroduction or prolongation of border controls at internal borders, the Commission **shall**, or any other Member State may, without prejudice to Article 72 TFEU, issue an opinion, if, based on the information contained in the notification and risk assessment, where appropriate, or any additional information, they have concerns as regards the necessity or proportionality of the planned reintroduction or prolongation of border control at internal borders.
3. Following receipt of notifications submitted in relation to a prolongation of border control at the internal border under Article 25a(4) which leads to the continuation of border controls at internal borders for **twelve** [...] months in total, the Commission shall issue an opinion on necessity and proportionality of such internal border controls. **The opinion of the Commission shall contain recommendations, where appropriate, on the improvement of the cooperation between Member States in order to limit the impact of the internal border controls and contribute to the reduction of the persisting threat.**

4. Where an opinion referred to in paragraphs 2 or 3 is issued, the Commission [...] **shall** establish a consultation process in order to discuss the opinion with the Member States. [...]
5. Where a Member State considers that there **is** [...] **a major** exceptional situation[...] **in respect to a persisting threat** justifying the continued need for internal border controls, in excess of the maximum period referred to in Article **25a(5)**, it shall notify the Commission **and the other Member States of its intention to prolong its internal border controls, at the latest four weeks before the planned prolongation, for an additional period of up to 6 months** [...]

The new notification, **taking into account the opinion of the Commission issued pursuant to paragraph 3, shall include a risk assessment in accordance with Article 27** [...]:

- substantiat[...]**ing** the continued threat to public policy or internal security[...];
- **substantiating that alternative measures to remedy the threat are deemed or have been found to be ineffective at the time of the notification;**
- **presenting the mitigating measures considered to accompany the controls;**
- **including, where appropriate, a presentation of the means, actions, conditions and timeline considered with a view to lifting the internal border controls.**

Within three months after this notification, the Commission shall issue a new [...] opinion. **Where this opinion expresses concerns on the necessity and the proportionality of the prolongation, the Commission shall adopt, without undue delay, a recommendation to be addressed to the Member State concerned, identifying means, actions and conditions with a view to lifting the internal border controls.**

Following the receipt of this notification, the Commission may on its own initiative, or shall at the request of the Member State directly affected establish a consultation process, in accordance with paragraph 1.

Where, in a major exceptional situation, the continued need for internal border controls is confirmed as a result of the procedure referred to in this paragraph and the additional period of six months referred to therein is not sufficient to ensure the availability of effective alternative measures to address the persisting threat, the Member State concerned shall notify the Commission without delay of its intention to prolong its internal border controls and shall specify the date on which it considers that the controls shall be lifted at the latest, consistently with the risk assessment as referred to in the second subparagraph. The Commission shall adopt without delay a recommendation on the compatibility with the Treaties of such final prolongation, including its date and scope, in particular with the principles of necessity and proportionality. The recommendation shall also identify, where appropriate with other Member States, the effective compensatory measures to be implemented and a reasonable timeline with a view to lifting the internal border controls. The Member State concerned shall take into account this recommendation with a view to lifting the internal border controls on a specified date.

(13) Article 28 is replaced by the following:

“Article 28

Specific mechanism where the serious threat to public policy or internal security puts at risk the overall functioning of the area without internal border controls

1. Where the Commission establishes that the same serious threat to internal security or public policy affects [...] **several** Member States, putting at risk the overall functioning of the area without internal border **controls**, it may make a proposal to the Council to adopt an implementing decision authorising the reintroduction of border controls by Member States, **including any appropriate mitigating measures to be established at national and EU level**, where the available measures referred to in Articles **21a**, 23 and 23a are not sufficient to address the threat. **The Member States may request the Commission to submit such a proposal to the Council.**
2. The decision shall cover a period of up to six months and may be renewed, upon proposal from the Commission, for further periods of up to six months as long as the threat persists, taking into account the review referred to in paragraph 5.
3. Where Member States reintroduce or prolong border controls because of the threat referred to in paragraph 1, those controls shall, as of the entry into force of the Council decision, be based on that decision.
4. [...]
5. The Commission shall **regularly** review the evolution of the identified threat as well as the impact of the measures adopted in accordance with the Council decision referred to in paragraph 1, with a view to **assessing** whether the measures remain justified.

6. Member States shall immediately notify the Commission and the other Member States in the Council of a reintroduction of border controls in accordance with the decision referred to in paragraph 1.
7. [...] **Member States may take** other measures, as referred to in Articles 23 and 23a, **in order to limit the scope of** [...] internal border controls [...] **The Commission shall take this into account in the review referred to in paragraph 5**”.

(14) Article 31 is amended as follows:

- a) Article 31 becomes paragraph 1;
- b) the following paragraphs **2 and 3 are** added:
 2. Where a Member State notifies the Commission and the other Member States of the reintroduction of border controls in accordance with Article 27(1), it shall at the same time inform the European Parliament and the Council of the following:
 - a) [...] **the scope of the reintroduction, specifying at which part(s) of the internal borders control is to be reintroduced;**
 - b) the reasons for the [...] reintroduction;
 - c) the names of the authorised crossing points;
 - d) the date and duration of the planned reintroduction;
 - e) where appropriate, the measures to be taken by the other Member State.
 3. Member States shall not be required to provide all the information referred to in the paragraph 2 in cases justified on public security grounds **or confidentiality of ongoing investigations.**

The provision of information may be subject to classification of information by Member States pursuant to Article 27(**5**).

The classification of information shall not preclude information from being made available by the Commission to the European Parliament. The transmission and handling of information and documents transmitted to the European Parliament under this Article shall comply with rules concerning the forwarding and handling of classified information which are applicable between the European Parliament and the Commission.”

(15) Article 33 is replaced by the following:

“Article 33

Report on the reintroduction of border control at internal borders

1. Within four weeks of the lifting of border control at internal borders, Member States which have carried out border controls at internal borders shall present a report to the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the reintroduction and, where applicable, the prolongation of border control at internal borders.
2. Without prejudice to the first paragraph 1, where border controls are prolonged as referred to in Article 25a(5), the Member State concerned shall submit a report at the expiry of twelve months and every twelve months thereafter if border control is exceptionally maintained.
3. The report shall outline, in particular, the initial and follow-up assessment of the necessity of border controls and the respect of the criteria referred to in Articles 26, the operation of the checks, the practical cooperation with neighbouring Member States, the resulting impact on the movement of persons in particular in the cross-border regions, the effectiveness of the reintroduction of border control at internal borders, including an ex-post assessment of the proportionality of the reintroduction of border control.
4. The Commission shall adopt a uniform format for such report **to be established by an implementing act** and make it available online. **That implementing act shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 38(2).**
5. The Commission may issue an opinion on that ex-post assessment of the temporary reintroduction of border control at one or more internal borders or at parts thereof.
6. The Commission shall present to the European Parliament and to the Council, at least annually, a report on the functioning of the area without internal border controls entitled (‘State of Schengen report’). The report shall include a list of all decisions to reintroduce border controls at internal borders taken during the relevant year. It shall also include an assessment of the necessity and proportionality of the reintroductions **and prolongations** of border controls in the period covered by that report **as well as** information on the trends within the [...] area **without internal border control** as regards the unauthorised movements of third country nationals, taking into account available information from the relevant Union agencies **and** data analysis from relevant information systems. [...]”

(16) In Article 39(1), the following point (h) is added:

- “h) [...] the [...] areas considered as [...] cross-border regions and any relevant changes thereto.”

(17) The following Article 42b is added:

*“Article 42b
Notification of cross-border regions*

By **six** [...] months of the entry into force of this Regulation at the latest, Member States **with common internal borders** shall **in close cooperation determine** [...] the areas of their territory considered as [...] cross-border regions, **taking into account the strong social and economic ties between them, and notify the Commission thereof.**

Member States shall also inform the Commission of any relevant changes thereto.”

[...]

“[...]”

([...]**18**) A new Annex XII is added:

“ANNEX XII

PART A

*Procedure for transferring **illegally staying third-country nationals [...]** apprehended **in [...]**
border[...] **areas***

1. **Transfer** [...]decisions **pursuant to Article 23a(2)** shall [...] be issued by means of a standard form, as set out in Part B, completed by the competent national authority. They shall take effect immediately.
2. The completed standard form shall be handed to the third-country national concerned, who shall acknowledge receipt of the **transfer** decision by signing the form and shall be given a copy of the signed form.

Where the third-country national refuses to sign the standard form, the competent authority shall indicate this refusal in the form under the section ‘comments’.

3. The national authorities issuing a [...] **transfer** decision shall record the following data:
 - a) to the extent that these can be established by them, the identity and nationality of the third-country national concerned,
 - b) the references of the identity document, if any,
 - c) where available, copies of any documents or data relating to the identity or nationality of the third country national concerned, in combination with the relevant national and Union databases.
 - d) the grounds for **transfer** [...],
 - e) the date of **transfer** [...],
 - f) the **receiving** Member State[...].

4. The national authorities issuing a **transfer** [...] decision shall [...] **inform the Commission yearly on the number of persons transferred to other Member States, indicating the Member State(s) to which the persons were transferred and, where available, the nationality of the third-country nationals apprehended.**

[...]

5. **Third-country nationals** [...] **subject to a transfer decision** [...] shall have the right to appeal. Appeals **against the transfer decision** shall be conducted in accordance with national law. A written indication of contact points able to provide information on representatives competent to act on behalf of the third-country national in accordance with national law shall also be given to the third-country national in a language that they understand or are reasonably supposed to understand. Lodging such an appeal shall not have suspensive effect.
6. The authorities empowered under national law shall ensure that the third-country national subject to a **transfer** [...] decision is transferred, **in the bilateral cooperation framework as referred to in paragraph 1(a) of Article 23a**, to the competent authorities of the **receiving** [...] Member State immediately and within 24 hours at the latest. The authorities empowered under national law in the **receiving** [...] Member State shall cooperate with the authorities of the **transferring** Member State to that end.
7. If a third-country national who has been subject to a decision referred to in paragraph 1 is brought to the border by a carrier, the [...] responsible **authority** [...] may:
- (a) order the carrier, **in accordance with national law**, to take charge of the third-country national and transport him or her without delay to the **receiving** Member State [...];
 - (b) pending onward transportation, take appropriate measures, in compliance with national law and having regard to local circumstances, to prevent third-country nationals who have been **subject to a transfer decision** [...] from [...] **absconding**.

PART B

Standard form for transferring **illegally staying third-country nationals** [...] apprehended **in** [...] border **areas**



Name of State

Logo of State (Name of Office)

_____ (1)

TRANSFER PROCEDURE AT THE INTERNAL BORDER

On _____ at (time) _____ at the location (indicate type of the internal border nearby or other relevant information related to the apprehension **in accordance with Article 23a** [...]) _____

We, the undersigned, _____ have before us:

Personal data (subject to availability)

Surname _____ First name _____

Date of birth _____ Place of birth _____ Sex _____

Nationality _____ Resident in _____

Type of identity document _____ number _____

Issued in _____ on _____

Visa number, if any _____ type _____ issued by _____

Valid from _____ until _____

For a period of _____ days: _____

Coming from _____ by means of _____ (indicate means of transport used, e.g. flight number), he/she is hereby informed that he/she [...] will be transferred to _____ pursuant to **Article 23a of the Schengen Borders Code** [...]:

[...] Grounds [...] stating that a person has no right to stay in the Member State :

[...]

[...]

Comments

The person concerned declined to sign the form.

Person Concerned [...] Responsible authorities [...]

The person concerned may appeal against the **transfer [...]** **in accordance with** national law. The person concerned receives a copy of this document (*each State must indicate the references to the national law and procedure relating to the right of appeal*).

Article 2

Amendment to Directive 2008/115/EC

1. Article 6(3) of Directive 2008/115/EC is replaced by the following:

“3. Member States may refrain from issuing a return decision to a third-country national staying illegally on their territory if the third-country national concerned is taken back by another Member State in accordance with the procedure provided for in Article 23a of the Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council* or under bilateral agreements or arrangements.

The Member State which has taken back the third-country national concerned in accordance with the first subparagraph shall issue a return decision in accordance with paragraph 1. In such cases, the derogation laid down in the first subparagraph shall not apply, **except for the derogation set out in Article 6(2).**

Member States shall without delay notify any existing, amended or new bilateral agreements or arrangements to the Commission.”

* Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2016 on a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code) (OJ L 077 23.3.2016, p. 1).

Article 3

Transposition of amendment to Directive 2008/115/EC

[...] Member States shall adopt and publish, by [...] **12** months from entry into force of this Regulation at the latest, the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with Article 2. They shall forthwith communicate to the Commission the text of those provisions.

They shall apply those provisions from [...] **12** months from entry into force.

When Member States adopt those provisions, they shall contain a reference to Article 2 of this Regulation or be accompanied by such a reference on the occasion of their official publication. Member States shall determine how such reference is to be made.

Article 4

This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.

However, Article 1, point 6, shall apply from [the date at which the amendments provided for in Article 2 apply in the Member States].

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in the Member States in accordance with the Treaties.
