EUROPEAN UNION
THE COUNCIL

Brussels, 28 July 1999

10219/99

LIMITE

SIS-TECH 96
COMIX 145

REPORT

from	:	Presidency
to	:	SIS-TECH Working Group (Iceland/Norway Joint Committee)
Subject	:	Summary report of the progress meeting with Global One held on 26 July 1999 in Brussels

Present: Mr. Sinephro (Global One), Mr. Aunola (Presidency), Mr. Vandamme, Mr. Hoogervorst, Mr. Huybreghts, Ms. Pensaert (Council Secretariat)

Mr. Aunola opened the meeting, expressing his regret that the GO General Manager, Mr. Van Eck, could not be present, although this was agreed upon last week.

Mr. Aunola further announced that a summary report of this meeting would be drafted and sent to Global One and also to the Working Party on SIS-Technology.

1. Extension of the contract

Mr. Aunola informed Global One of the fact that the Schengen countries had unanimously decided not to extend the Sirene phase II contract for two more years, i.e. from 2001 until 2003.

The main reasons for this were that:

- the conditions of Global One for the extension were not acceptable and
- as Global One made clear in its terms, a migration to a new technology would be necessary within a short period and the Schengen countries considered it best to do so via a call for tender procedure.

Mr. Sinephro replied that the conditions were always up for discussion and should not have been a reason for refusing the extension of the contract. The second argument was, however, an understandable and valid reason. Still, he regretted that the Schengen countries had not choosen to continue with Global One on this contract.

2. Conduct of Global One

Mr. Sinephro acknowlegded that the care for the quality of the documents had dropped a little, due to the fact that the network is running well. He vowed to ensure that this quality would improve and administrative work would be followed up more carefully and closely.

Furthermore, he agreed that some deadlines were not kept and stated that:

- on the one hand this was due to the fact that they had to rely on other partners, such as the engineering department or KryptoKom, and the fact that they cannot always estimate very well what the acceptable deadlines would be for these partners;
- on the other hand, especially Mr. Goarant should set realistic deadlines and be able to keep them, given the rather formal environment.

Mr. Sinephro apologised about the fact that meetings were cancelled at the last moment because of the absence of one of the participants but stated that this only happened twice in three years. He explained that this was normal and acceptable in a business relation, especially when the network is working well and there are other business priorities for bigger problems.

After some discussion, it was agreed that Global One and the MU would have regular (weekly) phone conferences to discuss any relevant technical problems and to agree on time-stamping etc. of incidents. An informal validation of documents should also take place between these parties before documents are published, in order to improve the quality of the documents.

Every month or every two months, according to the need, a progress meeting should be held, gathering both technical and contractual "experts" from both parties to discuss all open issues and decide, *inter alia*, on penalties.

If and when necessary, this progress meeting could be preceded by a technical meeting where the technical experts could finalise the discussion on technical issues and details, in preparation of the progress meeting.

These progress meetings should preferably take place in Brussels, taking into account the difficult reachability of Strasbourg.

3. Monthly reports of March and April

These reports were not discussed in detail.

Mr. Hoogervorst informed Global One of the fact that the Working Party on SIS-Technology accepted the time-stamping based on faxes and agreed not to apply penalties for line failures on sites that have no back-up line.

Mr. Sinephro took note of this and stated that the technical experts should still examine the issue of the Strasbourg site not having a back-up line because he was worried that if this line went down, the whole network might go down.

Mr. Hoogervorst pointed out that the Strasbourg site was not the core of the SIRENE nor of the VISION network.

4. KrypoGuard transportation procedure

Mr. Aunola stated that the Working Party on SIS-Technology was of the opinion that the transportation of the KryptoGuard was a responsibility of Global One, according to the contract. However, as the transportation procedure for the KryptoGuards seemed not to be a frequently occurring problem, both parties would check again what the exact issues were for this topic and see if and what should be changed in the current way of working, and more particularly on the administrative part of it.

5. Deliverables

Mr. Hoogervorst stated that the latest version of the deliverables seemed to be correct, subject to the correction of maybe one fax number.

6. Requests for change

Following up on the previous technical meeting, Global One will deliver some technical details by mid-August.

Global One is also requested to complete the price list for the access points in Iceland.

7. Definitions in the SLA

Mr. Aunola stated the Working Party on SIS-Technology does not see any reason to review the definitions in the SLA. However, if Global One wants to clarify/modify something about the SLA, it should come up with a clear and concrete proposal, so that the Working Party on SIS-Technology can discuss it.

8. Other business

Mr. Hoogervorst informed Global One of the fact that the Schengen countries do not request the traffic statistics anymore.
