

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT



session documents

ENGLISH EDITION

20 July 1995

A4-0186/95

FILE COPY

REPORT

on the draft Council conclusions on the organization and development of the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI) (C4-0008/95)

Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs

Rapporteur: Mrs Hedy d'Ancona

DOC_EN\RR\279\279397

PE 211.782/fin.
nl - Or. fr/nl

- * Consultation procedure
simple majority
- **I Cooperation procedure (first reading)
simple majority
- **II Cooperation procedure (second reading)
simple majority to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members to reject or amend the common position
- *** Assent procedure
majority of Parliament's component Members to give assent
but simple majority under Articles 8a, 105, 106, 130d and 228 EC

- ***I Codecision procedure (first reading)
simple majority
- ***II Codecision procedure (second reading)
simple majority to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members to adopt a declaration of intended rejection of the common position, and amend the common position or confirm its rejection
- ***III Codecision procedure (third reading)
simple majority to approve the joint text
majority of Parliament's component Members to reject the Council text

DA

DE

GR

EN

ES

FR

IT

NL

PT

FI

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Procedural page	3
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION	4
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	7
Opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights	10

By letter of 14 December 1994 the Council forwarded to Parliament its draft conclusions on the organization and development of the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI).

On 20 January 1995 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred the draft conclusions to the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs as the committee responsible and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights for its opinion.

At its meeting of 23/24 January 1995 the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs appointed Mrs d'Ancona rapporteur.

It considered the draft report at its meetings of 19/20 April, 23/24 May and 17/18 July 1995.

At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution unopposed with one abstention.

The following took part in the vote: Vitorino, chairman; Colombo Svevo and Wiebenga, vice-chairmen; d'Ancona, rapporteur; Barros Moura, Berthu, Chanterie, Cederschiöld, De Esteban Martin, Katiforis (for Ford), Klironomos (for Lindeperg), Lehne, Linzer, McKenna (for Orlando), Nassauer, Papakyriazis (for Rytter), Posselt, Reding, Salisch, Sauquillo Pérez del Arco, Schulz, Stewart-Clark, Telkämper (for Roth), Terrón i Cusí, Toivonen, Van Lancker and Zimmerman.

The opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights is attached.

The report was tabled on 20 July 1995.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the relevant part-session.

A
MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Resolution on the draft Council conclusions on the organization and development of the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI) (C4-0008/95)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the draft conclusions addressed by the Council to the European Parliament on the organization and development of the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI) (C4-0008/95),
 - having regard to Articles K.1, K.3, K.4 and K.6 of the Treaty on European Union and Articles 6, 7a, 8 and 8a of the Treaty establishing the European Community,
 - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs and the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights (A4-0186/95),
- A. whereas Article K.1 stipulates that asylum policy, immigration policy and certain rules governing the crossing of external borders are of relevance to achieving the objectives of the Union,
- B. whereas Article K.4 stipulates that the Commission is to be fully associated with work in the fields of justice and home affairs,
- C. whereas Article K.6 stipulates that the European Parliament is to be consulted on the principal aspects of activities in fields referred to in Title VI of the Treaty on European Union,
- D. whereas the impression given is that the remit of CIREFI, whose title includes the term 'immigration', will gradually evolve in such a way that it focuses (solely) on combating illegal immigration,
- E. whereas the planned gathering of information and data is taking place in the absence of the necessary data protection provisions, and whereas the point made in the Council's conclusions 'that personal data may not be processed and, in particular, may not be communicated to or by CIREFI' does not help remedy this situation,
- F. whereas Parliament has so far received very little if any information on or from the Centre,
- G. whereas research into immigration may be useful, but should not be conducted in conditions of secrecy,

General considerations

1. Is of the opinion that the Commission's right to propose legislation constitutes an essential and general feature of the TEU and that, in all areas covered by Article K.1(1) to (6), the Commission has a political obligation not to leave it to Member States or the Council Presidency to take the initiative;
2. Calls on the Commission to take a more active role, to propose binding measures and to forward such proposals to Parliament and the Council;
3. Urges the Commission, in all cases in which it can draw up proposals in the areas referred to in Article K.1(1) to (6), to investigate whether it is appropriate to apply Article K.9 and to report on such investigations in the explanatory memoranda accompanying its proposals;

Specific considerations

4. Regrets that the draft conclusions do not refer to the legal basis on which they are based and that these so-called conclusions are not one of the instruments of cooperation referred to in Article K.3 in Title VI of the TEU;
5. Points out that Parliament should have been consulted as regards this document, at least on the basis of the second paragraph of Article K.6 of the TEU and the document should not have been forwarded for information only, as was the case;
6. Notes that it does not have sufficient information on the Centre and that the Council and Commission have not provided it with such information;
7. Points out that, to judge from the blueprint which emerges from the documents studied and from the draft conclusions, CIREFI is designed as a basic instrument for controlling illegal immigration, and that such control is an important aspect of the activities with legislative implications under Title VI of the TEU;
8. Takes the view that the Council, by failing to consult Parliament on the basis of Article K.6 of the TEU and take due account of its views and any amendments it might make, and by disregarding the decision-making procedure laid down in the Treaty, is in breach of the Treaty;
9. Notes that the impression given is that CIREFI will be engaged chiefly in combating illegal immigration;
10. Has formed the impression, from the small amount of data available, that there is obvious duplication of the data on immigrants and asylum-seekers collected by the European Commission's Statistical Office, the data collected by the IOM and UNHCR and the Member States, the European Information System currently being established and the work which might be assigned to Europol;
11. Calls for one observer appointed by the Commission and one observer appointed by Parliament to be allowed, with immediate effect, to attend CIREFI meetings;

12. Finds that the provisions governing the communication and handling of so-called 'personal data' are imprecise and confusing; calls for proper guarantees to be laid down and for steps to be taken to ensure there is no duplication with other bodies in the collection of such data;
13. Requests that this proposal should clearly define: the obligations of the Member States; relations with other similar intergovernmental or Community bodies; the conditions and restrictions on the communication of information and data by the Member States, the protection of information and data by the Member States, the practical arrangements for this purpose and the long-term and immediate objectives of that body;
14. Calls for the operation of the Centre to be reviewed after a certain period and for it to be subsequently transformed, in the light of experience, into a body with the ability to help facilitate and support, within the Union, the adoption of joint decisions and comprehensive policies on the prevention and control of illegal immigration;
15. Hopes that illegal immigrants, too, will be treated with dignity;
16. Considers that the Commission must make its position known as soon as possible;
17. Rejects, in view of the foregoing, the (draft) Council conclusions;
18. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission, the Council and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.

B
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1. Introduction

Following the establishment of CIREFI in late 1992, on which Parliament was not consulted, Parliament received, by letter of 14 December 1994, a text from the Council relating to the draft conclusions on the organization and development of the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI).

It is particularly difficult to draw up a soundly based report, given the fact that Parliament was not aware of the decision to establish CIREFI. This report therefore focuses only on known facts. CIREFI should not be confused with CIREA (Centre for Information, Reflection and Exchange on Asylum) which produces reports on the situation in non-member countries.

Pursuant to the recommendation (SN 3017/93) on the monitoring and expulsion of nationals of third countries residing or working illegally in a Member State, decisions on the need to carry out 'checks' are to be taken on the basis of specific circumstances. 'The exchange of information between Member States on the nature of checks and procedures and the relevant legislation should take place within the framework of CIREFI' (Article 5 of the recommendation).

CIREFI's terms of reference may be summarized as follows, on the basis of paragraph 3 of the conclusions:

'Without prejudice to the other tasks in the Ministerial Decision of 30 November/1 December 1992, the specific tasks of CIREFI shall be to:

- collate, using standard forms, statistical information concerning
 - a. legal immigration
 - b. illegal immigration and unlawful residence
 - c. facilitating of illegal immigration
 - d. use of falsified travel documents
 - e. measures taken by competent authorities,and draw up regular and occasional situation reports on this basis commenting on trends, developments and changes;
- analyse the information compiled, draw conclusions and, when appropriate, give advice;
- conduct exchanges of information on expulsion matters, particularly in respect of countries of destination, airports of departure or arrival, carriers, flight routes, fares, reservation possibilities, conditions of carriage, escort requirements and charter possibilities as well as on problems in obtaining repatriation travel documents.'

CIREFI is to submit an annual report, and any additional reports on request, to the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) Council. Personal data may not be processed and, in particular, may not be communicated by or to CIREFI. CIREFI is not to be empowered to give instructions to Member States' authorities. The activities of CIREFI are not to affect closer cooperation between Member States.

2. Legal basis

Given that CIREFI's remit includes immigration, legal or otherwise, statistics and the crossing of internal and external frontiers, the question must be asked as to whether the Centre's activities come under Title VI (cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs) or within the scope of Community law. This is not evident from the form of document used, since neither the EC Treaty nor Title VI of the TEU provide for decisions or legislation to take the form of conclusions. Nor do the conclusions anywhere refer to the EC Treaty or to Title VI of the TEU. This is a case of the Council adopting a summary decision without detailed consultation of or cooperation with the Commission or Parliament. The absence of a legal basis makes it particularly difficult for the rapporteur to assess the proposal. It is, however, clear that it is the Court of Justice's job to ensure that the correct legal basis is stated and the correct procedure used when the EC Treaty is applied. There is no reason why it should be possible to depart from this arrangement now. The Council might possibly argue that the conclusions are an organizational measure for use within its General Secretariat or constitute non-binding guidelines.

It is obvious, however, from CIREFI's extensive terms of reference, and the fact that Member States, too, are, or have, to cooperate, that the conclusions are not an internal instruction to the staff of the General Secretariat of the Council. Given the peremptory nature of their wording, the draft conclusions are not non-binding guidelines either.

Despite the fact that Parliament was not notified of the substance of the decision of 30 November/1 December 1992 establishing CIREFI, it is possible to say, on the basis of paragraph 3 of the conclusions, that its tasks fall into the following categories:

- statistical work
- the gathering of data of a legal nature
- analysis of legal and illegal immigration
- analyses relating to policing measures (falsified documents, illegal immigration, etc.).

Some of its provisions relate to the first pillar of the TEU, i.e. the EC Treaty, since internal frontiers come under the jurisdiction of the EC on the basis of Article 7a of the Treaty. A clearing house (the term used in connection with CIREFI) monitoring legal or illegal immigrants is also, by definition, concerned with intra-community movements. This area of the Centre's activities might lend itself to inclusion in the Commission's general statistical programme.

Others relate to asylum policy, immigration policy, provisions concerning the crossing of the external frontier, judicial cooperation in criminal matters and cooperation with a view to preventing and combating international crime (e.g. organizations which facilitate illegal immigration, the falsification of passports, the smuggling and trafficking of people). This is part of the third pillar of the TEU (Title VI), in respect of which the Commission and Parliament also have certain powers.

3. The role of the Commission

Having established above that some of CIREFI's activities relate to the first pillar and some to the third pillar, it is obvious what role the Commission could, or should, have played. It has the right to propose legislation as regards activities falling within the scope of the EC Treaty. As regards those falling within the scope of Title VI, it is to be 'fully associated' (Article K.4(2)). It may even, on the basis of Article K.3(2) take far-reaching measures in relation to asylum, immigration and the crossing of the external frontiers. It is not evident from the Council conclusions that the Commission has been involved in any way. This means, therefore, either that the Council wrongly excluded the Commission or that the Commission wrongly omitted to consider the conclusions.

4. The role of the European Parliament

Parliament must be consulted as regards measures relating to both the first and third pillars. Although it is somewhat unclear whether the text considered by Parliament is in fact a definitive text, it has been argued on several occasions¹ that the Council cannot adopt decisions under Title VI of the TEU without first consulting Parliament pursuant to Article K.6, second paragraph². The Presidency must consult Parliament on the principal aspects of the activities and must ensure that Parliament's views are duly taken into consideration.

5. The decision itself

As already stated, the legal basis must be specified. The impression given is that the Centre will evolve into a body which lays down policy on illegal immigration. The rapporteur cannot agree to a hunting down of illegal immigrants. Action must be taken to prevent illegal immigration into the Union, and effective controls on the external frontiers may help to achieve that aim, but an inhuman and oppressive policy can only have negative consequences.

It may be argued that activities which are not directly of a criminal nature should, together with the associated data, be dealt with by the EIS, which should be administered by the Commission. Data on criminal activities should be sent to Europol. The rapporteur's provisional assessment is that the arrangements as they currently stand represent a duplication of effort and a waste of money.

Whilst the costs incurred by national bodies are borne by the Member States, it is obvious that the costs incurred by the General Secretariat of the Council in providing 'the staff and equipment required' for CIREFI (see Article 4 of the conclusions) will be charged to the Union budget. This is unacceptable if the Council chooses to disregard the Union's decision-making procedures.

¹ For example, during and at the close of the annual debate on the basis of Article K.6, third paragraph, last sentence, in December 1994.

² 'The Presidency shall consult the European Parliament on the principal aspects of activities in the areas referred to in this Title and shall ensure that the views of the European Parliament are duly taken into consideration'.

O P I N I O N

(Rule 147 of the Rules of Procedure)

of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights
for the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs
Draftsman: Mrs Palacio Vallelersundi

At its meeting of 22 February 1995 the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights appointed Mrs Palacio Vallelersundi draftsman.

At its meetings of 1 June 1995 and 26 June 1995 it considered the draft opinion.

At the latter meeting it adopted the conclusions as a whole unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Casini, chairman; Rothley, vice-chairman; Palacio Vallelersundi, vice-chairman and draftsman; Alber, Añoveros Trías de Bes (for Janssen van Raay), Cot, Gebhardt, Hlavac, Malangré and Ullmann.

1. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

On 14 December 1994 the Council forwarded to Parliament the document to which this opinion refers and which looks at various questions relating to a 'Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI)'.

With regard to the formalities and procedure used by the Council in forwarding its draft conclusions and Parliament's consideration of the document, it should be pointed out that:

(1) the CIREFI document was forwarded together with three other documents also relating to immigration policy:

- in the accompanying letter, the Council stated that the above-mentioned four documents were forwarded 'for information';
- the accompanying letter referred to the three documents as 'Recommendation 6/95' and 'Resolutions 5/95 and 7/95'; the document which is the subject of this opinion, i.e. the document concerning CIREFI, is designated 'Conclusions 8/95'.

(2) In some language versions, for example the French, the CIREFI document (C4-0008/95 of 10 January 1995), is called 'Conclusions', whereas its Spanish title is '... Proyecto de Conclusiones del Consejo sobre la creación y desarrollo ...'.

The difference in the title, i.e. the inclusion of the word 'draft', is also reflected in the body of the text.

(3) The draftsman did not have access to certain Council documents which she considers essential for the drafting of a well-founded opinion. Those documents include, in particular, the documents for the meetings of the Council of Ministers responsible for immigration held on 30 November and 1 December 1992 in London, 1-2 June 1993 in Copenhagen and 29-30 November 1993 in Brussels, which reveal the scope of the decisions adopted in relation to the CIREFI. Parliament cannot under any circumstances accept the relevant press releases (the only texts available to it) as a substitute.

2. BACKGROUND TO CIREFI AND THE DRAFT CONCLUSIONS

Bearing in mind that only the above-mentioned Council press releases were available and that caution is therefore called for, the background to the Conclusions is as follows:

- the Council of Ministers responsible for immigration which met in London on 30 November-1 December 1992 approved the setting up of a Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the crossing of frontiers and immigration (CIREFI) (as gathered from point 6, section c of the draft Conclusions, according to which the ministers noted the viability study on CIREFI and approved the establishment of the said centre).

- the Council of Ministers meetings of 1-2 June and 29-30 November 1993 referred to the activities of CIREFI (according to section IV(ii) of the press release for the former meeting, 'Ministers noted that, following their decision in London, CIREFI had begun work').

In the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on immigration and asylum policies (COM(94) 0023) of 23 February 1994, paragraph 44 states: '... This led to the setting up of two 'clearing houses' - the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on Asylum (CIREA) and the Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on the Crossing of Borders and Immigration (CIREFI) - which are informal structures enabling national experts to be brought together on an occasional basis. Their mandates include exchanging data on the number of applications for admission, the numbers of persons admitted and the number of returnees. The collection of data has become a regular exercise and its compilation is done by means of a computerized system. That information, however, is as yet not always directly comparable' (emphasis added).

Consequently, the relevant Conclusions of the Council refer to an informal structure - just a label without any definite legal personality - which brings together national experts, without a set calendar, to exchange data on requests for admission and related matters. In view of that fact, the new competences conferred on the CIREFI are scarcely compatible with retaining the structure and nature which it appears to have had hitherto.

3. IMMIGRATION-POLICY BACKGROUND RELATING TO THIS OPINION

Immigration policy is a matter of priority for the European Union and its Member States, particularly since 1991. It is worth recalling, in particular:

- Practically all documents in this areas - from both the Commission and the Council - stress that a prime element of cooperation, and of the eventual establishment of a Community policy, is reliable and accurate information based on harmonized statistics on migratory movements.
- The above-mentioned CIREA (Centre for Information, Discussion and Exchange on Asylum), set up by meeting of the Council of Ministers responsible for immigration in Lisbon in June 1992, also has the task of carrying out a joint assessment of the situation in the countries of origin, with a view to both admission and the deportation of citizens of non-member countries illegally resident, a matter for which CIREFI is also competent.
- The European Parliament has repeatedly urged the Council finally to submit to it the proposal leading to the European Information System provided for in the Convention on the Crossing of External Borders, the objective of which is the drawing up of a harmonized list of foreigners who may not be admitted to the Union.
- Moreover, the European Parliament has pointed out on a number of occasions, in particular in paragraph 2 of its Resolution of 18 November 1992 on European immigration policy (A3-0280/92, OJ C 337, 21.12.1992, p. 95), 'the importance of channelling migration in a rational manner' and called on the Commission 'to set up a European monitoring centre to supervise migratory movements'.
- The Commission, for its part, is still debating whether a European monitoring centre should be set up for controlling migratory flows - which would not be restricted to gathering statistical data but would also draw up general policies - for which there has been a budgetary line in the Budget since 1993.

- Be that as it may, it is clear from the background documents that the Commission has not played a part in, among other things, setting up or defining the role of CIREFI.

4. WORKING METHODS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CIREFI, SUBSTANCE AND NATURE OF THE DOCUMENT STUDIED

(A) SUBSTANCE

The preamble to the draft Conclusions recalls a number of previous decisions before referring to the problems of illegal immigration and calling on the Member States to combat it. The preamble concludes: '... the Council considers and decides that CIREFI should be, as a further step, progressively developed in the following way: ...' (The Spanish version, unlike the French version, omits the words 'and decides').

It appears from the provisions of the text that CIREFI will consist of a Standing Conference of national experts with logistical back-up from the General Secretariat of the Council and the national central units of the Member States.

The tasks of CIREFI are extended to cover the collation, using standard forms, of statistical information to assist the Member States in the following:

- the prevention of illegal immigration and unlawful residence;
- combating criminal illegal immigration networks and immigration crime in general;
- improving deportation and repatriation practices and instruments, particularly with regard to modes of transport.

It is expressly stated that CIREFI will submit to the Council an annual report on its activities and any other reports on request. Personal data may not be processed and may not be communicated by or to CIREFI. CIREFI has no power to give instructions to Member States' authorities.

From an administrative and organizational point of view, CIREFI is assisted by the General Secretariat of the Council.

Finally, the text under discussion ends by stating that: 'CIREFI may begin to carry out its work as defined in these conclusions from 1 January 1995'.

Despite the contradictions and ambiguities of the text under consideration, it is clear from the above that, owing to the competences conferred on it, the 'new' CIREFI is an important initiative covered by the concept of 'principal aspects of activities' within the meaning of Article K.6 of the TEU.

(B) NATURE

(1) It is clear from the above that some of the 'tasks' assigned to CIREFI could come within the scope of the first pillar of the TEU (i.e. the EC Treaty), particularly anything which could relate to internal frontiers (on the basis of Article 7a of the EC Treaty). Moreover, the monitoring of the intra-Community movement of illegal immigrants may be considered to be part of the Commission's normal statistical programme.

However, it must be considered that most of the 'tasks' appear to come under Title VI of the TEU (third pillar), in particular matters relating to immigration policy, external frontiers, judicial cooperation in criminal matters (networks which facilitate illegal immigration, the forging of documents, etc.).

While there is a need for caution owing to the lack of precedents and the ambiguous wording of the text in question, in the draftsman's opinion these roles in the processing of information and data are not only important (for the purposes of Article K.6 of the TEU), THEY PRODUCE LEGAL EFFECTS. Consequently, Parliament must in any case be consulted both on matters which come under the first pillar and those which come under the third pillar. It goes without saying that the Commission should also be involved.

(2) Article 189 of the EC Treaty and Title VI of the TEU define, for the matters within their respective scopes, the various legal instruments available to the Community institutions. However, there is no provision in any article of the Treaties for a 'Conclusion of the Council' with a legislative scope.

This is a clear case of Council's political and legislative roles becoming mixed up. Although it is customary for political decisions to take the form of conclusions, it is unacceptable for this practical system to be used to shield decisions with legislative implications.

It must be stressed that this lack of rigour in the formulation of Council acts constitutes an infringement of the principle of legal certainty, if nothing else.

As to the document's designation as 'Conclusions' or 'draft Conclusions', in the draftsman's opinion, the former is an act which is formally complete and is capable of producing immediate legal effects, whereas the latter is a proposal, a draft, an act which is formally incomplete designed to initiate the relevant legislative procedure; criticism of the Council's action would in that case be restricted to its having forwarded the text to the Parliament 'for information'.

That being so, if the content of the Conclusions has already been implemented, it should be considered whether the breach of the institutional balance due to the failure to consult the Parliament is such as to warrant an action before the Court of Justice.

(3) Particularly reprehensible is the failure to state the legal basis used by the Council to lay down provisions which go far beyond the political sphere and which must therefore be regarded as acts of the Council in its legislative capacity, as already mentioned.

(4) In spite of the contradictory wording of the provisions of the document under consideration, an implied obligation must be considered to have been imposed on the Member States with regard to the gathering and storage of certain data. Logically, that obligation could involve amendment of the existing legislation in at least one Member State, which is inconceivable for an act with no legal status.

5. CONCLUSIONS

For all the above reasons, the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights requests the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs to incorporate in its draft report the following conclusions:

1. Deplores the fact that the Council did not consult the European Parliament at the time on whether CIREFI should be set up.
2. Makes clear that, to judge from the blueprint which emerges from the above-mentioned background documents and from the document submitted for an opinion, CIREFI is designed as a basic instrument for controlling illegal immigration, and such control is an important aspect of the activities with legislative implications under Title VI of the TEU.
3. Regrets that this initiative was not channelled through one of the instruments of cooperation mentioned in Article K.3 in Title VI of the TEU.
4. Points out that, consequently, Parliament should have been consulted, as regards this document, at least on the basis of the second paragraph of Article K.6 of the TEU and the document should not have been forwarded to it for information only, as was the case.
5. Calls on the Council to withdraw its draft Conclusions and on the Commission to present a proposal on the basis of the provisions of Title VI of the TEU and calls for the European Parliament to be consulted in this process by virtue of the second paragraph of Article K.6.
6. Requests that this proposal should clearly define: the obligations of the Member States; relations with other similar intergovernmental or Community bodies; the conditions and restrictions on the transfer of information and data by the Member States, the protection of information and data by the Member States, the practical arrangements for this purpose and the long-term and immediate objectives of that body.
7. Calls for the operation of the Centre to be reviewed after a certain period and for it to be subsequently transformed, in the light of experience, into a body with the ability to help facilitate and support, within the Union, the adoption of joint decisions and comprehensive policies on the prevention and control of illegal immigration.