Annex 1: A template for a report from the process of integrated impact assessment on border control technologies in the European Union and the Schengen Area¹

Nikolaos IOANNIDIS,* Simone CASIRAGHI,** Alessandra CALVI*** and Dariusz KLOZA****

* Vrije Universiteit Brussel. E-mail: nikolaos.ioannidis@vub.be.

** Vrije Universiteit Brussel. E-mail: simone.casiraghi@vub.be.

*** Vrije Universiteit Brussel. E-mail: alessandra.calvi@vub.be.

**** Vrije Universiteit Brussel. E-mail: dariusz.kloza@vub.be.

Cover page

Name of the initiative under assessment
Name, contact details and other identifying details of:
border control authority deploying the initiative
data controller(s)
data processor(s), if applicable
person(s) in charge of the initiative
assessor(s)
data protection officer(s) (DPO), if appointed
chief information security officer, if appointed

quality control body supervising the assessment process, if appointed	
data protection authority/ies (DPA)	
research ethics committees at public or private organisations	
national ethics committees or councils	
groups of <i>ad hoc</i> recruited ethics experts	
anyone else involved, as practicable	
Version of the assessment report	
Level of confidentiality of the assessment report	 Public Confidential Specific [explain]
Date and place of compilation of the report	
[Any other details, as practicable]	

Executive summary

[Summarise the most significant information concerning the outcomes of each step of the integrated impact assessment process.]

Phase I: preparation of the assessment process

Step 1: Screening (threshold analysis)

Step 1a: Preliminary description of the envisaged initiative

	7	What?	
S	Contextual description	How much/how many?	/?
ion aspect.	contextual	Where?	
ata protect	0	Why?	
Overview of data protection aspects	ption	Overview of personal data and processing operations	
Ô	Tecchnical description	Infrastructure	
	Tecch	Actors	
Overvie	w of privac	cy aspects	
Overvie	w of ethica	ll aspects	
Overview of social acceptance aspects			
[other, e	rplain		
louner, e	лршпј		

Positive criteria	Legal provision	Applicable?	Explanation
Criterion 1: The envisaged processing operations are likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons (general)	35(1)		
Criterion 2: Processing operations deemed highly risky			
2a. Processing operations entailing systematic and extensive evaluation of personal aspects relating to natural persons which is based on automated processing, including profiling, and on which decisions are based that produce legal effects concerning the natural person or similarly significantly affect the natural person	35(3)(a)		
2b. Processing operations regarding special categories of data, or personal data relating to criminal convictions and offences on a large scale	35(3)(b)		
2c. Processing operations entail a systematic monitoring of a publicly accessible area on a large scale	35(3)(c)		
Criterion 3: Processing operations included in the public list of processing operations that require a data protection impact assessment compiled by the DPA(s) to which jurisdiction(s) the data controller is subject	35(4)		
Criterion 3bis : Processing operations that require a DPIA as included in a code of conduct to which the data controller is subject	40		
[other, cf. Step 2a: Benchmark; explain]			
DECISION			required
			not required

Step 1ba: Personal data protection screening (threshold analysis)

Annex 1 – Step 1: Screening (threshold analysis)

Negative criteria	Legal provision	Applicable?	Explanation
Criterion 4: Processing operations included in the public list of processing operations that DO NOT require a data protection impact assessment compiled by the DPA(s) to which jurisdiction(s) the data controller is subject	35(5)		
Criterion 5: Whereas the legal basis for the processing operations is the compliance with a legal obligation to which the controller is subject or the performance of a task carried out in the public interest, on the basis of EU or member state's law, and an impact assessment satisfying the conditions of DPIA under the GDPR has already been performed	35(10)		
Criterion 6: Processing operations concerning personal data from patients or clients performed by an individual physician, other health care professional or lawyer	Recital 91		
Criterion 6bis : Processing operations exempted from a DPIA by a code of conduct to which the data controller is subject	40		
[other, cf. Step 2a: Benchmark; explain]			
DECISION			exempted
			not exempted

Step 1bb: Ethics and social acceptance screening

Could the initiative result in the development and/or use of technologies and/or processing activities that:	Applicable?	Explanation
1. Would produce excessive costs in comparison to the advantages they bring?		
2. Would fail to ask for the users' consent in a plain understandable lan- guage, allowing space for questions, when it is needed?		
3. Could be misused (e.g. for terrorism purposes)?		
4. Would involve vulnerable individuals or groups?		
5. Would involve children and/or minors?		
6. Would increase risk of discrimination of certain groups (e.g. third-country nationals)?		
7. Would divide users into categories (e.g. low risk and high risk)?		
8. Would not be accessible for certain categories of people?		
9. Could have potential for military applications?		
10. Would increase chances of identity theft?		
DECHT		required
RESULT		not required

Step 1bc: Privacy screening

Could the initiative result in the development and/or use of technologies and/or processing activities that:	Applicable?	Explanation
1. Would interfere with <i>bodily privacy</i> ?		
2. Would interfere with <i>spatial privacy</i> ?		
3. Would interfere with <i>communicational privacy</i> ?		
4. Would interfere with <i>proprietary privacy</i> ?		
5. Would interfere with <i>intellectual privacy</i> ?		
6. Would interfere with <i>decisional privacy</i> ?		
7. Would interfere with <i>associational privacy</i> ?		
8. Would interfere with <i>behavioural privacy</i> ?		
9. Would interfere with <i>informational privacy</i> ? [overlapping]		
RESULT		required
REJULI		not required

Comments

[Explanation]

Step 2: Scoping

Step 2a: Benchmark

Step 2aa: Personal data protection

Applicable laws and regulations				
Applic	able laws and regulations	Appli	Explanation	
	General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)			
	National law(s) supplementing/implementing the GDPR			
	National data protection laws (extra-EEA)			
alis	National exclusion/inclusion list(s) (Art. 35(4)-(5) GDPR)			
lex generalis	Codes of conduct			
lex	Certificates (Art. 42 GDPR)			
	Technical standards			
	Laws from extra-EU jurisdictions			
	[other, general sources for personal data protection, explain]			
	Regulation 1725/2018 (EU Institutions)			
	Europol Regulation			
	ePrivacy Directive [as transposed in national law]			
	Law Enforcement Directive (LED) [as transposed in national law]			
	SIS framework			
	VIS framework			
alis	Eurodac framework			
lex specialis	EES framework			
lex	ETIAS framework			
	ECRIS-TCN framework			
	Interoperability framework			
	Eurosur framework			
	API framework			
	PNR framework			
	[other, specific sources for personal data protection, explain]			

Annex 1 – Step 2: Scoping

Applicable laws and regulations				Explanation
SMI	Data protection policies			
by-laws	[other, explain]			
Scope	e of the assessment process	Legal provision	Applicable?	Explanation
Perso	onal data protection principles	Art. 5		
Legal	basis for processing	Art. 6		
Data	subject rights	Art. 15-22		
Oblig	gations of data controller and processor	Art. 24-39		
Data	transfers outside EU/EEA	Art. 46		
Speci	fic processing situations	Art. 85-91		
its	Private and family life, home and communications			
Other fundamental rights	Freedom of thought, conscience and religion			
ndamo	Freedom of expression and information	Recital 4		
er fun	Freedom to conduct business			
Oth	Right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial			
	Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity			
[othe	r, explain]			

Step 2ab: Ethics

				able?
ID	Theory	Argument	Examples	Applicable?
1		Universality of principles and/or values	1.1 The initiative is (not) based on universal principles	
			1.2 The initiative is (not) based on universal values	
			l.x	
2		Technological determinism	2.1 The initiative is presented as a panacea for long-las- ting social problems	
			2.2 It is inevitable that the initiative will become ubi- quitous in society	
	1		2.3 It is inevitable that "traditional" border checks will disappear	
			2.4 The initiative is the <i>only</i> way to solve problems of security and improve efficiency	
			2.x	
3		Neutrality of technology	3.1 The initiative is (not) neutral	
			3.2 The initiative is (not) biased	
			3.x	
4		Arguments from precedent	4.1 The initiative is likely to propose problems that have happened in the past	
			4.2 The initiative is likely to solve problems that have happened in the past	
			4.3 The initiative is likely to promote benefits that have happened in the past	
			4.x	
5		Change of ethical values arguments	5.1 The initiative will change people's ethical values (such as autonomy)	
			5.2 The initiative will change/improve people's ethical behaviour	
			5.3 The initiative will change/improve people's ethical judgements	
			5.4 The initiative affects the autonomy of border guards' decision-making	
			5.x	

ID	Theory	Argument	Examples	Applicable?
6		Slippery slope	6.1 The initiative, if developed on a large scale, can give rise to uncontrollable effects	
			6.2 If we do not implement T now, we will suffer uncon- trollable effects	
			6.3 The initiative bears the risk of "function creep"	
			6.x	
7	Deon- tology	Principles/rights/duties before consequences	7.1 The initiative will respect principle X, regardless of the consequences	
			7.2 The initiative is designed respecting the principle/ value X	
			7.3 There is a categorical prohibition (e.g. "red line") for certain uses of the initiative	
			7.4 The initiative (does not) respect the human right X	
			7.5 The initiative is not in line with the Code of conduct X	
			7.x	
8	Conse- quenti-	Benefits will outweigh costs	8.1 The initiative brings about (economic) benefits that will outweigh the costs	
	alism	alism	8.2 The initiative will increase security despite an infrin- gement of privacy	
			8.3 The initiative will make border crossing/control more efficient	
			8.4 The initiative can be misused or used for military purposes	
			8.x	

Border Control and New Technologies

ID	Theory	Argument	Examples	Applicable?	
	butive benefits and risks	9.1 The initiative is (not) equally accessible to everyone (e.g. people in wheelchairs, third-country nationals)			
		9.2 Only/mostly <i>some</i> people will benefit from the initia- tive (e.g. <i>bona fide</i> travellers)			
		9.3 Some people are more prone to be considered high- risk travellers (e.g. third country nationals)			
				9.4 There are risks of bias or stigmatisation when using the initiative	
			9.5 The accuracy of the initiative is unreliable for certain categories of people		
			9.x		

Step 2ac: Social acceptance scoping

Perspective	Applicable?	Stakeholders considered for acceptance assessment	Acceptance assess- ment technique	Explanation
Socio-		EU/EEA/CH citizens		
political		Non-EU/EEA/CH citizens, and sub-categories		
		Border control authorities		
		[other, explain]		
Market		Industrial stakeholders		
		Scientific experts		
		Policy makers		
		[other, explain]		
Community		Local stakeholders		

Annex 1 – Step 2: Scoping

Step 2ad: Privacy



Step 2b: Stakeholders and their consultation techniques

Internal stakeholders

Category of stakeholder	Involved?	Level of involvement	Stakeholder involve- ment techniques	Explanation
Data processor(s)				
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)				
Recipient(s) (Article 4(9))				
Third parties (Article 4(10))				
Representative(s) (Article 27)				
Information security officer(s)				
Legal service				
Employees, trade unions, contractors, etc.				
[other, specify]				

External stakeholders

	Category of stakeholder	Involved?	Level of involvement	Stakeholder involvement techniques	Explanation
Individuals whose rights and freedoms are affected by the initiative and their representatives	Data subjects, including: Minors Vulnerable people [other, specify]				
whose rights ar by the initiativ representatives	Representative(s) of data subject(s)				
als whose ted by th repres	Individuals who are not data subjects				
Individu: are affec	Representative(s) of indi- viduals who are not data subjects				
ctor ders	Supervisory authority(ies) (DPA)				
Public sector stakeholders	Policy makers				
Pt	Local stakeholders				
Private sector stakeholders	Technology providers				
Private stakeh	Transportation companies				
	Research Ethics Commit- tees, at public or private organisations				
Experts	National ethics committees or councils, at EU or Mem- ber State level				
	Groups of <i>ad hoc</i> recruited ethics experts				
	Scientific experts				
	[Anybody else affected, etc., specify]				

Element of the benchmark	Technique	Applicable?	Explanation
Data Protection	Necessity and proportionality assessment		
Data P1	Risk assessment		
Privacy	Necessity and proportionality assess- ment (as per human rights)		
P_{t}	Risk assessment		
Ethics	Ethics assessment		
Social acceptance	Social acceptance assessment		
Border management	Legal compliance with border ma- nagement law		
	Scenario planning		
entary	Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)		
Supplementary	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT)		
	[other, specify]		

Step 2c: Appraisal techniques

Step 2d: Other evaluation techniques



Comments

[Explanation]

Step 3: Planning and Preparation

Specific objectives of the assessment process

Objective	Applicable?	Explanation
Protection of individuals		
Compliance with the law		
[other, specify]		

Criteria for the acceptability of negative impacts

Objective		Applicable?	Explanation
Necessity and proportionality (Article 35(7)(b))			
Human rights limitatio CFR)	Human rights limitation criteria (Article 52(1) CFR)		
Risk assessment	Likelihood scale		
(qualitative, quantitative)	Severity scale		
(risk criteria)	Point of acceptability		
[other, specify]			

Resources

	Value(s)	Explanation
Time (how long?)		
Money (how much?)		
Workforce (how many people?)		
Knowledge (what expertise?)		
Know-how (what experience?)		

Border Control and New Technologies

	Value(s)	Explanation
Premises (where?)		
Infrastructure (by what means?)		
[other, specify]		

Procedures and timeframes for the assessment process

	Milestone	Deadline	Responsibility	Supervision
1	[Specify]			
2				

Assessor(s)

	Name	If external: organisation	Contact details	Expertise	Roles and responsibilities	Other information
1	[Specify]				[Leader]	
2						

Stakeholders

[Provide contact details of all stakeholders to involve in the present impact assessment process and a consultation plan, if necessary.]

Continuity of the assessment process

[How would the present assessment process be continued in the event of a disruption, reorganisation, etc. of the sponsoring organization?]

Criteria triggering the revision of the assessment process

Criterion	Applicable?	Explanation
Change of likelihood and/or severity of a risk		
[Other, specify]		

Comments

[Explanation]

Ongoing Steps for Phase I

Step A: Stakeholder involvement

Internal stakeholders

Category of stakeholders	What information has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
Data processor(s)			
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)			
Recipient(s) (Article 4(9))			
Third parties (Article 4(10))			
Representative(s) (Article 27)			
Information security officer(s)			
Legal service			
Employees, trade unions, contractors, etc.			
[other, specify]			

External stakeholders

	Category of stakeholders	What information has been communi- cated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provi- ded (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
and freedoms are their representatives	 Data subjects, including: Minors Vulnerable people [other, specify] 			
	Representative(s) of data subject(s)			
uals whose rights the initiative and	Individuals who are not data subjects			
Individuals affected by the	Representative(s) of individuals who are not data subjects			

or rs	Supervisory authori- ty(ies) (DPA)
Public sector stakeholders	Policy makers
Pu	Local stakeholders
ctor ers	Technology providers
Private sector stakeholders	Transportation companies
	Research Ethics Committees, at public or private organisations
Experts	National ethics commit- tees or councils, at EU or Member States' level
<u>н</u>	Groups of <i>ad hoc</i> recruited ethics experts
	Scientific experts
	[Anybody else affected, etc., specify]

Lack of stakeholder involvement in the present phase

[If stakeholders are not involved in the present phase of the impact assessment process, explain why.]

Step B: Quality control

Quality control body	What feedback was received?	How was the feedback implemented? Why was it rejected?
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)		
Supervisory authority (DPA)		
[Other, specify]		

Comments

[Explanation]

Phase II: Assessment

Step 4: Systematic (detailed) description of the initiative

a) A succinct description of the envisaged initiative

[Explanation]			

b) Personal data protection

Overview

Contextual description

		Explanation
Nature		1
(what types of processing operations? e.g. collection, storage, erasure, etc.)		2
storage, erasure, etc.)		
Scope	Scale (how much? how many? how far?)	
	Time (when? how long?)	
Context	Internal (concerning the controller)	
(in what circumstances?)	External (concerning individuals, groups, society, etc.)	
Purpose of processing operations, in legitimate interest (why?)	cluding, where applicable,	
Benefits	for individuals, inclu- ding data subjects	
of processing operations	for the data controller	
	for society as a whole	
Drawbacks	for individuals, inclu- ding data subjects	
of processing operations	for the data controller	
	for society as a whole	

185

	Explanation
Categories of personal data (what?) special categories of personal data personal data of vulnerable people (e.g. children) data of a highly personal nature	
Means of processing (infrastructure) (by what means?)	
Envisioned data flows (where to where? whom to whom?)	
Data security (how is it ensured?)	
Jurisdiction/market (where?)	
Actors in the 'supply chain' (who?)	
[Other, explain]	

Diagram of personal data flows and/or other visualisations

[Insert a diagram]

c) Privacy

	Explanation
Bodily privacy	
Spatial privacy	
Communicational privacy	
Proprietary privacy	
Intellectual privacy	
Decisional privacy	
Associational privacy	
Behavioural privacy	
Informational privacy	

Comments

[Explanation]

		STEP 5 Appraisal of impacts		Principle			 	LawIulliess		
		al of impacts			Consent	Contract	Legal compliance	Vital interests	Public interest	Legitimate interests
				noisivorq lagsJ	6(1) (a)	6(1) (b)	6(1) (c)	6(1) (d)	6(1) (e)	6(1) (f)
				?əldnəilqqA						
				Shəilərin2						
				Explanation						
ID of a p	Type of a	STEP 6]	Response	əəvəld ui səvusbəM						
ID of a processing operation	Type of a processing operation	STEP 6 Recommendations	Response plan, if principle not satisfied	ot sərusnəM Əsubortni						
cration	peration	tions	iple not satisf	uosıəd əldisnoqeəA						
			îed	Priority						
				ənilbnəU						

Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts & Step 6: Recommendations

Step 5aa: Data protection : Necessity and proportionality of the processing operations

i) Level 1: Personal data protection principles

Fairness				
Transparency		5(1)(a)		
			1	
	Specific			
	Explicit			
Purpose limitation	Legitimate	5(1)(b)		
4	Not processed further			
	(Exceptions)	89(1)		
	Adequate			
Data minimisation	Relevant	5(1)(c)		
	Limited			
	Accurate	E(1)/4)		
Accuracy	Up-to-date	(n)(r)c		
Ctourse limitation	Necessary	5(1)(e)		
	(Exceptions)	89(1)		
Data corruitur	Integrity and confidentiality	5(1)(f)		
Data security	Security of processing	32		
Data protection by design	sign	25(1)		
Data protection by default	fault	25(2)		

Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

Border Control and New Technologies

STEP.	STEP 5 Appraisal of impacts			STEP 6 R	STEP 6 Recommendations	tions		
				Response	plan, if princ	Response plan, if principle not satisfied	ĥed	
Criterion	ion	\$bsiteita2	Explanation	in place səruzame	introduce Measures to	uosıəd əlqisuodsəy	Priority	9nilbn9U
LEGALITY Is the envi quality?	LEGALITY Is the envisaged initiative provided for by law of a sufficient quality?							
Essence Does the se a fund	ESSENCE Does the envisaged initiative still make it possible to exerci- se a fundamental right or freedom?							
	LEGITIMACY Does the envisaged initiative serve a legitimate aim?							
YTIJAN	SUITABILITY Is the envisaged initiative suited (ever capable) to achieving this aim?							
Ркороктіс	NECESSITY Is the envisaged initiative necessary to achieve this aim?							
	PROPORTIONALITY SENSU STRICTO (BALANCING) Is the interference with the right justified in light of the gain in protection for the competing right or interest?							

Step 5ab: Data protection: Risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons

				ənilbnəU					
				Priority					
			uosıəd əj	qisuodsəX					
		: plan	əənpoıtui ot						
	TION	Response plan		səınsvəM					
	RISK EVALUATION	R		R					
SNO	RISK]		Revised risk level (score) (Any residual risk?)	S I					
STEP 6 RECOMMENDATIONS			ised ris l (score, dual ris						
COMM		se	Rev leve resi	L[P]					
ep 6 Re		Risk response	u	Descriptio					
STI		Rish		әdқ _L					
			ио	itnnulqxI					
	SISYIA		(કર૦૫૬) દ્વારક [૬٨૬]	R = L[P] * S					
	RISK ANALYSIS	уsi	Severity of consequence(s) if t sesialises	S					
CTS		[ʎ1	ој оссиненсе Тікеlihood [probabili	L[P]					
STEP 5 APPRAISAL OF IMPACTS	RISK IDENTIFICATION		Description	(risk source, risk owner, etc.)					
STEP 5 APF	RISK IDEN			Risk	[Specify]				
				IJ	1	5	\tilde{c}	4	

Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

Risk matrix

[Insert a diagram] [Insert a diagram]	[Insert a diagram]

Step 5b: Ethics assessment

Stage 1: Analysis

ID	Questions	Answers
1	How is the initiative (not) in line with universal values or principles?	
2	How is the initiative presented in a deterministic way? Is it a positive or negative picture?	
3	Why is the initiative (not) neutral?	
4	Is the initiative legitimised by similar technologies that already worked in the past? Or is it legitimised by reference to a dystopian future?	
5	How is the initiative said to change our values or ethical principles?	
6	How does the use (or lack of use) of the initiative cause uncontrol- lable effects?	
7	How does the initiative protect principles/rights/duties before con- sequences? Which principles/rights/duties are respected, and which are infringed?	
8	Why is the initiative said to produce more benefits than costs? How is the argument justified?	
9	How are the risks and benefits of the initiative distributed between different groups? Which groups are discriminated and how?	

Stage 2: Assessment

		Assessment	
IDs	Questions	Conflict	Counterarguments or fallacies
1	Are the values/principles invoked universal? Or are they instead local?		
2	Will the initiative materialise independently of what people think and decide? Or is there some room for alternatives?		
3	Is the initiative neutral or biased?		
4	Does the parallel with the past/ future hold?		

Border Control and New Technologies

		Assessment	
IDs	Questions	Conflict	Counterarguments or fallacies
5	To what extent does the initia- tive change our morality?		
6	Can more and more similar initiatives ultimately lead to a dystopian future if used on a larger scale, although it seems innocuous at first?		
7	Do the principles/rights/duties invoked actually justify the initiative? Are invocations to principles/ rights/duties side-tracked by consequentialist arguments? Can one principle/right/duty be outweighed by another? If so, how do you balance compe- ting principles?		
8	Are the promises of the initia- tive plausible? Is there a better alternative to the initiative (e.g. less invasive) that is technically and econo- mically feasible? What are the possible unin- tended side effects? Do costs outweigh benefits? Or are the costs and risks downplayed?		
9	Is (the access to) the initiative distributed equally between travellers? Is (the access to) the initiative distributed on the basis of the needs of the travellers? Are distributive justice arguments side-tracked by consequentialist ones? Are discriminatory issues sufficiently addressed?		

Step 5c: Social acceptance assessment

Stage 1: Analysis

ID	Acceptance assessment technique	Type of analysis	Findings and patterns (summary)
1		Quantitative	
		Qualitative	
		Mix	

Stage 2: Assessment

ID	<i>Positive or negative</i> <i>consequences</i>	Stakeholders affected
1	1x	
	1y	
	1z	

Step 5d: Privacy assessment

Technology implemented (repeat and justify for each)	Applicable?	Description of impact	Legality	Essence	Legitimacy	Necessity	Proportionality
Bodily privacy							
Spatial privacy							
Communicational privacy							
Proprietary privacy							
Intellectual privacy							
Decisional privacy							
Associational privacy							
Behavioural privacy							

Step 5e: Legal compliance requirements

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
		Data Protectio	on		
1	Roles of controllers and processors	Have the responsibilities of controllers and processors been allocated in accordance with the law?			
		[other, specify]			
2	Lawful processing	Has a legal basis grounding the personal data processing been identified?			
		[other, specify]			
3	Purpose limitation	Are the purposes for which a border control technology processes personal data in line with those specified in the relevant legal and other- wise regulatory framework applicable to it?			
		[other, specify]			
4	Data minimisation	1. Does the border control technology process only the personal data that is adequate, relevant and not excessive for the specific border control activity?			
		 Does the border control technology ensure that only specific categories of personal data are processed? 			
		[other, specify]			

Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
		Data Protecti	on		
5	Accuracy	Where inaccurate or outdated information is stored in a database, are mechanisms place to ensure that the infor- mation is erased or updated within a specific period of time, and that the changes are communicated to those (authorities) concerned?			
		[other, specify]			
6	Accuracy of biometric data	Does the border control tech- nology comply with minimum data quality standards for biometric data?			
		[other, specify]			
	Storage limitation	 Does the border control technology ensure that data is automatically de- leted once the retention period elapses? 			
7		2. Does the border control technology ensure that logs are deleted once the retention period elapses?			
		[other, specify]			
		Data Protecti	on		
8	Availability, integrity and confidentiality	 Has the organisation adopted technical and organisational measures to ensure the security of the data processed by the border control technology? security, business continuity and disaster and recovery plan fall-back procedures encryption etc. 			
		[other, specify]			

Border Control and New Technologies

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
9	Accountability	Does the border control authority have accountability measures in place? • logs/records of processing activities • staff training • self-monitoring • professional secrecy • reports of security incidents • etc.			
		[other, specify]			
		Data Protection	on		
10	Data subjects' rights	 Are data subjects granted the possibility to exercise their rights? information access rectification erasure restriction of processing to not be subjected to a decision solely based on automated decision making etc. 			
		[other, specify]			
11	Data transfers	Are personal data transfers to third countries and/or international organisations and/or private entities either not allowed or restricted to very specific cases?			
		[other, specify]			
Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
		Data Protectio	on		
		 Do only specific staff members of pre-defined national competent authorities have access to data processed by the border control techno- logy? 			
12	12 Accessibility of data:	2. Do only specific staff members of pre-defined EU agencies have access to data processed by the border control tech- nology insofar as it is necessary to fulfil their mandate or exercise their tasks?			
		[other, specify]			
	Other / specify				
		Privacy			
1	Respect for private life	Does the border control tech- nology ensure that the processing of personal data respects one's private life?			
		[other, specify]			
2	Respect of (bodily) integrity	Does the border control technology ensure that the processing of personal data respects the (bodily) integrity of individuals?			
		[other, specify]			
		Privacy			
3	Privacy by design	Have privacy considerations been embedded in the border control technology for its entire lifecycle?			
		[other, specify]			

Border Control and New Technologies

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation		
4	Privacy by default	Are the default settings of the border control technology the most privacy-friendly possible?					
		[other, specify]					
	Other / specify						
		Ethics					
		 Is the public informed about the existence of the border crossing point? 					
1	Informed consent	2. Is the public infor- med of the temporary reintroduction of border controls?					
		[other, specify]					
		 May a person opt to not use a border control technology (e.g. e-gate)? 					
2	Freedom of choice	 Are persons who opt to not use the border control technology not discriminated against for their choice? 					
		[other, specify]					
	Ethics						
3	Dual-use	Are restrictions in place for dual-use items?					
		Other / specify					
4	Fairness	Is the use of the border con- trol technology fair towards third-country nationals?					
		[other, specify]					

Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
		 Does the use of the bor- der control technology not result in inhuman or degrading treatment? 			
5	Human dignity	2. Is the procedure of taking fingerprints in accordance with safe-guards in CFR?			
		[other, specify]			
6	Non-discriminati- on and bias	Has the technology been de- veloped in such a way that the processing of personal data will not result in discrimina- tion against persons on any grounds, such as gender, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, member- ship of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation?			
		[other, specify]			
		Ethics			
7	Rights of elderly and persons with disabilities	Has the border control technology been designed in such a way to be used by all persons, except for children under 12 years of age, to the fullest extent possible?			
		[other, specify]			

Border Control and New Technologies

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
	8 Rights of children	 Are children under a certain age exempted from giving fingerprints? 			
		 Are alerts regarding children admissible only in restricted cases and to safeguard the best interest of the child? 			
8		3. Are alerts concerning children deleted when the child reaches the age of majority and in the circumstances specified in Article 55 SIS Regula- tion 1862?			
		4. Are queries in the CIR against minors of 12 years or under allowed, except when in the best interest of the child?			
		[other, specify]			
		Ethics			
	9 Vulnerable persons	 Are alerts concerning vulnerable persons admissible only in restricted cases? 			
9		2. Are the alerts concerning vulnerable persons dele- ted in the circumstances specified in Article 55 SIS Regulation 1862?			
		 Have border guards received specialised trai- ning for detecting and dealing with situations involving vulnerable persons? 			
		[other, specify]			

Annex 1 – Step 5: Appraisal of Impacts

ID	Description		Applicable?	Compliance?	Explanation
		 Are the individuals not subject to refoulement? Do they have the possi- bility to ask for asylum? 			
10	Non-refoulement and right to asylum	 Are the rights of people in need of international protection taken into special account? 			
		[other, specify]			
	Other / specify				

Other evaluation techniques

Assessment	Recommendations
[Explanation]	[Explanation]

Comments

[Explanation]		

Step 6: Recommendations

Recommendations concerning ethics

		Counter-		Response plan		
ID	Conflicts	arguments	Fallacies	Measure	Responsible	Deadline
1						

Recommendations concerning social acceptance

			Response plan		
ID	Users	Critical points	Measure	Responsible	Deadline
1					

Recommendations concerning privacy

	Aspect(s) of		Response plan		
Technology	privacy	Interference	Measure	Responsible	Deadline

Recommendations concerning legal compliance

	Response plan		
ID	Measure	Responsible	Deadline
		Data protection	
1			
		Privacy	
1			
		Ethics	
1			

Other evaluation techniques

[Explanation]

Recommendations

Synth	esis of recommendations	Decision of the sponosoring organisation and its justification
1	[Explanation]	
2		

Decision of the sponosoring organisation and its justification

Overall recommendation

to deploy the initiative without changes		
to modify the initiative	[Specify how]	
to cancel the initiative	[Specify why]	

Comments

[Explanation]		

Ongoing Steps for Phase II

Step A: Stakeholder involvement

Internal stakeholders

Category of stakeholder	What information has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
Data processor(s)			
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)			
Recipient(s) (Article 4(9))			
Third parties (Article 4(10))			
Representative(s) (Article 27)			
Information security officer(s)			
Legal service			
Employees, trade unions, contrac- tors, etc.			
[other, specify]			

External stakeholders

	Category of stakeholder	What informa- tion has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
ıs are affected entatives	Data subjects, including: Minors Vulnerable persons [other, specify]			
nd freedom neir repres	Representative(s) of data subject(s)			
se rights ar ative and th	Individuals who are not data subjects			
Individuals whose rights and freedoms are affected by the initiative and their representatives	Representative(s) of individuals who are not data subjects			

Annex 1 – Ongoing Steps for Phase II

	Category of stakeholder	What informa- tion has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
tor ers	Supervisory authority(ies) (DPA)			
Public sector stakeholders	Policymakers			
Pu	Local stakeholders			
Private sector stakeholders	Technology providers			
Private stakeh	Transportation companies			
	Research Ethics Committees, within public or private organisations			
Experts	National ethics committees or councils, at EU or Member State level			
	Groups of <i>ad hoc</i> recruited ethics experts			
	Scientific experts			
	[Anybody else affected, etc., specify]			

Lack of stakeholder involvement in the present phase

[If stakeholders are not involved in the present phase of the impact assessment process, explain why.]

Step B: Quality control

Quality control body	What feedback was received?	How was the feedback implemen- ted? Why was it rejected?
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)		
Supervisory authority (DPA)		
[Other, specify]		

Comments

[Explanation]

Phase III: Ex post (eventual) steps

Step 7: Prior Consultation

	Competent DPA(s)	A(s	A(A(s	(s)									
uc	Date of submission	ioı	sio	sio	on									
otecti	Date of receipt of the response	of t	of	of	f th	ne re	esp	on	ise					
Data protection	Inquiry (summary)	ıry	lar	hary	ry)									
Da	Response (summary)	na	m	ıma	nary	y)								
	Decision of the controller after consultation	co	cc	e co	ont	trol	ller	aft	ter	cons	sulta	atior	n	
	Ethics committee and/or competent authority	ee a	tee	tee	e ar	nd/o	or c	cor	mpe	eten	t aut	thor	rity	
	Date of submission of application for approval	ioı	sio	sio	on	of a	app	plic	catio	on fo	or ap	ppro	oval	
Ethics	Date of receipt of the response	of t	of	of	f th	ne re	esp	on	ise					
臣	Response (summary)	na	m	ıma	hary	y)								
	Decision of the sponsoring organisation after consultation	spo	sp	sp	роі	nso	orin	ıg c	orga	anisa	atior	n aft	ter	
[other,	explain]													

Comments



Step 8: Revisiting

Criterion		Change?	Explanation
Nature (what types of proces erasure, etc.)	sing operations? e.g. collection, storage,		
0	Scale (how much? how many? how far?)		
Scope	Time (when? how long?)		
Context	Internal (concerning the controller)		
(in what circum- stances?)	External (concerning individuals, groups, society, etc.)		
Purpose of processing operation legitimate interest (w	ons, including, where applicable, hy?)		
Benefits	for individuals, including data subjects		
of processing operations	for the data controller		
	for society as a whole		
Drawbacks	for individuals, including data subjects		
of processing operations	for the data controller		
operations	for society as a whole		
	s of personal data vulnerable persons (e.g. children)		
Means of processing	(infrastructure) (by what means?)		
Envisioned data flow	vs (where to where? whom to whom?)		
Data security (how i	s it ensured?)		
Jurisdiction/market	(where?)		
Actors in the 'supply	chain' (who?)		
[Other, explain]			

Annex 1 – Step 8: Revisiting

Overall suggestion

What should be done with the assessment pr	rocess?	When?	Decision of the sponsoring organi- sation and its justification
□ revise	□ entirely	[Specify]	
	□ in part [Specify]	[Specify]	
□ do not revise	[Specify why]		

Ongoing Steps for Phase III

Step A: Stakeholder involvement

Internal stakeholders

Category of stakeholder	What information has been communi- cated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provi- ded (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
Data processor(s)			
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)			
Recipient(s) (Article 4(9))			
Third parties (Article 4(10))			
Representative(s) (Article 27)			
Information security officer(s)			
Legal service			
Employees, trade unions, contrac- tors, etc.			
[other, specify]			

External stakeholders

	Category of stakeholder	What informa- tion has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
edoms are af- epresentatives	Data subjects, including: • Minors • Vulnerable persons • [other, specify]			
Individuals whose rights and freedoms are af- fected by the initiative and their representatives	Representative(s) of data subject(s)			
	Individuals who are not data subjects			
Individ fected by	Representative(s) of individuals who are not data subjects			

Annex 1 – Ongoing Steps for Phase III

	Category of stakeholder	What informa- tion has been communicated to stakeholders?	What input have the stakeholders provided (e.g. opinion)?	How was their input included? Why was it rejected?
Public sector stakeholders	Supervisory authority(ies) (DPA)			
	Policymakers			
	Local stakeholders			
Private sector stakeholders	Technology providers			
	Transportation companies			
Experts	Research Ethics Committees, within public or private orga- nisations			
	National ethics committees or coun- cils, at EU or Member State level			
	Groups of <i>ad hoc</i> recruited ethics experts			
	Scientific experts			
	[Anybody else affected, etc., specify]			

Lack of stakeholder involvement in the present phase

[If stakeholders are not involved in the present phase of the impact assessment process, explain why.]

Step B: Quality control

Quality control body	What feedback was received?	How was the feedback implemented? Why was it rejected?
Data protection officer(s) (DPO)		
Supervisory authority (DPA)		
[Other, specify]		

Comments

[Explanation]

		Attachment	Confidentiality level	Appended?	Comments
Step 1 Step 4		Record of processing activities			
otop 1	Data protection	Approved codes of conduct			
		Certificates			
Step 2		Binding corporate rules (BCRs)			
		Standard contractual clauses (SCCs)			
		Data protection policies			
		Professional codes of conduct			
		Data sharing agreement(s)	confidential		
		A copy of a service contract (in the event that the impact assessment is outsourced)			
Step 3	Stakeholder involvement	A list of stakeholders to consult and their contact details			
		Stakeholder consultation plan	confidential		
Step 7	Data protection	Request for prior consultation with a supervisory authority			
		Response from a supervisory authority			
		Response from a supervisory authority			

Step C: Documentation

		Attachment	Confidentiality level	Appended?	Comments
Step A	Stakeholder involvement	Technical briefing(s) for stake- holder consultation			
		Stakeholder consultation (reports)			
	Data protection	DPO opinion (report)			
[Reports from other evaluation techniques; specify]					
[other, explain]					

Comments

[Explanation]

Annex 1 – Closing Page

Closing Page

Endorsements

Responsibility	Name	Remarks	Date	Signature
Assessor(s)				
Data protection officer				
Data controller(s)				
[other, explain]				

Endnotes

1. Based on: Dariusz Kloza et al., "Data Protection Impact Assessment in the European Union: Developing a Template for a Report from the Assessment Process," d.pia.lab Policy Brief (Brussels: VUB, 2020), https://doi.org/10.31228/osf.io/7qrfp.