



### InsSciDE Work Package 6:

#### **Security: Scientific and Technical Cooperation in the Context of European Diplomacy**

<b>Case Study n°6.2</b>	<b>Migration and border management</b>
Author	<b>Ursula Naue</b>
Consortium Partner n°10	Universität Wien (UNIVIE)
Additional author affiliation	Senior Lecturer at the Department of Political Science, University of Vienna, Austria

### Abstract

Our InsSciDE case study 6.2 seeks an understanding of how diplomats, foreign policy experts, and home affairs experts perceive the application of biometric technologies in the context of securing the Schengen boundaries – on national level, European Union (EU) level, and in domestic cooperation between home affairs and foreign affairs. In the context of preventive diplomacy, security-focused EU/Schengen border management and the utilization of biometric technologies raise questions about the role of scientific and technological diplomacy within the EU global strategy for security. The establishment of centralized databases for the purpose of migration and border management (European Parliament 2016) became increasingly significant in the last years and impacts the development of policies for EU external border crossings. We investigate the role given to bioinformation such as DNA and fingerprints: biometric technologies appear to be viewed as a powerful and effective way of testing trustworthiness of persons, an important aspect in the overall political context of securitization of migration and asylum. We will conduct a qualitative study using expert interviews, policy documents, relevant literature and media as sources for the analysis.

### Introduction

In case study 6.2, country case studies will serve as a basis for discussing science diplomacy (as preventive diplomacy) regarding a security-focused EU/Schengen border management utilizing biometric technologies. We will investigate the way in which way scientific collaboration and policy learning takes place, and which role bioinformation such as DNA and fingerprints is given.

The guiding research question is the following:

How do diplomats/foreign policy experts and home affairs experts perceive the application of biometric technologies in the context of securing the Schengen boundaries –on national level, EU level, and in domestic cooperation (between home affairs and foreign affairs)?

In this context, we will deploy the following relevant presuppositions, referring to science diplomacy as the co-production of biometric technologies and the securitization of Schengen border management:

- 1) The history/tradition of applying biometric technologies in the context of securing the Schengen boundaries impacts upon how countries act (history matters)
- 2) The geographical distance from Schengen borders impacts upon how countries act (geography matters)
- 3) The recent/current number of migrants/asylum seekers directly at the respective Schengen borders impacts upon how countries act (affectedness matters)
- 4) The political orientation of countries/governments towards (perceived threats posed by) migrants/asylum seekers impacts upon how countries act (attitude matters)



5) The transfer and also the implementation of EU policies regarding the focus of the task is crucial when evaluating the impact of presuppositions 1) – 4) on political practices in the field.

### Actors

The relevant actors in the context of case study 6.2 are the a) diplomats, b) foreign policy experts, and c) home affairs experts – both on the national level (especially regarding the domestic cooperation between home affairs and foreign affairs), and on the EU level.

### Politics and policies

The focus of our research question is on policymaking on different political levels (country level, EU level), on the cooperation between these political levels, and on the cooperation between home and foreign affairs. This multi-level approach is necessary to be able to analyze political practices – the status quo, and also trends and developments – of European science diplomacy when it comes to the application of biometric technologies in the context of securing the Schengen boundaries.

Especially in the last years, movements of persons have been associated with various challenges, including terrorism, criminality, and national identity issues (cf. Huysmans 2000, 751; Léonard 2010, 231). This has led in the course of time to an increased securitisation of migration and asylum (cf. Huysmans 2000; Léonard 2010). In this context, the EU's Schengen border management policies focus on the creation and development of instruments, agencies and practices to meet “heightened security concerns”, as the European Parliament (2017) argues. In the last years and regarding the development of policies for EU external border crossings, the establishment of centralised databases for the purpose of migration and border management (European Parliament 2017) became increasingly important. These databases refer i.a. to biometric technologies which enable the EU and its Member States to collect data on persons and to trace these persons. Especially significant in this context is the Prüm Treaty to reinforce transnational collaboration in combating crime, terrorism and illegal migration (Prainsack/Toom 2013). Collected in large databases, bioinformation such as DNA and fingerprints is perceived as a powerful source: biometric technologies seem to be an effective way of testing trustworthiness of persons (cf. Hall/Naue 2015) which is an important aspect in the overall political context of securitisation of migration and asylum.

The EU's reaction to these movements of persons is to deepen the coordination between its home affairs (internal rule of law) specialists and its diplomats (preservation of international order), combining foreign policy and home affairs expertise (Brady/Parkes 2015, 7f). In this context, 'preventive diplomacy' is a way to “... work with countries of origin to address and prevent the root causes of displacement, manage migration, and fight trans-border crime.” (European Union 2016, 27)

### *Disciplinary/methodological approach*

While the main approach for our case study is a political scientific one, it is important to combine this approach with a) an analysis of the respective legal context and b) with an STS perspective on science diplomacy (as preventive diplomacy) policymaking with a security-focused EU/Schengen border management. Heinemann et al. 2015 have shown that a combination of scientific approaches is an appropriate way to approach the subject. Nevertheless, what is new in the context of our case study is the fact that it goes beyond mere analysis and intends to re-connect the scientific findings with concrete policymaking in the field of science diplomacy – in adjusting the expectations and identifying the many facets of the potential of science diplomacy in the field of security related issues and the utilization of biometric technologies and also, in developing policy recommendations.

We will conduct a qualitative study (in the context of a comparative case study approach), through expert interviews, policy document analyses, and literature and media analyses. Currently (July 2018), we are discussing different scenarios for the case study selection, based upon the presuppositions mentioned in our



introduction above. It is planned to conduct 2-3 interviews per country and also, at the EU level (depending on the final number of countries researched and compared). Several case country selection scenarios with representative/significant results are possible and will be finally decided in cooperation and coordination with A. Kyrtis (case study 6.1).

### *Essential bibliography*

- Brady, Hugo / Roderick Parkes (2015). EU home affairs diplomacy: why, what, where – and how. Institute for Security Studies Chaillot Papers: Paris.
- European Union (2016). Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. European Union Global Strategy. Available via [https://eeas.europa.eu/top\\_stories/pdf/eugs\\_review\\_web.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf) (retrieved 10 July 2018)
- European Parliament (2017). Management of the external borders. Available via [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/fiches\\_techniques/2013/051204/04A\\_FT%282013%29051204\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/fiches_techniques/2013/051204/04A_FT%282013%29051204_EN.pdf) (retrieved 10 July 2018)
- Hall, Kevin / Ursula Naue (2015). Austria: DNA profiling as a lie detector. In: Heinemann, Torsten et al. (eds.). Suspect Families. DNA Analysis, Family Reunification and Immigration Policies. Routledge: Abingdon, 55-78.
- Heinemann, Torsten, Ilpo Helén, Thomas Lemke, Ursula Naue and Martin Weiss (2015) (eds.), Suspect Families. DNA Analysis, Family Reunification and Immigration Policies. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Huysmans, Jef (2000). The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies* Vol. 38/5, 751-777.
- Léonard, Sarah (2010). EU border security and migration into the European Union: FRONTEX and securitisation through practices. *European Security* 19(2), 231-254.
- Prainsack, Barbara / Victor Toom (2013). Performing the Union: the Prüm Decision and the European dream. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* Vol. 44/1, 71-79.