



**Outcomes of Proceedings of the  
4<sup>th</sup> CEPOL Management Board Meeting**

**15-16 May 2018**

**Sofia, Bulgaria**

**Chair: Dr. Norbert LEITNER**

**ITEM 1. Welcome by the Chair**

*Presenter* : Mr Norbert LEITNER, MB Chair

*Took the Floor* : -

The **Chair** welcomed the Bulgarian Deputy Minister of Interior, **Mr Krasimir Tsipov**, as well as all the delegates and guests to the 4<sup>th</sup> Management Board meeting and announced that the meeting will be recorded.

**ITEM 2. Welcome by the Presidency**

*Presenter* : Mr Krasimir Tsipov, Deputy Minister of Interior, Bulgaria

*Took the Floor* : -

In his welcoming speech, **Mr Tsipov** underlined the Ministry's strong emphasis on the proper education and training of its employees. The first Bulgarian police school was established in 1925 and a specialised higher education of police officers dates back to the 1960ies. The Academy of the Ministry of Interior has proven to be a reliable partner of other law enforcement training institutions of the Member States (MSs). Regarding CEPOL the Ministry highly appreciates the opportunities for professional training and knowledge sharing provided by Agency provides to law enforcement officers. It is important that the activities are designed to meet the needs of the MSs in the priority areas of internal security and that the trainings are focusing on issues stemming from the EU policy cycle on serious and organised crime.

**ITEM 3. Adoption of the Agenda**

*Presenter* : Chair

*Took the Floor* : -

The **Chair** welcomed the new voting and alternate members attending in a CEPOL MB meeting in such position.

He reported about three proxy votes given to the MB Chair: from Sweden for the whole meeting, as well as from Italy and Portugal only in case of need due to the early departure of the respective Voting Members. Regarding the voting procedure he told that including proxy votes all 27 Members are represented, the total number of votes is 27. Hence, for a qualified (two-third) majority 18 votes while for simple majority 14 votes will be needed.

After the summary of the voting related information the **Chair** invited Voting Members to vote on the draft Agenda.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft Agenda**

#### ITEM 4. Announcements by the European Commission

*Presenter* : Ms Victoria Amici, European Commission

*Took the Floor* : -

**Ms Amici** provided an update on the ongoing work in the areas of security and progress achieved in consolidating a security union. Regarding information exchange she told that data sharing and the availability of information lies in the heart of cooperation of LE services. The legislative proposals of the Commission on the interoperability of information systems at EU level is currently in the interinstitutional process and the Parliament and the Council aims to reach a general approach in June.

The European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) reached the final stage of discussion and ready to be adopted. Triologue meetings are taking place between Commission, Parliament and Council on the three legislative proposals to reinforce the Schengen Information System (SIS), where a political agreement should be reached by the end of May. The Automated Fingerprint Search (AFIS) introduced on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March will strengthen the usefulness of the SIS database, too. Besides, triologue discussions also include the European Criminal Record on Information System (ECRIS), and the proposals on strengthening Eu-LISA.

Regarding implementation she underlined the joint work invested in the elaboration of the directive on Passenger Name Record (PNR), where the deadline for transposition is 25 May. From an international perspective PNR transfers with other 3<sup>rd</sup> countries have been on hold until the Commission renegotiates a new agreement with Canada.

Practical measures in counterterrorism have been followed up with a new security package adopted on 17 April. It includes two legislative proposals to improve the cross-border collection of electronic evidence, and access to financial information for the purposes of investigation and prosecution. Furthermore, it also includes a proposal for a directive to facilitate the use of financial and other information, in order to strengthen cooperation between financial intelligence units and law enforcement authorities. Operational measures accompanying these proposals include measures aiming to prevent the access of terrorists and criminals to import firearms and explosive precursors, as well as measures improving the security of national ID cards and residence documents.

Besides, the Commission continues its efforts towards stepping up cooperation between public authorities and internet platforms, in order to detect and remove illegal contents online. On 1 March the Commission adopted a recommendation addressed to online service providers in MSs in order to better target their efforts against illegal online contents.

The draft annual budget for 2019 will be adopted by the Commission on 23 May. In order to ensure the availability of the necessary and relevant financial resources, a considerable amount of preparatory work have been done regarding the new multiannual financial framework regulation, covering the period of 2021-2027. Since security remains among the top priorities, the proposed level of funding for the related Agencies - including CEPOL and Europol - is preserved across the whole period.

**Ms Amici** also highlighted that the fast pace of evolution in the security area - with new instruments being introduced, new data and management processes being established - will call upon a resilient and adaptable law enforcement community, where targeted, up-to-date and fit for purpose training is essential. Via its activities CEPOL contributes considerably to these innovations, and equips this community with the best means, to carry out its job.

**Conclusion: The MB took note of the announcements.**

## ITEM 5. Management Board Matters

### ITEM 5.1 Election of the new Deputy Chair of the Management Board

<i>Presenter</i>	: MB Chair and Ms Victoria Amici, European Commission
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

The **MB Chair** explained that following the Bulgarian Presidency's nomination on behalf of the Presidency TRIO, *Mr Elmar Nurmela* (Estonia) is the candidate for the vacant post of Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board. In line with Article 2 of the rules of procedures of the MB, the Chair invited Ms Amici, to chair this agenda item. **Ms Amici** informed that this election requires a 2/3 majority of votes in favour of the candidate and invited the Voting members to vote.

Mr Elmar Nurmela has been elected unanimously. The **MB Chair** announced that Mr Elmar Nurmela will become the Deputy Chair from 1 June 2018.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: Effective from 1 June 2018 the new MB Deputy Chair has been elected.**

## ITEM 6. Strategic Orientation Debates

### ITEM 6.1 Business implementation by the Agency

<i>Presenter</i>	: Executive Director
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: all members

The **Executive Director** welcomed all participants and introduced the idea of strategic orientation debates, a new initiative giving the opportunity to all MB members to discuss and express opinions on actual strategic issues. After the introduction of the concept, he invited participants for remarks and proposals regarding the proposed approach. Participants did not make remarks, but during the discussions the idea of such debates has received several positive feedback from the members.

Regarding the *Business implementation of the Agency* - based on the meeting document - two questions have been discussed by the MB.

- *Question 1:* Is there a broad agreement on the principle that a more sustainable division of labour should be established between CEPOL and the framework partners as to the planning and delivery of training activities, to fully implement the CEPOL Regulation, enhance training effectiveness and facilitate multiannual resource planning?
- *Question 2:* Would MB members agree to the envisaged division of labour outlined under item 4 - 4. Proposed way forward?

**The Netherlands** supported this new discussion instrument during MB meetings, and agreed with the proposed division of labour, however, did not recommend for CEPOL to cover all EMPACT areas. Since the CKCs seem to be the most relevant development for dealing with the CEPOL training portfolio in the future, they should become the main providers of CEPOL's core business of training. The Netherlands also asked how trainer capacities could be ensured and what the foreseen training locations are.

In his answer the **Executive Director** underlined that CEPOL tries to approach and involve all different angles of training providers within the EU, hence, established among the standard activities of CEPOL an open call resulting approximately 70 applications from experts, coming mainly from universities and not from CEPOL's network. For CEPOL, the best location for its own training is Budapest HQ or rented venues in Budapest, however, other Member States can also host activities, if need be.

Following the **Chair's** invitation, **all members** shared their views regarding the raised questions. Even though both questions have been supported by all delegates, several members made additional remarks:

According to **Finland**, there should be ways to activate passive FPs. **Germany** missed an explanation on the structure, showing how CEPOL will get trainers. The spin of the Agency is going too strongly on a horizontal level with other agencies, and the idea of network is going more to the background. This can be a direction, but at the end CEPOL needs to have trainers and a location for trainings - as a training institution. If CEPOL goes operational, it will be in competition with other actors.

**Portugal** highlighted that the idea of Framework Partners (FPs) has been initiated by the new regulation, hence, the consequences of such movement have not been considered carefully enough. As far as the location of the activities is concerned, law enforcement training is not only for lecturing and providing locations for training. Law enforcement training also benefits from being delivered by MS's and continuous involvement of national partners also contribute to keeping the networking concept alive.

**France** underlined that the introduced business model will bring significant changes in the nature of the organisations, hence, the consequences of such a division of labour should also be considered.

Regarding Cybercrime issues, **Belgium** asked about the practical implementation to see if CEPOL will have a central role in the coordination of the training activities in this field and how the cooperation will look like, especially with those already specialised in cybercrime.

**Poland** shared the opinion of France and asked explanation on why residential training activities related to cybercrime, witness protection and informant handling are taken out of the planned grants. If these topics are performed only by CEPOL, the national level experiences will be missing. Poland also highlighted the added value of other programmes - e.g. Horizon 2020 - giving more possibilities of using funds for improving the training facility. Even though the workload regarding CEPOL or Horizon 2020 is rather similar, there might be training providers preferring to take other programmes, offering bigger benefits in terms of investing in the training facility. Hence, in some cases, other programmes could help to activate some additional training facilities. A written procedure on declaration of stakeholders` interest should also be initiated to double-check if it is certain, that no other training facilities on national level wish to implement some of the activities.

**Ireland** expressed its concerns about logistics and financing and wished to see further details about the new process - including EMPACT - and the changes from the budgetary perspective.

**Greece** underlined that CKCs, MENA, as well as the law enforcement networks should remain a priority and agreed with the Netherlands regarding trainer capacity problems, where the Lecturer Trainer Database might be a solution.

**Italy** stressed the importance of keeping FPs alive, which could also be facilitated by co-sharing some activities in a way that some could remain with the FPs and others with the CKCs and the Agency.

The **Commission** underlined that CEPOL does not want to take over MS capacities and would only step in where no other options are available and recommended that CNU's could also make steps to activate their national level FPs.

The opinion of the Netherlands has been supported by **Croatia, Germany, Slovenia, France, Sweden, Poland, Malta**, and **Estonia**, while **Sweden** also agreed with the remark of Germany and Portugal. Besides, the contribution of Portugal has also been agreed by **Greece** and **Italy**, while **Cyprus** supported the remark of Germany only regarding CEPOL`s need for experts and premises.

In his answer, the **Executive Director** underlined that CEPOL is still in a transition period concerning its Mandate, and one of the main reasons for this debate is to adjust the structure and budget accordingly. Since the Mandate requires cooperation with the MS and support for law enforcement communities, CEPOL is not a competitor to MSs, and would only intervene where an activity is not covered. Since 2012, CEPOL has tried to activate its FPs in many ways, including a 2<sup>nd</sup> call and joint procurements, but concluded that the capacity of the Framework Partners have reached its limits. It is hoped that CKCs will distribute their tasks better, ensuring that no FPs can remain passive in the consortium.

He also underlined that looking on courses and seminars we should not forget the usefulness of other training options, e.g. exchanges and visits. CEPOL would be capable of organising by far more exchanges, if budget allows. Regarding EMPACT he stressed that CEPOL has no intention to take it over, still, there is a role to play in fields, not covered by anybody. However, this role should not be dominant, since by definition, EMPACT should be run by MSs. CEPOL will play here a role as information hub between the EMPACT groups and the CKC. In the field of cybercrime CEPOL is cooperating with the EC 3 Programme Board and ECTEC, while the competency framework on Cybercrime is under development together with the European Commission.

**ITEM 6.2 CEPOL Engagement in capacity building projects**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>all members</i>

The **Executive Director** told that engagement in capacity building projects is one of the tasks assigned to the Agency, however, CEPOL, as an EU agency cannot independently decide on its external cooperation. Based on the meeting document he summarised the strategic challenges regarding the change in threat landscape, as well as the current situation and future perspectives.

Regarding CEPOL’s engagement in capacity building projects, two questions have been discussed by the MB.

- *Question 1:* Does the Members of the Management Board agree that CEPOL will fulfil its task out of the regulation by implementing externally funded capacity building projects?
- *Question 2:* Do they agree that the Agency will seek close cooperation with the CNU’s and FP’s on a voluntary basis to be engaged in the projects?

Following the **Chair’s** invitation, **all members** shared their views regarding the raised questions. *Question 1* has been supported by all delegates, while two countries - **Germany** and **Belgium** – did not agree with *Question 2*. **Bulgaria, Sweden, Cyprus, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg** and **Malta** underlined that for *Question 2* the voluntary basis should also be kept in mind.

According to **Germany**, budget cuts and the financial supports of 3rd country related projects show a shift towards 3rd countries and even if their capacity building is one of CEPOL’s key tasks, its volume is too high compared to activities targeting the MSs. For this reason Germany supported *Question 1* only with a lower budget. According to **France** and **Greece** CEPOL needs more human and financial resources for the implementation of such projects.

**Belgium** and **Poland** asked to keep balance between trainings offered to the MSs and engagement of CEPOL in capacity building projects, since the regulation does not specify the number of capacity building projects. **Finland** and **Germany** requested to bring all future projects to the MB, to approve CEPOL’s engagement. **Portugal** agreed on both questions and mentioned to be looking forward to new cooperation with Portuguese speaking countries, even though it is a long process.

According to **Ireland**, due to the ongoing challenges in resources it is desirable to utilise funding from external sources to ensure the continuation of this type of engagement. Ireland underlined the considerable training experience of the United Kingdom and Denmark and recommended to continue engaging them for CEPOL - as an agency - to see how they can further support areas, like counterterrorism training.

The **Netherlands** underlined that CEPOL should monitor that no money is used for projects from the core business, and advised to stick with the projects agreed by now, and not to take other projects in. The priority should be on the core business of CEPOL. The Dutch experience is that experts prefer to be involved in projects, rather than in core business activities, because project experts can be paid. To avoid such a differentiation, payments for project activities are not given to the experts of the Dutch agencies, but spent for financing the personal development of the officers, e.g. via language training.

**Estonia** shared the remarks of Germany, Poland, Belgium and the Netherlands. Also asked how MSs can join to 3rd country projects and how national and CEPOL budget can be combined.

The **Commission** underlined that external relations is an integral part of CEPOL's Mandate, hence, it is also part of its core business. It is understandable that a careful balance has to be kept between the core business areas, but capacity building is also one of them.

The **Executive Director** told that all projects are funded by the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Commission's services after a consultation cycle with the MSs. He promised that MB will be updated regarding future project initiatives. Ensuring transparency, a new unit will be dedicated to projects, once the new organogram is approved.

Regarding experts he informed that as a result of an open procurement short term experts will be shortlisted. The list of applicants include independent consultants, university teachers and trainers, active and retired officers, etc. Experts identified will be available for other training activities, as well. CEPOL pays the same fees for project experts and non-project experts, hence, experts will have no benefit in giving priority to work in projects.

He pointed out that CEPOL has no core tasks, only a portfolio of tasks and every task should be taken equally on board. Still, the volume of regular budget is too low, law enforcement training would deserve stronger support in the future. Answering Estonia he told that CEPOL deals only with EU funds, but in case of interest in a joint cooperation with a region or a country, Member States are welcome. In case of participation, their activities should be covered by their national budget.

According to **Germany**, tasks should be prioritised, and this is the task of the MB. Hence, Germany does not agree to implement all tasks equally. Supporting Germany, **Belgium** underlined that the volume and prioritisation of the activities should be focused on. From the given budget it is not possible to fulfil all tasks with a huge volume.

**Poland** remarked that the remuneration is not equal for police officers working in a project or in other CEPOL activities, hence there is still an unequal treatment that might risk stronger engagement into project activities.

The **Executive Director** generally agreed with the German and Belgian position, indeed MB has to prioritise, but CEPOL has no budget dedicated to external projects, hence, the Agency cannot cover this part of its mandate. These extra funds are basically helping CEPOL to fulfil its Mandate.

**Germany** requested to clarify the Management Board's role and room for manoeuvre regarding 3<sup>rd</sup> country cooperation issues, especially, if decisions are made by different bodies, after a consultation cycle with the MSs. Since there are many players on the field asking for the same trainers, CEPOL will lose its main tasks by going to a too wide field.

**Belgium** asked if the Mandate can be fulfilled by implementing only one activity, and if CEPOL will take over all other activities, that the MSs cannot implement because of their involvement in projects. As it is seen from the answers many countries supported *Question 2* by stressing the importance of its voluntary basis. What if only one country will do it on a voluntary basis?

According to the **Executive Director**, projects should be considered as an opportunity to bring new partners and knowledge in. It is an acknowledgement if CEPOL is getting more recognised as a relevant actor. Currently, these capacity building projects have no negative impact on standard CEPOL activities. He underlined that CEPOL was not applying for these funds, it was approached to implement these projects. He is optimistic that there are MSs supporting these ideas.

**Italy** indicated its readiness to participate in line with its available capacities.

### ITEM 6.3 CEPOL long term strategy from 2020 on

Presenter : Executive Director

Took the Floor : all members

In his introductory speech the **Executive Director** outlined the key strategic development areas crucial to achieve effective implementation of the CEPOL Regulation, with special emphasis on those, haven't been effectively and fully addressed, such as the extension of the target group, mutual recognition of EU training, contributing to research, as well as training coordination in the EU. For a strategic way forward, he emphasised the importance of additional resources, threat based prioritisation, quality, accountability, innovation, research and development.

Regarding *CEPOL's long term strategy from 2020 on*, four questions have been discussed by the MB:

- *Question 1:* Does the Management Board share the commitment that prioritisation of the needs shall be based on **the tools applied** by the agency instead of perceptions?
- *Question 2:* Does the Management Board agree that EU level training shall be based on standards and certified by 2021, and **the EQF** is the frame to be used?
- *Question 3:* Does the Management Board agree with the above priorities on **research and innovation**?
- *Question 4:* Does the Management Board fully support the increase of resources for CEPOL to be able to implement its mandate?

Following the **Chair's** invitation, **all members** shared their views regarding the raised questions. *Question 1* has been supported by almost all delegates, however, according to **Portugal** – supported by **Sweden, Poland, Greece** and **Italy** – the question can only be answered after the evaluation of the tools. **Romania** noted that a long term strategy requires information on the available budget, not only the aims.

Regarding *Question 2* the majority of the members agreed, however, 12 members (**Finland, Germany, Portugal, France, Spain, Belgium, Poland, Cyprus, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg** and **Malta**) requested clarification and further elaboration of the EQF related possibilities and approach to be implemented by an expert group, as agreed during the CNU meeting. **Poland** recommended a careful, step by step approach and by taking one or two pilot courses, based on the guidelines of the expert group. **Ireland** was wondering if the approach will be implemented centrally by CEPOL or by the universities of the MSs, and noted that the digitalisation of training, learning and development is a good direction, even though a number of CEPOL's programmes would not fit within an academic programme for accreditation.

**The Netherlands** did not support *Question 2*, because EQF will not bring CEPOL an accreditation or certification, since it is only a translation tool. Countries can describe their own education systems according to EQF's descriptors and benchmark their own education levels to European standards, giving the levels of qualifications. Besides, in order to get involved in EQF an awarding body is also needed. The Police Academy of the Netherlands went through the work of describing its own education according to the EQF model and in that way, they could benchmark it to the regular Dutch education, ensuring mutual recognition. Estonia and Hungary did the same and now it is possible to follow semesters at each other's institutions and collecting related credit points.

**Estonia** supported the Netherlands and asked all CEPOL voting members to indicate if their educational institutions are possessing any international accreditation regarding law enforcement education curricula. Only 6 CEPOL MB voting members raised their hands.

*Question 3* have been supported by the majority of the participants, however, 11 countries (**Finland, Germany, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Belgium, Poland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands** and **Malta**) requested further clarifications in the terminology and would wait for the results of the expert group to be established on research, as agreed during the CNU meeting. **Croatia** was concerned about the resources to accomplish the mentioned tasks.

**Poland** agreed with **Germany**, that the meaning of research should be clarified and then should the right mechanism be taken in place. E.g. if it is based on a Public Private Partnership, it is already an objective of Horizon 2020 and in this field a competition or overlap might arise for CEPOL. The **Netherlands** shared the concerns of Finland, Germany, Portugal, and Sweden, that priorities have to be feasible for CEPOL. **Estonia** underlined the importance of information technologies, especially when it comes to innovation. **Greece** supported innovation and reminded to the motto of CEPOL: Educate, Innovate, Motivate.

Concerning *Question 4* all members gave a positive reply, however, **Germany** believed that it should be further discussed, in order to be answered. The **Netherlands** expressed its support, and asked the Executive Director to inform MB if there are important meetings scheduled so that MB members can request support from their national representatives participating in those, important meetings where finance related key decisions are made.

According to the **Commission**, CEPOL has done an excellent work regarding EU STNA. Regarding the goal of extending the target group the **Ms Amici** suggested to consider reserving a few seats in the training courses for other than police law enforcement areas. Concerning accreditation and certification related comments she wondered whether the activation of the Scientific Committee would not advance the discussion and contribute to devise the strategy towards accreditation. Regarding financing and budget she underlined that no exponential increase is foreseen in CEPOL's budget, hence prioritization is key.

In his response to the contributions the **Executive Director** explained that CEPOL is aware that EQF gives only an orientation frame and the task of the mentioned expert group will be to describe the concrete steps to make towards the certification and accreditation in the frame of EQF. Regarding research he underlined that it is explicitly meant in line with CEPOL's mandate. As far as innovation is concerned it is more a management model helping management to stimulate a constant process of innovation within an organisation, so that staff are motivated to bring in new ideas to move the organisation forward. Still, the whole threat map landscape is changing dramatically, hence, many mechanisms of investigations will need to be adjusted and approved, requiring innovation.

Answering Romania he explained that the discussed long term starts in 2020, hence, the available budget is currently unknown, however, the aim of the debate is to set directions and agree on objectives. He agreed with Poland that CEPOL should be able to train more than 5 people and based on the EU-STNA (to be validated by 1<sup>st</sup> September 2018) and OTNA. It is hoped that the higher needs will give opportunities to train more people. e.g. CEPOL's course on open sourced intelligence is oversubscribed by 100% every time. Besides, via all different electronic tools more people can be reached out. To be improved in the field of information technologies CEPOL need budget investments, however, a better system than eNET would require 1.5 – 3.5 million EUR extra, which is currently not available.

The **Executive Director** also appreciated the support of the Netherlands in conveying messages to national representatives regarding CEPOL's support. Answering the Commission, he told that seats are already allocated to some target groups, however, the totality of outreach cannot be enhanced, since CEPOL is limited in the seats for residential activities. The Scientific committee would be a useful supporting body for the future, however, last year the MB considered the idea premature. Based on the opinion of the discussed expert groups, further steps in this direction can be thought over.

As the Chair of Workshop 2 of the CNU meeting **Mr Gerhard Haberler** confirmed that EQF is a frame to compare different levels and noted that in the OTNA there is already a distinction between awareness level and expert level, aiming to refer to the EQF levels. Hence, when OTNA will be used by the CEPOL Knowledge Centres (CKCs). They will be responsible to design their training according to the training needs, e.g. awareness training or expert training. He also highlighted that distinction should be made between training and courses. A training should be a comprehensive package which can imply for instance also e-learning, online learning or even an exchange programme. Hence, it also gives an idea on how to recognise learning, which is also the task of CEPOL according to its Mandate. In this way it is also for

further consideration on how to recognise different non-formal learning (the majority of CEPOL's training belong to this category), or even informal learning (e.g. an exchange programme, which is basically an informal learning process). He welcomed that related discussions have already started and underlined that it is a step-by-step approach, and certification and accreditation are only at the end of the process. The first step is to find common standards and according to EQF recommendations it should also be confirmed that participants have acquired the required learning outcomes. Therefore, training assessment and evaluation are of key importance.

Answering **Germany** the **Executive Director** told that the aim of these debates is orientation for CEPOL management about the voting members' opinion on strategic issues, and they also will give directions for the further planning of the SPD 2019 document. Members' feedback will also be summarised in the Outcomes of Proceedings.

## **ITEM 7. Agency Progress report**

### **ITEM 7.1 Agency progress report – to end of March**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
------------------	-----------------------------

<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -
-----------------------	-----

The **Executive Director** gave an overview on the core business of CEPOL, with special emphasis on residential training activities, webinars, and online learning modules. So far only one exchange took place with 20 participants, however, the CEPOL Exchange Programme is expected to have 581 exchanges until the end of the year 2018. Two new CEPOL projects have also been started: CEPOL CT2 (EU/MENA Counter-Terrorism Training Partnership 2), CEPOL FI (Financial Investigation In-Service Training Western Balkan).

Regarding the current human resources situation, he informed that due to staff resignations the Agency is challenged by a high staff turnover, especially in management positions. Ensuring the highest level of transparency during the selection of the vacant management positions, the invited panel members consist of the Executive Deputy Director of Frontex, a Deputy Director from Europol and a Head of Administration from the European Environment Agency in Copenhagen. Besides, the services of the Assessment Centre will also be used.

Concerning the current CEPOL building he informed that it has been calibrated for only 53 office seats, while the staff is close to 70 persons, already. Additionally, the building does not provide sufficient functional rooms for trainings. Hence, CEPOL is looking for a long-term solution with a new building in cooperation with Hungarian Government, but until then a short-term solution could be an additional office space, to be rented close to the current building for the projects.

**Conclusion:** The MB took note of the report.

## **ITEM 8. Planning and budgeting**

### **ITEM 8.1 Approval of the list of Residential Activities 2019**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Ms Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department</i>
------------------	--

<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Germany, Finland, Spain, Estonia, Commission</i>
-----------------------	---

**Ms Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department** told that the list of CEPOL residential training activities for 2019 has been compiled based on the list of courses suggested by Member States, the European Commission and EU agencies. These have been consolidated by CEPOL and prioritised by the Member States after a consultative process. The submitted 377 training proposals are covering all topics but Counter-terrorism and CSDP Missions as training needs in these two fields are analysed by a new, "pilot" OTNA methodology. Proposals on the same topic but for different target groups (e.g. police officers, prosecutors, customs officers) were merged, however, in these cases the number of

participants was raised from 26 to 35 where 1/3rd of places would be reserved for the non-police target group.

She underlined that when the policy cycle came into play, only around 20% of the training courses were dealing with it, now it is closed to 50 %. In order to promote common respect for fundamental rights in law enforcement, CEPOL suggests to implement the course titled `Hate speech`, in spite of the budgetary constraints and the fact that the course was awarded low score (97) from Member States.

Regarding the future of the prioritization exercise she anticipated a shift from a topic-based to a competence-based approach.

Due to the unknown budget it cannot be predicted how many activities can be finally granted for 2019. FP need to take note of this uncertainty.

**Germany** - supported by **Finland, Spain** and **Estonia** - requested to consider bringing in the portfolio the course on “Vehicular Semi-automated and Autonomous Systems, Security Threats” regarding to the terrorist attacks and the course on “Crime control and traffic safety”. Referring to the first course, the **Executive Director** invited the CKC on CT to take this issue on board. As far as traffic safety is concerned, the **Acting Head of Operations Department** reminded that it is out of the scope of CEPOL’s mandate and covered by other EU funds via TISPOL.

According to **Germany** TISPOL is not providing training in this field. **Finland** – supported by **Spain** - noted that since a year ago TISPOL is not financed by EU funds, hence, it is advisable to initiate cooperation with TISPOL in road policing, where serious and organised crime often occur.

The **Commission** remarked that CEPOL’s Mandate refers essentially to serious crime mainly with a cross border dimension, terrorism, and the maintenance of public order - in particular international policing of major events - hence, it is difficult to make a nexus between CEPOL’s mandate and traffic offenses, but there might be a way to illustrate this somehow.

Regarding the list the Commission recommended to bring forward 5 courses in the ranking order: “Facilitating illegal immigration – Western Balkans focus”, “Train the trainers SIRENE”, “Latent Print Development Methods and Fingerprint Identification”, “Train the trainers in the field of prosecuting corruption related crimes” and “Organised crime phenomena for senior LE managers”.

The **Acting Head of Operations Department** explained that CEPOL has been organising the activity on “Facilitating illegal immigration – Western Balkans focus” for several years and noticed, that it is difficult to get Western Balkans’ target groups interested in this due to the many other different training available on migration in the Western Balkans region already. Hence, CEPOL decided to organise this activity biennially, only. Regarding “Train the trainers in the field of prosecuting corruption related crimes” there is an activity on corruption with an increased number of possible participants to include the prosecutions.

The **Executive Director** proposed to put on the reserve list both the remaining 3 courses mentioned by the Commission, and the course initiated by Germany – with a sharpened profile focussing on the impact of new technologies in modern traffic and its links to organised crime, e.g. new technology applied in traffic environment / difficulties in e-evidence, since it is more forensic competence than traffic control. Depending on CEPOL’s final budget for 2019, these courses can be realised if funds will become available. Based on these compromises the **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the list.

***Voting results:***

**In favour:** 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 1 (Commission)

**Conclusion: The MB has approved the list of Residential Activities 2019.**

## ITEM 8.2 Programming principles for SPD 2020

*Presenter* : Ms Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department

*Took the Floor* : Germany, Estonia, Executive Director, Commission

The **Acting Head of Operations Department** presented the concept for the development of the Single Programming Document (SPD) 2020. The document outlines the multiannual and work programme objectives and includes a brief outlook on the resources necessary to meet the strategic objectives. Since the final allocation of 2019 budget and human resources are not yet known for CEPOL, the development of the SPD 2020 will be continued during 2018 and its first draft will be presented to the MB during the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 2018).

**Germany** – supported by **Estonia** - remarked that CEPOL cannot deliver itself a PhD program, hence, the related accreditation process will be the task of the network. The **Executive Director** agreed and invited MB members to develop a model for this, where accreditation is provided by various academies of the network, and either the related organisation or CEPOL could propose relevant research topics.

According to the **Commission** the building blocks of the SPD 2020 seems perfectly reasonable and aligned with the already expressed strategic vision and recommended to better define objectives and Key Performance Indicators with a multiannual nature, particularly regarding external relations and capacity building.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 9. Core Business

### ITEM 9.1 Grants Procedure 2019

*Presenter* : Ms Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department

*Took the Floor* : Poland

The **Acting Head of Operations Department** told that 2019 will be the second year of pilot implementation of CEPOL Knowledge Centres (CKCs). In grant process terms it means that CEPOL and its Framework Partners will continue to operate in a two-track grant mechanism.

*Track 1* includes call for proposals for applications for the implementation of CEPOL residential activities except those falling into remit of CKCs. *Track 2* covers the operation and direct grants to CKCs.

In 2019 CKCs will enter into a new stage, where new Operational Training Needs Methodology (OTNA) applies. The OTNA reports for Counterterrorism and CSDP mission training are expected to be approved by the MB during its current meeting and then the reports are planned to be handed over to CKCs. The CKC Steering Board meetings are scheduled for the period of May and June, while their training portfolio proposals will be submitted to the agency between September and October, including budget proposals. October and November will be devoted to negotiations on details and budget, to be presented to the MB in November. Grants will be awarded to CKCs in December 2018.

Responding to **Poland**, the **Acting Head of Operations Department** explained that the reasoning for keeping Cybercrime package together and not splitting it into parts is the same, as the reasoning for creating CKCs, i.e. ensuring business continuity, know-how, context, availability and access to the experts. Hence, splitting the package is not really possible and it is more to be considered how MSs can be engaged about the location of the activities, since these are subject to available training facilities. If CEPOL is creating training facilities in Budapest, then other facilities should be provided by those MSs wishing to be involved. Hence, splitting activities within a thematic area goes against the idea of CKCs.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

## ITEM 9.2 Update on STNA

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Stefano Failla, Acting Head of Training and Research Unit</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Germany</i>

**Mr Stefano Failla, Acting Head of Training and Research Unit** presented the EU-STNA results achieved so far. Until end May the team is consulting expert groups regarding the capability challenges of the law enforcement area, which can be addressed by EU level training. So far, all EMPACT groups have been consulted, however, other consultations are still in the pipeline, followed by a MS strategic level prioritisation of the identified EU level training needs in June. Then, the prioritised list will be shared with the JHA agencies for their feedback, so that the final report can be prepared for Council and Parliament. The first evaluation cycle of the EU-STNA is scheduled for 2020.

Answering **Germany**, **Mr Failla** confirmed that the report will also be shared with the Management Board.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

## ITEM 9.3 Pilot OTNA Report

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Stefano Failla, Acting Head of Training and Research Unit</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

The **Acting Head of Training and Research Unit** explained that the OTNA methodology establishes a structured training needs analysis procedure, taking into account deliverables of the EU-STNA process. The methodology is being piloted as from November 2017 with limited number of thematic priorities for CEPOL training portfolio planning 2019, namely CSDP Missions and Counterterrorism.

The two pilot reports tabled for the MB for adoption describe training priorities in the area of CSDP Missions and Counterterrorism for 2019 based on the analysis of the data received from law enforcement agencies and CEPOL National Units. According to the CSDP Missions report the most urgent areas to be tackled were “organised crime and corruption in host country” and “Pre-deployment training”, while for Counterterrorism “Terrorism/Firearms trafficking”, “Radicalisation” and “Foreign terrorist fighters” received the highest urgency rates.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the report.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the report**

## ITEM 9.4 Progress on Working Arrangements and their implementation

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

The **Executive Director** told that the only outstanding Working Arrangement (WA) to be concluded with a third country of primary relevance for CEPOL is the one with the Ukraine. He informed that CEPOL received requests for cooperation in the framework of a WA from Tunisia and Uzbekistan, while another request is foreseen from Lebanon. CEPOL will continue to operationalise its external relations focusing on quality instead of quantity, and complementing the WAs by periodical Action Plans to jointly determine concrete deliverables with the partners. He also reminded, that CEPOL is supporting 3<sup>rd</sup> countries via a 5 seats scheme, meaning that their participation in CEPOL trainings up to 5 seats are financed by CEPOL.

As for organisations, the draft WA replacing the existing one with the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI) has been finalised and submitted for consultation to DG HOME in early April. The draft WA with the UNODC is currently under further elaboration.

## Conclusion: The MB took note on the update

### ITEM 9.5 Update on Planning of Capacity building Projects

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

The **Executive Director** told that in the future he will try to keep MB better updated on new, potential upcoming capacity building projects for CEPOL. He informed that CEPOL has been engaged in negotiation with Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) Ljubljana office and FRONTEx in order to define potential involvement in the Western Balkans Border Security programme. This was already presented to the MB earlier, however, partners did not move on, hence, the project's starting date is still unknown. Besides, there is another project in the pipeline with OLAF on digital forensics, however, OLAF still did not find a proper legal basis for the sub-delegation of this project, but looking forward to changing its financial regulation so that it can be realised from next year.

## Conclusion: The MB took note on the update

### ITEM 10. Regulatory matters

#### 10.1.1 Update on Implementing Rules

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

**Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department** referred to two MB decisions tabled to the MB in the next agenda point: the implementing rule regarding the *Guide to Missions and Authorised Travel*, as well as the model decision on *Learning & Development for CEPOL staff*. Next he presented an overview of General Implementing Provisions adopted by the Commission and communicated to CEPOL. CEPOL opted out from *Contract staff 3a & 3b*, since a model decision for the agencies is being developed by the Standing Working Party (SWP). Concerning the *Temporary occupation of management posts* CEPOL will use the model decision as developed by the SWP and bring it forward for adoption by the MB in written procedure. Further model decisions on *Whistle blowing*, on the *Function of Advisor* and on *Middle management* will also be offered to the MB for decision in written procedure later this year.

He informed that there are 4 Commission Decisions in different stages of preparations: 2 new model decisions (on *Contract agents 3a & 3b*; and on *Types of posts and post titles*). Besides, CEPOL staff will receive guidelines on how to deal with *External activities*. Also, *Underperformance* related guidelines will be prepared for CEPOL on how to deal with staff that does not perform as expected.

## Conclusion: The MB took note on the update

#### 10.1.2 Draft decision 15/2018/MB on rules regarding the extension and removal of the ED

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

After reviewing the background of the decision, **the Head of Corporate Services Department** told that by the end of the four-year period of the term of office of the Executive Director, the Commission, in association with the MB, shall undertake an assessment taking into account an evaluation of the Executive Director's performance as well as CEPOL's future tasks and challenges. Based on the assessment the MB may extend the term of office of the Executive Director once and for no more than four years.

The instances justifying removal from office are described in the Conditions for Employment of Other Staff (CEOS) and include cases of intentional or negligent failure of the Executive Director to comply with statutory obligations. Before removal, the Management Board may decide on the suspension of the Executive Director.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 15/2018/MB**

### 10.1.3 Probation period of the ED – 16/2018/MB on appointment of Reporting Panel

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Chair</i>
------------------	----------------

<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -
-----------------------	-----

The **Chair** informed that the MB has to appoint a Reporting Panel for completing the probation period report of the Executive Director. The duration of the probation period is 9 months. The Panel should consist of 3 members, one from the European Commission, and two from the MB. He proposed the Estonian and Croatian voting members – representing the outgoing and incoming TRIO - to be included in the panel and invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 16/2018/MB**

### ITEM 10.2 Draft decision 17/2018/MB on the adjustment of CEPOL Organogram

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD</i>
------------------	---

<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Finland, Estonia, Germany, Belgium, Executive Director</i>
-----------------------	---

The **Head of Corporate Services Department** explained the reasons for a change in the structure of CEPOL. The workload and resources related to (externally financed) projects have been increased and it is expected to continue in the years to come, hence, this should be reflected in the structure.

Besides, the volume and variety of the different functions within the Agency directly subordinated to the Executive Director should be grouped together in a Cabinet. For this reason, the establishment of a cabinet to support the Executive Director in strategic (External relations, Planning, Quality Management etc.) and support activities (Governance & Management Support, Internal Control, and Communication) is proposed.

Answering **Finland**, he told that there is no post on innovation management so far, still, the responsibility for innovation will be within the Cabinet. Replying to **Estonia** he informed that the Data Protection Officer roles are taken care off by the Legal Officer. The **Commission** requested to change the wording from Cabinet to Director's Office, since in EU nomenclature Cabinet is exclusively reserved for the private office of Commissioners. Regarding capacity building projects the Commission suggested for the new unit to cover external relations also more generally, not only externally funded, capacity building projects.

Answering **Germany** and **Belgium**, the **Executive Director** told that for the moment the change in the structure does not have additional budget and staff implications, it is just mirroring the reality, however, for the future, if the establish plan allows then few additional post would be needed for stakeholder management as well as for innovation and managing the work of the Director's office. Referring to the Commission he agreed with the recommended change of wording from Cabinet to Director's Office.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 17/2018/MB with a qualified majority**

## ITEM 10.3 Voting on draft MB Decisions

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Chair</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Romania, Commission, Head of Corporate Services Department</i>

### 10.3.1 04/2018/MB Appointing a selection panel for the creation of CEPOL working groups

The **Chair** invited the MB members to volunteer for the 5<sup>th</sup> position of the panel. **Romania** volunteered and the decision was adopted including the 5<sup>th</sup> member, i.e. Romania.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 04/2018/MB**

### 10.3.2 07/2018/MB On the updated content of the online module on “Prum Decision”

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** Portugal

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 07/2018/MB**

### 10.3.3 08/2018/MB On the updated content of the online module on “Lisbon Treaty”

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision. The **Commission** indicated that some corrections have been sent to CEPOL regarding this draft decision and requested to requested to apply these modification in the final text of the online module.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** Portugal

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted decision 08/2018/MB**

### 10.3.4 09/2018/MB On the updated content of the online module on “SIS II”

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** Portugal

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 09/2018/MB**

### 10.3.5 11/2018/MB On the meeting Calendar for the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2018

The **Chair** reminded that Romania requested a change regarding the date of the 6<sup>th</sup> MB meeting and invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision with this modification.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** Belgium

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 11/2018/MB**

### 10.3.6 12/2018/MB On application by analogy of Commission decision 444/2015 on the security rules for protecting EU classified information

The **Head of Corporate Services Department** explained that based on consultations with the Commission, especially with the Directorate-General for Human Resources and Security, 3 broad issues need to be further developed in the document that CEPOL was not able to finalise for this MB meeting. Hence, the current document is withdrawn from voting and the further developed draft decision will be circulated in written procedure.

#### **Voting results: No voting took place**

**Conclusion: draft decision 12/2018/MB to be decided at a later stage via Written Procedure**

### 10.3.7 13/2018/MB On implementing rules regarding Mission guide

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 13/2018/MB**

### 10.3.8 14/2018/MB On implementing rules regarding Learning & Development for CEPOL staff

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 14/2018/MB**

## ITEM 11. Reporting

### ITEM 11.1 Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2017 and its assessment by the MB based on the opinion of the IAP (Draft MB Decision: 10/2018/MB)

<i>Presenter</i>	: Executive Director and Ms Katarzyna Klimczak-Sych Chair of IAP
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

The **Executive Director** gave a short introduction into CEPOL's Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2017. The **MB Chair** invited the Chair of IAP to express her opinion regarding the report.

**Ms Katarzyna Klimczak-Sych, Chair of IAP** told that there are 2 meetings scheduled for the IAP for 2018, one has already been held in March and the next one is planned for September. Given the limited scope and timeframe of the audit and checks carried out in March, the members of the Audit Panel did not make any comments on the 2017 Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) and Provisional Annual Accounts, however, they drew attention to three issues that emerged during the work of the Audit Panel. Firstly, it is appropriate for Decision No 42/2017/DIR of the Executive Director of CEPOL on the funding arrangements for courses to be incorporated into the E-NET system. Secondly, there is still a need to adopt and implement budgetary procedures that are currently under development. Thirdly, it would be necessary to consider and propose changes to the tasks assigned to the Audit Panel which have been established in Decision 27/2012/GB. Additionally, within the scope of task 6 of Decision 27/2012/GB, the name of the document was changed and now it is called Consolidated Annual Activity Report.

During its next visit the IAP intends to have a closer look at the organisation of the Exchange Programme; the preparation of the draft budget for 2019; check other work programmes, including MENA.

The **MB Chair** thanked the comments of the IAP Chair and invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision.

**Voting results:**

**In favour:** 27 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 0

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 10/2018/MB**

## ITEM 11.2 Provisional Annual Accounts 2017 and the opinion of internal/external auditors (IAP, ECA)

*Presenter* : Ms Ludmila Milotova, Team Leader, DG BUDGET

*Took the Floor* : Ms Katarzyna Klimczak-Sych, Chair of IAP

In her presentation **Ms Ludmila Milotova, Team Leader** overviewed the process and status of the 2017 Annual accounts and summarised the financial statements and budget implementation for 2017. Regarding budgetary expenditures she told that 97.09% of the C1 budget has been committed, out of which 86.53% has been paid, which is a very good result. The next step will be the issuing and submission of the final annual accounts to the discharge authorities, to the European Parliament, to the Court and to the Council by the statutory deadline of 1 July 2018, and ultimately the accounts will be published, as will the Court's final report by the 15th of November 2018.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 11.3 Audits and Internal Control matters: Internal/external audits/ex post controls – follow-up of recommendations and action plans

*Presenter* : Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : -

The **Executive Director** gave a short overview on the specific items identified by the Internal Audit Panel, the Internal Audit Service, European Court of Auditors, as well as the ISO 9001:2015 external quality audit and Ex-post controls.

In 2018 CEPOL will continue to implement ex-post controls on internal control standards, recruitment, procurement, grant agreements (via on the spot visits to the State Police of Malta & Central Forensic Laboratory of the Police and the Police Training Centre Legionowo - Poland).

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 11.4 Update on CNU workshops

*Presenter* : Mr Svetlozar Markov, Bulgarian Presidency

*Took the Floor* : Belgium, the Netherlands, Executive Director

**Mr Markov** gave a summary of the 3 workshops held during the 4th CNU meeting (17-18 April, Budapest, 2018). *Workshop 1* reviewed CEPOL's research development and the role of Research and Science Correspondents, *Workshop 2* discussed possible steps of developing CEPOL learning products towards EQF referencing, and *Workshop 3* focused on CEPOL's external relations.

Participants of *Workshop 1* recommended to index CEPOL's European Law Enforcement Research Bulletin in relevant scientific databases, as well as to evaluate CEPOL's research and science products from a scientific perspective, also keeping in mind the limited staff capacity within the agency. Furthermore, workshop discussions underlined that scientifically qualified lecturers need to be an integral part of every CEPOL course, in order to increase the impact of research and science activities of CEPOL. Besides, the possible benefits and obstacles in respect to the establishment of a Scientific Committee were also tackled without drawing conclusion.

Regarding *Workshop 2* **Mr Markov** highlighted the next steps identified, including the involvement of other MS in the reflection, discussion and commenting process, as well as the amendment of the already existing background paper with the outcomes of the WS and comments of the MS. Participants of *Workshop 2* also recommended to set up an Expert Group

to prepare a report about the possibilities to achieve certifications within CEPOL courses and align them with EQF.

Concerning *Workshop 3* he summarised the collected ideas in operationalising existing external relations, with special emphasis on increasing 3rd countries’ opportunities to access to and participate in activities, online modules, and webinars. Besides, involvement in the CEPOL Exchange Programme would also deliver mutual benefit.

Answering **Belgium**, the **Executive Director** informed that expert groups can be appointed by himself (contrary to working groups where MB decision is required). He also agreed with **the Netherlands**, that the tasks of the expert group should be realistic, hence, he will ask his colleagues to draft the terms or reference of the expert group accordingly.

**Conclusion: The MB took note of the report**

**ITEM 12. AOB**

<i>Presenter</i>	: Chair
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: Ms Isabel Polonia, Ms Aija Kalnaja, Executive Director

A) Leaving Member(s) and colleagues

**The Chair** announced that one CEPOL MB Voting Member and one CEPOL Head of Department will leave CEPOL community. **Ms Isabel Polonia** expressed her honour to be a voting member of the MB. **Ms Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department of CEPOL** thanked the cooperation and support of the MB and expressed the importance of the Law Enforcement community in making CEPOL training activities relevant.

**MB Chair** and CEPOL **Executive Director** thanked their work and commitment and wished success in their future career.

B) Increase accommodation expenses in Belgium

Answering **Belgium**, the **Executive Director** expressed his readiness to have a bilateral discussion regarding budget difficulties of Belgium due to the radically increased accommodation expenses.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

**ITEM 13. Austrian Presidency Priorities**

<i>Presenter</i>	: Chair
<i>Took the Floor</i>	:-

Representing the Austrian incoming presidency, the **Chair** gave a short introduction to the priorities of Austria. In line with its motto of “*A Europe that protects*”, the Austrian Presidency will put emphasis on areas where the EU has a particular protective role, such as the strengthening of the EU’s external borders, establishing a crisis resistant EU asylum system, removing the breeding ground for violent extremism and terrorism, as well as guaranteeing digital security. During its presidency, Austria would like to promote the “Vienna Process”, in order to reach more sustainability and to come up with citizen-focused solutions. The end of the process aims at drawing up a “Vienna Programme” which should imply an Integrated Internal Security Strategy for a citizen-focused, crisis-resistant, future-oriented Security Union. Right after the beginning of the Austrian presidency, the Informal COSI and the Justice and Home Affairs council will also address the “Vienna Process”. Besides, it is envisaged to organize international conferences to certain key-challenges and cross-cutting issues in October and November during the Austrian presidency on the topic “Vienna Process”. One of them will be organized as a CEPOL presidency activity.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 14. Closing of the meeting

*Presenter* : *Chair*

*Took the Floor* : -

The **MB Chair** thanked the Bulgarian Presidency, the participants, presenters and CEPOL for their work and officially closed the meeting.

*Vienna, 06 August 2018*

*Budapest, 31 July 2018*

*<Signature on file>*

*<Signature on file>*

*Mr Norbert Leitner*

*Mr Detlef Schroeder*

*Chair of CEPOL Management Board*

*Executive Director of CEPOL*

**Annex 1** – List of Meeting Participants

## Annex 1. List of Meeting Participants

### Chairperson of the Management Board:

Country	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Norbert	LEITNER

### Members/Alternate members (with voting right):

Country	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Peter	LAMPLOT
BELGIUM	Alain	RUELLE
BULGARIA	Nedelcho	STOYCHEV
CROATIA	Danijela	PETKOVIC
CYPRUS	Georgios	FANGOU
CZECH REPUBLIC	Petr	NOVAK
ESTONIA	Elmar	NURMELA
European Commission – DG HOME (alternate member)	Victoria	AMICI
FINLAND	Kimmo	HIMBERG
FRANCE (alternate member)	Emmanuel	GRAVIER
GERMANY	Matthias Ernst	ZEISER
GREECE	Athanasia	KORKONTZELOU
HUNGARY	Emese	HORVACZY
IRELAND	Patrick	MURRAY
ITALY	Gennaro	VECCHIONE
LATVIA	Gatis	SVIKA
LITHUANIA	Rimantas	BOBINAS
LUXEMBOURG	Marc	WELTER
MALTA	Mario	SPITERI
NETHERLANDS	Sandra	WIJKHUIJS
POLAND	Irmina	GOLEBIEWSKA
PORTUGAL	Isabel	POLONIA NICO
ROMANIA	Ovidiu	MACOVEI
SLOVAKIA (alternate member)	Marek	KORDIK
SLOVENIA	Danijel	ZIBRET
SPAIN (alternate member)	Gabriel	VALLEJOS
SWEDEN (proxy given to MB Chair)	- proxy -	- proxy -

**Member State observers:**

AUSTRIA	Gerhard	HABERLER
AUSTRIA	Carina	MAYER
BELGIUM	Isabelle	BORREMAN
BULGARIA	Svetlozar	MARKOV
BULGARIA	Nikola	STALEV
BULGARIA	Desislava	DRAGOVA
BULGARIA	Dragan	PESHINSKI
BULGARIA	Iskra	STEFANOVA
BULGARIA	Milena	DZHUMAYSKA
CROATIA	Valerija	BENCERIC
CYPRUS	Floris	NIKANDROU
CZECH REPUBLIC	Petra	JIRKU
ESTONIA	Kalvi	ALMOSEN
FINLAND	Pasi	KEMPPAINEN
FRANCE	Magali	CHASSERIAU
FRANCE	Benoit	CHEVALIER
GREECE	Dimitrios	KRIERIS
HUNGARY	Bence	MESZAROS
IRELAND	Brian	CONWAY
ITALY	Massimo	TULINI
LITHUANIA	Rasa	SEJONIENE
NETHERLANDS	Cor	VAN DER LUGT
POLAND	Anna	GRUNT
PORTUGAL	Eduardo	FERREIRA
ROMANIA	Calin	BALAEI
SLOVENIA	Egidij	GLAVIC
SWEDEN	Ulf	SYDORF

**Other observers:**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>
European Commission – DG HOME	Giulia	CAMOZZINI
Audit Panel - Chair	Katarzyna	KLIMCZAK-SYCH
EC DG BUDGET	Ludmila	MILOTOVA
EC DG BUDGET	Dana	RADU

**CEPOL HQ:**

<b>Function</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>
Executive Director (ED)	Detlef	SCHRÖDER
Head of Corporate Services Department (HoCSD)	Roeland	WOLDHUIS
Acting Head of Operations Department (AHOOD)	Aija	KALNAJA
Acting Head of Training and Research Unit	Stefano	FAILLA
Governance Assistant (Outcomes)	Gyorgy	ISPANKI
Governance Support Assistant	Cecilia	DUBOIS