



Item 4

**Outcomes of Proceedings of the
2nd CEPOL Management Board Meeting
9-10 May 2017
St Julians, Malta
Chair: Mrs Frederike Everts MPA**

ITEM 1	Welcome by the Chair
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	N/A

The **Chair** welcomed the delegates to the 2nd Management Board meeting and announced that the meeting will be recorded.

ITEM 2	Welcome by the Presidency
Took the Floor	Professor Tanya Sammut-Bonnici , Vice-Rector of the University of Malta; Mr Mario Spiteri , Maltese Presidency, Voting Member for Malta

Professor Tanya Sammut-Bonnici, Vice-Rector of the University of Malta has welcomed the delegates. In her welcoming speech, she explained that Malta’s police academy has undergone a substantial transition and has evolved into the Academy of Disciplined Forces, which provides training for the Malta police force, as well as the armed forces, civil protection, and the Corradino correctional facilities. The academy also embraces the values of fundamental human rights, justice, diligence, integrity, ethics, and honesty as the underlying framework of the content of its educational and training programs.

She has also underlined the importance of CEPOL’s activities.

In the name of the Maltese Presidency **Mr Mario Spiteri** has also welcomed the participants and gave a short summary of the main logistical and technical aspects of the meeting.

ITEM 3	Adoption of the Agenda
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	Germany, Poland, Belgium

The **Chair** informed the participants about the voting procedure during the meeting. There are 26 member states present and the Commission, meaning 27 votes in total.

She has also announced that there are room documents for item 10-2a and 10-2b scheduled for the next day and reported about one proxy vote: Ms Michele Rocchegiani gave the Italian proxy vote to Lt. Colonel Maddalena Rebai.

Regarding the order of discussion points she informed that point 13 will be discussed in a closed session in the early morning of the second day, followed by point 10. For AOB 2 issues have been proposed: Ad 1- the cancelling of the police leadership seminar (**Germany**) and Ad 2 – problems with the reception of some documents (**Germany, Poland, Belgium**)

Conclusion: The MB adopted the agenda.

ITEM 4	Draft Outcome of Proceedings of the 1st Management Board Meeting, Bratislava, Slovakia
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	N/A

No comments have been made.

Conclusion: The MB adopted the Outcomes.

ITEM 5	Announcements by the European Commission
Presenter	Victoria Amici, European Commission
Took the Floor	France, Germany, Poland

Ms Amici has introduced *Ms Merit Vertmann*. Regarding policy development in the European agenda on security **Ms Amici** presented the latest proposals put forward by the Commission in the priority areas of terrorism, organized crime and cybercrime. The revision of the European Firearms Directive continues its progress through the legislative system, as the fourth revision of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. The Commission has also put forward amendments to the Schengen Borders Code. Besides, there are entirely new proposals to establish an EU entry/exit system, and to set up a European Travel Information and Authorization System (ETIAS).

Considerable work has been carried out on implementing the Passenger Name Record (PNR) Directive, while the Malta Declaration has been adopted on 3rd February 2017. This declaration focuses on measures to stem the flow of irregular migrants and is accompanied by an implementation plan of actions aimed at fighting against human smuggling and trafficking networks and finding more effective ways to manage migratory flows with a view to reducing the loss of life at sea and improving also the living conditions of migrants and refugees in Libya and the neighbouring countries.

The new EU policy cycle on serious and organized crime was opened by Europol's SOCTA 2017 which identified five specific priority crime threat areas: cybercrime; drug production, trafficking, and disruption; migrant smuggling; organized burglaries and theft; trafficking in human beings. For the first time, it also presented three cross-cutting threats that are enablers or facilitators of all the other forms of serious and organized crime: document fraud, criminal finance including money laundering, and online trade in illicit goods and services.

Regarding CEPOL's 2018 Budget the revision of the multi-annual financial framework is likely to have an impact on the amounts for 2018. In its discussions with DG Budget, DG Home has supported increases for CEPOL for the next year in terms of both posts and appropriations. Discussions are still ongoing and the draft budget is expected to be adopted on the 30th of May.

France indicated that there is a gap between the CEPOL member states' network priorities included in the annual work programme and the SOCTA priorities from EUROPOL. It would also be useful to hear about the EEAS priorities, and the way forward.

In its response, the **Commission** has explained that Policy Cycle priorities are not Europol's priorities, but EU priorities, decided in the Council, i.e. by Member States. EUROPOL initiates the process by drawing up its threat assessment, which in turn is based on the contributions that Member States provide. These are delivered according to a very specific and regularly reviewed methodology, where Member States need to make sure that all the relevant stakeholders within their own constituencies can provide the relevant input. In addition to this, the other agencies are also the recipients of the questionnaire that forms the basis of the SOCTA and it is the Member States who discuss in the Council and decide finally on the priorities that will guide future action for the years to come, not EUROPOL. **Germany** has remarked that out of 250,000 police officers in Germany, maybe only 2500 police officers are working in the field of the policy cycle. This might be the reason why it is difficult to find institutions to apply for calls from CEPOL or why they are not able to do courses listed in the priorities.

According to **Poland** there are strategic planning, operational planning, training activities and other types of funds available for EUROPOL to do the training, while Poland has a limited amount of people who can do all these. Hence, it should be planned very precisely, whether to do the training via CEPOL or via the different funds available from EUROPOL. Otherwise people don't know what the training priority is, who is supposed to realize that and via which framework (CEPOL, EUROPOL, or some other entities).

Conclusion: The MB took note of the announcements.

ITEM 6	Reporting
---------------	------------------

ITEM 6.1	Agency Progress Report – to the end of March 2017
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	Deputy Director, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Estonia, Poland

The **Executive Director** and the **Deputy Director** gave a short overview on the core business of CEPOL with special emphasis on residential training activities, grant agreements, CEPOL Exchange Programme, e-Learning, research and science related activities, as well as external relations.

With regard to the leadership and management, CEPOL has updated its management plan and risk register for the year, while CEPOL's Quality Management System has received an ISO 9001:2015 certificate applicable for residential activities and the CEPOL Exchange Programme.

Concerning human resources management, the **Executive Director** underlined that the turnover of staff is very high, and the number of applications for vacant posts have decreased significantly, besides, the geographical balance can be maintained less and less. Therefore, there is a risk for mid and long term that CEPOL cannot benefit from those institutional cultures that broadly represent the whole European Union. He expressed his gratefulness to the auditors, who have pointed out this risk and draw the attention of all responsible bodies to do more regarding the attractiveness of CEPOL.

Regarding the geographical imbalance of staff origin, **the Netherlands** asked about the foreseen consequences and recommended to discuss it on MB level. In his answer, **the Executive Director** expressed that not only the geographical imbalance but also the European law enforcement character needs to be focused on, so that all the law enforcement communities from the European Union are represented in CEPOL. Currently around 20 countries are represented at CEPOL, meaning, that the geographical balance is still there, even if current trends indicate a decrease in balance in the coming three to five years.

Belgium remarked that not the number but the content of the cooperation agreements with third countries is important. MENA is a very positive example, but in some cases the efficiency of these agreements is questionable. **Germany** supported **Belgium** about the number of cooperation's of CEPOL and wished to see a strategy behind the huge number of cooperation, to better understand the added value of them. Regarding the research and science conference Germany explained that the granted organisation stepped back from the organisation of the 2017 research and science conference, because it had a misunderstanding about the grant. The **Executive Director** underlined, that compared to the situation CEPOL had in 2010, when cooperation with third countries was just a protocol, now 40 countries are involved in CEPOL activities and most of them come based on working arrangements they have with CEPOL.

Belgium and **Estonia** have asked about the possibility of a jointly budgeted exchange program with Frontex, while **Poland** requested to receive some basic information on general Frontex exchange rules.

In his reply, the **Executive Director** did not see the necessity to come up with a jointly budgeted exchange programme with Frontex at this stage, however, for the future he did not close out the possibility of having one exchange programme. About the possibility of merging the master

program of CEPOL and Frontex the Executive Director explained that CEPOL has initiated such negotiations repeatedly, but it didn't lead to a solution so far, and Frontex still prefers to have its separate master course.

Conclusion: The Management Board took note of the report.

ITEM 6.2	Change Management Plan – Progress report by the Executive Director
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	Austria, Germany

The Executive Director reported that altogether CEPOL has 36 activities involved in the Change Management Plan, out of which 22 have been completed, while there are 14 ongoing or not yet started activities.

Germany remarked that according to the report of the CEPOL Knowledge Centre (CKC) Working Group the timeline under 3.2.b needs adjustment, because the current date of 30 June is not the one the WG suggested.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 6.3A	Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2016 and its assessment by the MB based on the opinion of the IAP
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the floor:	Portugal, the Netherlands

Executive Director gave a short introduction into CEPOL's Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2016 underlining that the new legal mandate of CEPOL requires less reports to be produced in the future, but the CAAR is one of them.

Portugal underlined the good quality of the report and made few comments, as follows: the stated 'mission', 'vision' and 'core values' were not the same as the ones mentioned in the Single Programming Documents, hence, these should be discussed and harmonised; the increase in the number of participants derives mainly from e-learning activities, but in fact participants in residential activities decreased by 4 percent; it is mentioned that the satisfaction on the quality of the CEPOL products was very high, however, not all the stakeholders' satisfaction is surveyed.

In his answer, the **Executive Director** explained that the remarked decrease of the participants at residential courses is due to the nature of the training and not due to the lack of interest, since there are training activities that are able to receive only less participants but those seats are still oversubscribed. Regarding the stakeholders' opinions he informed, that the post-course evaluation is asking both the participants and their line managers and the line managers are considered, as stakeholders. The last real stakeholders' survey took place in 2012 and at that time the result was 70 percent. A comprehensive stakeholder survey was planned for every second year but it was postponed due to CEPOL's relocation. Now, that CEPOL is settled, the agency is working on the preparation of its next stakeholders' survey. Concerning budget implementation, he underlined that 93 percent should be considered as a good result, especially, if one recalls that in 2009 CEPOL spent only the 60 percent of its budget. Since that time there was one year when CEPOL was able to reach the 95 percent, i.e. the limit when budget deductions are not applied for the next year's budget.

The Netherlands recommended to include more benchmarks for communications in the document, indicating the figures of previous years. The **Executive Director** accepted the proposal and suggested to include comparative data from previous years in brackets.

Conclusion: The MB has unanimously adopted CAAR 2016, with the adaptation of the mission, vision and core values and the adding of benchmarks where applicable.

Item 6.3 B	Summary version of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2016
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the floor	Portugal, Germany, Deputy Director

As an introduction to the document the **Chair** informed the participants, that producing the agency's annual report is no longer a legal requirement. In order to ensure a broader audience and inform the EU citizens on CEPOL's efforts and achievements in an accessible manner, CEPOL has prepared the summary version of the consolidated annual activity report for publication and dissemination.

Portugal has requested to mention the Framework Partners in the document.

Germany has asked about e-Net 3.0, since it was mentioned as a single procurement activity on page 24. In his reply, the **Deputy Director** explained that the procurement will be divided into elements instead of having one procurement for the new e-Net. The first concrete steps will not take place before autumn 2017.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 6.4	Provisional Annual Accounts 2016 and the opinion of CoA
Presenter	Mr Derek Dunphy, Head of Accounting Unit, DG Budget
Took the Floor	Executive Director, Donna Radu

As background information **Mr Derek Dunphy** explained that years ago the accounting officer of the Commission offered the opportunity to all EU agencies and European entities to use the accounting services of DG Budget to perform their risks. CEPOL was a pioneer in this respect, being the first agency to take up this opportunity.

Regarding the accounts he underlined that they are clean and reliable, hence there are no specific recommendations to make. The official transmission of the draft findings of the Court with regard to the accounts has not arrived yet, but they seem to be very positive. **Ms Donna Radu** gave a detailed overview about the main figures and changes since the previous year. The next step - after the approval of the provisional accounts by the MB in June - will be its submission to the European Parliament, to the Court and to the Council by the statutory deadline of 1 July 2017, and ultimately the accounts will be published, as will the Court's final report by the 15th of November. The **Executive Director** expressed his great thanks to DG Budget for the very good cooperation.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 6.5	"Review of the Common Approach" Report
Presenter	Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD, CEPOL
Took the Floor	N/A

The **Head of CSD** has informed participants that the implementation of the Common Approach through the Commission's roadmap of December 2012 has been completed.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 6.6	Update on CNU workshops
Presenter	Mario Spiteri, Presidency Chair
Took the Floor	Germany, Poland

Mr Mario Spiteri gave a comprehensive summary of the 3 workshops held during the 2nd CNU meeting (4-5 April, Budapest 2017). Workshop 1 was *Exploring Options for the Scientific Committee*, Workshop 2 focused on *The Path towards Innovation at CEPOL*, and Workshop 3 discussed *How CEPOL can serve its enlarged target group*.

Regarding the 3rd topic Poland has recommended to reconsider the rule of "one country gets one place in training" in line with the suggestions came up during the CNU workshop. Germany has asked for the written summary of the workshops. (attached to the CNU outcomes of proceedings).

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 6.7	Update on the Action Plan for the recommendations following the five-years external evaluation
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	Estonia

According to the presentation of the **Executive Director** the five-year evaluation has stipulated 17 recommendations and over 30 actions to be implemented. Regarding the *JHA training matrix* related recommendations he agreed with the Internal Audit Service to use the matrix as a planning tool in the future, however, the coordination between the JHA agencies is more challenging than expected. He underlined that only the web meeting for the CNU's has been cancelled, since it become unnecessary.

Estonia remarked that recommendation number 16 is not mentioned in the activity plan. (*"CEPOL should explore the use of multiannual direct awards to consortia of implementing partners to encourage pooling of resources, contributing to efficiency gains and reducing bureaucracy"*). Estonia proposed to include in the action plan one separate point on this under 16.2. The **Executive Director** has asked **Estonia** to submit a textual proposal on this and if the management board is not against then it will be incorporated in the document. (There were no objections from other voting members to the proposal made by Estonia.)

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 7	Planning and Budgeting
---------------	-------------------------------

ITEM 7.1A	CEPOL Single Programming Document 2018 a) Update from European Parliament and European Commission
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	European Commission

The **Executive Director** reminded the MB that the Multiannual part of the single programming document has been approved in November last year and following that time - in accordance with the new regulation – it has been sent to the European Parliament and the Commission. Then on March 22nd, the ED presented the draft CEPOL strategy to the LIBE Committee, where he received a positive feedback, no proposals have been raised from the Parliament to modify the draft. Since the Commission has not provided its feedback so far, he has asked Ms Amici, to forecast when CEPOL can expect a feedback from the Commission. The aim is to take a decision on this in November at the next Management Board meeting.

In her response **Ms Amici** explained that the Commission will adopt its opinion on draft SPD after the draft budget 2018 has been adopted..

Conclusion: The MB took note of the update.

ITEM 7.1 B	CEPOL Single Programming Document 2018 b) Approval of the list of Activities 2018
Presenter	Deputy Director
Took the Floor	Germany, European Commission, Portugal, France, Belgium, Poland, Ireland, The Netherlands, Estonia, Austria, Executive Director

The **Deputy Director** has requested the support of the Management Board to approve the recommended list of activities so that it can be published in the call for grants to be sent out to the Framework partners by the end of June. The list is also considering some very important topics - like fight against terrorism - and gives higher priority to three activities related to terrorism. Besides, also the research and science conference is put higher on the priority list. Regarding the

procedure he explained that the call for grants is planned to go out by the end of June, and then, in mid-July the Framework Partners will be invited for the discussion of the activities.

Since **many of the voting members** expressed their objections and disagreements regarding the list of priorities, the **Deputy Director** recommended to launch a procedure of reprioritisation with a one-week deadline, then - after one week of administrative preparation - a written procedure could be launched with another one-week deadline. In this way, by the end of June the call for grants could still commence. As for the reprioritisation, a list will be circulated so that all countries can place in their order of priorities again. It should be noted though, that the exact number of covered activities are not known at this stage.

Since there were no objections against the proposal of the Deputy Director, the **Chair** has announced that this agenda point will be finalised via a written procedure.

Conclusion: The MB will approve the list of Activities 2018 via written procedure.

ITEM 7.2	CEPOL Single Programming Document 2019
Presenter	Deputy Director
Took the Floor	Estonia, Germany, Deputy Chair of CEPOL MB, Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands, European Commission

The **Deputy Director** informed the participants that the planning cycle for the SPD 2019 document has already been started and in order to have it finalised for the next MB meeting, CEPOL is now presenting it as a draft concept for discussion. He underlined that there are some uncertainties that do not help the planning, e.g. human and financial resources for 2019, and regarding the content there are some considerable developments foreseen for 2018, e.g. the STNA, and the whole concept of Centre for Excellence (CEPOL Knowledge Centres). Beside all the uncertainties, CEPOL would like to meet the MB needs for the planning of SPD 2019. If there's a specific request or any idea that the MB has regarding CEPOL's broader target audience, these instructions should be given at this stage, to provide a solid basis for the planning of the operational activities for 2019.

As a reaction to the draft SPD 2019 **Estonia** pointed out that under Multiannual objective 3.3 "*Upgrade the technological infrastructure (e-Net, ICT)*" and 4.6 "*Development of policy leading to increased e-Governance*" the performance indicators are missing.

Germany highlighted that the increased human resources at CEPOL will require increased capacities from the CNU's, otherwise, the ambitious aims and plans of CEPOL will not be fulfilled at national level. Germany has asked for the written outcomes of the Workshop on the tasks of the CNU's, discussed during the 2016 autumn CNU meeting. **Mr Marek Kordik**, Chair of the Workshop told that the outcomes of the workshop have been circulated among the Member States participated in the Workshop for comments. According to **Germany** the process has not been finished, hence requested to put this issue on the agenda of the next MB meeting. This has been accepted by the **MB Chair**.

Portugal commented that research related key performance indicators should focus on stakeholders' level of satisfaction on research activities rather than on research related budget spending, besides, proposed to include the research agenda in a new format.

In his reply, the **Deputy Director** noted that stakeholder satisfaction can only be measured once CEPOL defined its research objectives. Regarding all the wording related recommendations he requested the MB to send written proposals to CEPOL, since the main aim of the actual exercise is to get guidance from the MB on the directions CEPOL should write the SPD document - to avoid later disagreements.

Taking into consideration that the very high stakeholder satisfaction rate (94%) does not give much room for improvement, **Belgium** proposed the revision of the methodology, leading to the current satisfaction rate, while the **Commission** recommended to have a second look at the objectives and the performance indicators to make them as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic/Relevant, Time related), as possible.

Reacting on the advice of **the Netherlands** to have a consultation round before the next MB meeting the **Deputy Director** indicated that this topic will also be discussed during the next CNU meeting, plus there can be virtual meetings organised to discuss similar issues.

Conclusion: CEPOL will submit written proposal regarding the SPD 2019 and the results of the last CNU Workshop on the tasks of CNUs will be put on the next MB meeting.

ITEM 8	Audits and Internal Control matters and Accounts
---------------	---

ITEM 8.1	Internal Audit Panel - Audit Plan 2017
Presenter	Ms Karin Hochhaus, Chair of the Internal Audit Panel (IAP)
Took the Floor	Executive Director

The **Chair of the Internal Audit Panel** gave a short overview on the work of the IAP since autumn 2016. The 2016 Budget of CEPOL comprises of 8.641 million Euros. From this amount, 95.95% have been implemented and 1,470,000 Euros have been carried over to the next year and about 200,000 Euros have been cancelled. The MENA Budget comprises of 2.49 million Euros covering a certain couple of years. From this has been payed to CEPOL 1.243 million Euros and 89% have been paid out or committed from that amount.

Concerning the carry forwards, she underlined that a remarkable amount is dedicated to the travel agency's services and mismatching invoices. However, CEPOL's budget is accurate, comprehensive, gives reasonable assurance of the fair, legal, economic, and effective implementation of the budget.

The **Executive Director** on behalf of CEPOL and the **MB Chair** on behalf of the MB have thanked the work of the IAP.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 8.2	Update on Internal Control Plan 2017
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	Latvia, Lithuania

The **Executive Director** explained that the Internal Control Plan for 2017 schedules 5 ex post controls inside CEPOL and 2 on the spot controls at the premises of Grant Beneficiaries (Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania and the State Police of Latvia).

Latvia and Lithuania requested to learn more in advance about the visit to be able to prepare all the documentation and to arrange the meeting with the controlling delegation.

In his reply, the **Executive Director** informed that there is a standard procedure including a letter indicating the topics and the scale/scope of the audit. The timing is always agreed beforehand and the focus of the audit usually includes the implemented courses, financial report, and related budget consumption. He thankfully took note on the Lithuanian remark as well.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 8.3	Implementation of the Anti-fraud Strategy
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	-

The **Executive Director** informed that all actions of CEPOL's Anti-fraud Strategy Action Plan have been completed.

No comments have been made.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 8.4	ISO 9001 - 2015 Certification
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	-

The **Executive Director** announced that CEPOL will approach the Framework Partners concerning the ISO Certificate, in order to ensure the visibility of ISO 9001 regarding trainings.

Besides, he expressed his wish to arrive to a common understanding on how ISO standards can be kept in the future. This requires close cooperation, joint efforts, and unified implementation. Next year in January, CEPOL will have the next ISO audit and by that time a very clear practice and common understanding needs to be created to know what and how must be done in terms of these standards.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 8.5	Internal Audit Service - Final Report
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	N/A

The **Executive Director** informed that the Internal Audit Service had no findings regarding CEPOL's annual programming, but made a recommendation to use the training matrix as a planning tool. CEPOL is working on this, and tries to convince the other JHA agencies to demonstrate progress. CEPOL needs to improve its planning procedure, because there are already 240 training proposals for this year, and the demand is still growing. Therefore, there is a need to enhance the capacities of CEPOL, especially via its Framework Partners.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 9	Grant Management
---------------	-------------------------

ITEM 9.1	Results of the analysis - Grants Procedure 2017
Presenter	Deputy Director
Took the Floor	Czech Republic

The **Deputy Director** shortly summarised the result of the analysis that has been asked from CEPOL during the MB meeting of Bratislava regarding the reasons for the low level of interest in some of the activities.

The **Czech Republic** has asked about the possibilities for all the Framework Partners (including non-successful ones) to participate in training on the organisation and financing of online courses, perhaps even merged with the FP meeting.

According to the **Deputy Director** it needs to be discussed with his colleagues responsible for this at CEPOL and they have to see, how many framework partners would like to take part in such an activity. He reminded though that CEPOL will separate residential activities and online activities for next year, hence, for the grants this will not be combined like it was recommended last year.

The **Chair** concluded that the analysis does give an overview on the reasons that were behind the situation and this raises the hope that in this year it will go smoother.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 9.2	Working Group on Centres of Excellence
Presenter	Mr Gerhard Haberler, Chair of the Working Group on Centre of Excellence
Took the Floor	Portugal, Poland, Executive Director, Belgium, Germany (not all contributions are mentioned below)

Mr Gerhard Haberler, Chair of the Working Group on Centre of Excellence (18/2016/GB) presented the WG's finalised proposal.

Regarding the term "Centre of Excellence" the WG believed that it would lead to high expectations and recommended to start with a new term "Knowledge Centre" and after a 2-4 years period it can be transferred to a Centre of Excellence, as originally thought. The implementation should be done by a step-by-step approach via a pilot phase, which could start already in 2017 and should be evaluated in 2018 or beginning 2019. For piloting thematic area, the WG proposed the "EU CSDP missions" and "Counter Terrorism". The full implementation can start in May 2019, once the management board agreed on the thematic areas. The rest of the year is to set up the consortium, so that the full operation can start from the 1 January, 2020.

The **Chair** reminded that this agenda point is not for decision and opened the topic for discussion.

Portugal has asked clarification regarding the implication that for CKCs there is no need for call for proposals (page 6), because according to Portugal there must always be a call for proposal before a grant is awarded. Portugal has also suggested that future grants should not be awarded solely to CKCs (as it was implied in page 7) and that there should remain an option for FPs' stand-alone applications in certain topical areas. The 2 processes (pilot phase and excellence award) should be more distinguished, including an explanation on the evaluation of future excellence awarding criteria.

Besides, it would be useful to know how much this CKC approach will increase the spending in the certain set of activities. The estimation of the business volume is not coherent with the other parts of the document, and the ability to accredit/certify training and the awarding criteria for the excellence brand should be discussed with more caution, already in this phase.

Poland supported all major parts of the proposal and asked if it will be translated into an MB Decision and launched as a written procedure.

According to **the Chair of the WG** the task of a working group was only to present a strategic document, which can be transferred into a Management Board decision later on. This is a two-year pilot project, before starting the implementation. Answering the questions of Portugal, he explained that the main idea behind this new business model is to overcome the internal competitions by putting together thematic areas and covering them by a thematic consortium. Regarding the awarding criteria, the WG is representing somehow the future consortia (being potential future beneficiaries), hence, the WG cannot set up criteria. This should be done in another way, similar to other, funded projects. The ability of certification should be left open for the framework partners - there should be the flexibility within the knowledge centre to further develop it. Referring to page 6, footnote 6 he added, that a grant can be awarded only on the basis of an application consisting of a content and financial part. Still, the grant ensures multi-annual activities even if budget allocations can only be done on an annual basis.

Regarding the possibility to grant activities without a prior call, the **Executive Director** referred to Article 21 (2) of the CEPOL regulation, saying that *"in duly justified cases, and with the prior approval of the Management Board, CEPOL may award grants without an open call for proposal to the member states, providing training relating to the tasks referred to in Article 4 (2) and (4)."* In line with this the Management Board can give the mandate to the Executive Director every year to grant the knowledge centres without an open call. Referring to the CKC Steering Boards (SB) he supported the idea of co-chairing them by CEPOL. This would ensure a proper level of representation for the agency, i.e. the granting authority. He underlined, that while the decision on the business model is the mandate of the management board, the allocation of the activities is the Executive Director's exclusive responsibility - in accordance with the financial rules and regulations, and CEPOL's legal mandate. Besides, he underlined the importance of quality assurance from both the CKCs and CEPOL's side even if it requires additional capacities. CEPOL will further develop this document and prepare it for the decision of the Management Board.

Besides, the Agency will consult the Commission's services to make sure that all the planned mechanisms (budgetary and grant aspects) are on a solid ground.

The **Chair** invited the MB to vote on asking the Executive Director to work out a decision for written procedure based on the work of the working group. After voting she concluded that the proposal is adopted, and the Executive Director is asked to prepare a written procedure.

Conclusion: The MB took note on the report of the working group and asked the ED to prepare a written procedure for MB decision based on the work of the WG.

ITEM 9.3	Revision of 30/2006/GB Decision
Presenter	Deputy Director
Took the Floor	The Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Legal Officer of CEPOL

The **Deputy Director** explained that Decision 30/2006/GB contains detailed rules regarding financial and other organisational aspects of courses, seminars and conferences, hence, CEPOL has decided to request from the Management Board to adopt a decision repealing 30/2006/GB. Subsequently, all the rules covering financial aspects linked to the implementation of grant agreements would be reflected in an annex to the call for grant proposals. In the future, these rules will become part of the framework partnership agreements.

The initiative is in line with the recommendation of the European Commission regarding the implementation of grant agreements, whereas the creation of an annex is meant to prevent adoption of financial rules by the grant beneficiaries themselves. Rules regarding organisational aspects will be reflected in a guide supplemented by templates.

The **Netherlands** requested to repeal the decision at the date when the exact content of the replacing decision is known. **Austria** asked for clarification regarding entry into effect and the scope of the change.

In his reply, the **Deputy Director** stressed that the decision repealing GB Decision 30/2006 would be only in place from 1 January 2018 onward. The **Legal Officer** recommended to clarify the entry into force by adding "it shall apply for the activities contained in the work program 2018".

Answering **Portugal's** question on the urgency of the repealing, the **Deputy Director** explained that CEPOL needs to have this regulated before sending out the next call for the activities. However, accepting the concerns of the MB he recommended to place this issue for written procedure. Based on the many nodding reactions the **Chair** confirmed to come back to the repealing via a written procedure.

Conclusion: The MB agreed to come back to the repealing of 30/2006/GB via a written procedure.

ITEM 9.4	CEPOL Research Agenda and related grant
Presenter	Deputy Director
Took the Floor	Portugal, Germany, Austria, the Executive Director

In his introduction, the **Deputy Director** explained that CEPOL plans to start research grants in 2018 - with an annual budget of 50,000 EUR - in the areas proposed by the network of research and science correspondents. **Portugal** would support more options for priority area by asking all stakeholders about their priorities in terms of research projects - similar to what is done for training activities, but **Germany** supported to accept the recommendations of the RSC network, and considered the €50,000 budget as a good start, but underlined that it is a very limited amount for research and it should be raised in the midterm. **Austria** proposed to see the calculations based on which this amount has been concluded. The **Executive Director** promised more precise calculations once the chosen topic is known. The approval of the budget - as part of the single programming document - is foreseen for November. The **Chair** invited the Members for voting and announced that the MB Decision was adopted, including the proxy vote of Greece (given to Cyprus due to early departure).

Before voting for the first research grant topic for 2018, Germany proposed a discussion and for consideration underlined the concreteness of topic C, since the Civilian Crisis mission is an

international issue reflecting many countries within the European Union. Then, the voting for the 3 topics took place, where the majority of the MB voted in favour of topic B. (Detailed result:

- Topic A - From police to law enforcement: best path for an extended training outreach: 1 vote
- Topic B - Identifying the evidence-base for an optimal blended-learning approach in law enforcement training and education: 15 votes
- Topic C - Preparing for Civilian Crisis Missions: What training support is needed on the ground?: 9 votes

(total = 25 votes plus 2 abstentions)

Conclusion: The MB approved the decision and then majority voted in favour of topic B, (SK and the European Commission abstained from voting)

ITEM 9.5	Update on CEPOL Content Experts
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	The Netherlands, Belgium, Deputy Director

The **Executive Director** informed that CEPOL intends to launch a call for procurement in order to establish an expert pool for the framework partners and for the agency. These experts would be then made available for providing expertise in the preparation and organization of the particular courses.

The **Netherlands** supported the proposal but plead for dropping the mandatory inclusion of experts in the Lecturers, Trainers and Researchers (LTR) database. In his reaction, the **Executive Director** explained that once CEPOL has a pool of experts, content advisors, it is necessary to ensure the easy access to this pool. The sense to put this pool into the LTR database would ensure this easy access, even an online access, already known and used by the course organizers. Putting the list of experts to a separate place would require the development of another solution for easy access, which would generate confusion and additional expenses. Therefore, he suggested to use the so called “one window system” (one stop shop) to put all experts in one place and to make it available for the course organizers.

Belgium asked the impact on the budget when a member state will make use of experts for organizing one activity. According to the **Deputy Director** the expenses of external experts should be calculated during the planning phase, and included in the budget of the given activity.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 10	Management Board Matters
----------------	---------------------------------

ITEM 10.1	Election of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board
Presenter	Bulgaria
Took the Floor	Chair

On behalf of the new presidency trio **Bulgaria** expressed its initiative to nominate **Mr. Norbert Leitner** from Austria and **Mr. Priit Heinsoo** from Estonia as candidates for the post of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board respectively, with the effect from the first of July 2017 to 31 of December 2018.

The **Chair** proposed to proceed with the voting in one round for the incoming Chair and Deputy Chair. She concluded that the proposal is unanimously accepted, and congratulated both the incoming Chair and Deputy Chair for their election.

Conclusion: The MB has unanimously accepted Mr. Norbert Leitner from Austria as the incoming Chair and Mr. Priit Heinsoo from Estonia, as incoming Deputy-Chair.

ITEM 10.2 A	Update on the progress of the recruitment of the Executive Director
	A) Rules on the selection of the ED of CEPOL
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	Germany

The **Chair** asked the Voting Members to vote on the draft rules of the selection of the Executive Director of CEPOL. Taking on board **Germany's** remark on the discrepancy between “absolute majority” in the rules under Article 5, and “two third majority” in the vacancy notice under Chapter 3, the rules have been approved. (26 in favour and 1 abstention (BE)).

Conclusion: The MB has approved the Rules on the selection of the ED of CEPOL.

ITEM 10.2 B	Update on the progress of the recruitment of the Executive Director
	B) Adoption of the vacancy notice for the post of the ED of CEPOL
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	Germany, Portugal, Greece, Poland, Sweden, European Commission, Ireland

The **Chair** opened a discussion on the vacancy notice for the post of Executive Director of CEPOL. **Germany** proposed to insert experiences in lecturing under the eligibility criteria, **Portugal** did not agree with this, and suggested to leave the Vacancy Notice as it is, **Greece** recommended to request proven technical knowledge under topic B, and proven communication and other skills under topic C. **Poland** proposed to include lecturing skills under communication related selection criteria, **Sweden** preferred to use rather the term of “law enforcement” than “policing” under the selection criteria.

The **Commission** was not sure if these recommendations represented a majority opinion, but as a compromise recommended to include the following under the selection criteria, first bullet point: “very good knowledge of EU law enforcement systems, law enforcement training, policies, and implementation”. **Ireland** asked if training can be replaced by the terminology of “learning and development”. Considering this the **Commission** recommended to write “technical knowledge and experience” under selection criteria point B and then to add after the third bullet a fourth bullet which will cover experience and could read “experience in learning or development or training”. With these changes, the VN has been approved. (26 in favour and 1 abstention (BE)).

Conclusion: The MB has approved (with the discussed changes) the Vacancy Notice for the post of the ED of CEPOL.

ITEM 10.3	Establishment of the Selection Committee for the recruitment of the Executive Director
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	Mr Cor van der Lugt, NL Chairmanship

The **Chair** explained that the establishment of the Selection Committee for the recruitment of the Executive Director will consist of two rounds of voting. All Member States should indicate four candidates for the position of the member of the selection committee, and the same applies for the voting regarding the alternate member of this committee. Member States were asked to weight their votes by indicating one, two, three, or four points. The voting forms have been marked with a stamp of the Maltese Police and signed.

In total 27 voting forms have been distributed (MS + European Commission).

26 voting forms were received in the voting box. The European Commission announced to abstain from voting. 1 voting form appeared to be blank and therefore invalid. 1 voting form appeared to be invalid for the alternate member voting part.

The results of the 25 valid voting forms for Members of the Selection Committee are as follows:

place	name	country	points
1	Mr. ██████████	Germany	56
2	Mr. ██████████	The Netherlands	36
3	Mr. ██████████	Italy	30
4	Mr. ██████████	Poland	23
5	Mr. ██████████	Hungary	17
6	Mr. ██████████	Estonia	16
7	Dr. ██████████	Portugal	15
8	Ms. ██████████	Latvia	14
9	Mr. ██████████	Lithuania	11
10	Mr. ██████████	Slovenia	11
11	Mr. ██████████	Croatia	10
12	Mr. ██████████	Romania	10

The results of the 24 valid voting forms for alternate Members of the Selection Committee are as follows:

place	name	country	points
1	Dr. ██████████	Germany	49
2	Drs. ██████████	The Netherlands	44
3	Mrs. ██████████	Italy	34
4	Mr. ██████████	Poland	31
5	Mr. ██████████	Lithuania	26
6	Mr. ██████████	Estonia	23
7	Mrs. ██████████	Romania	14
8	Dr. ██████████	Croatia	11
9	Ms. ██████████	Latvia	8

Based on the above the Selection Committee shall be composed of the following members:

Mr. ██████████ (Germany)	Full member
Mr. ██████████ (The Netherlands)	Full member
Mr. ██████████ (Italy)	Full member
Mr. ██████████ (Poland)	Full member
Mr. ██████████	Full member (Commission)
Dr. ██████████ (Germany)	Alternate member
Drs. ██████████ (The Netherlands)	Alternate member
Mrs. ██████████ (Italy)	Alternate member
Mr. ██████████ (Poland)	Alternate member
Mr. ██████████	Alternate member (Commission)

The voting resulted a full support of the mentioned composition of the Selection Committee, without any abstention.

Conclusion: The MB has unanimously approved the composition of the selection committee for the ED of CEPOL.

ITEM 10.4	Scientific Committee
Presenter	Executive Director
Took the Floor	Germany, Portugal, France, Czech Republic, Poland, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Estonia, Sweden.

The **Executive Director** gave a short introduction to the draft Management Board Decision on the establishment of a scientific committee, submitted only for discussion and for further amendments.

Germany has questioned the necessity of such a committee. First the new tasks of CEPOL should be established and only after 2-3 years it is time to discuss the need and possible tasks of a scientific committee.

Portugal did not share the German opinion and expressed the need of a Scientific Committee already on a short term. For example, the committee could give guidance to the design and the implementation of research relevant for training and contribute to the planning of future research agendas and to the organization of the research and science conference by advising on the selection of the papers and keynote speakers, etc. Besides, it could provide advice in the editing of the research and science bulletin and give some support regarding the approval of common curricula, and online modules. Furthermore, it could be very useful for the attribution of the excellence brand for the CEPOL knowledge centres in the future.

France, Czech Republic, Poland, The Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Estonia, Sweden supported Germany by expressing that the time is too early for such a discussion. The priority for CEPOL at this moment is much more the introduction of the new business model on CEPOL Knowledge Centres.

Conclusion: The MB has started to discuss the draft decision on the Scientific Committee, but the initiative has been considered too early for a meaningful debate.

ITEM 11	Legal Matters
----------------	----------------------

ITEM 11.1	Adoption of MB Decision on CEPOL Security
Presenter	Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD
Took the Floor	Portugal

The **Head of CSD** has referred to Article 30 of the CEPOL Regulation (EU (No) 2015/2219) stating that CEPOL shall apply the Commission's security rules for protecting European Union Classified Information (EUCI) and sensitive non-classified information as set out in Commission Decisions (EU, Euratom) 2015/443 and 2015/444. The draft MB Decision covers the application of Commission Decision 2015/443, *mutatis mutandis*, in CEPOL. He has kindly reminded the MB that the adoption of this draft decision is part of the change management plan of CEPOL and that the draft decision presented for adoption will require further elaboration of rules regarding specific aspects of its implementation, the so-called implementing rules.

Portugal has asked for clarification regarding the meaning of Article 12e of the Annex ("searching of CIS and equipment, telephone and telecommunications traffic data, log files, user accounts, etc.;"). According to **Head of CSD** it means that within the CEPOL premises - in order to ensure the security of CEPOL for its equipment and for its data - there can be security measures made, meaning that mandated staff can look at equipment, telephones, telecommunication traffic, data logfiles, etc. to see if security breaches have been made.

Conclusion: The MB has unanimously approved the decision.

ITEM 11.2	MB Decision on Handling confidential information
Presenter	Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD
Took the Floor	-

With regards to the decision on handling confidential information the **Head of CSD** gave a short overview and informed that the incorporation of the comments received from the Commission on this particular subject is still in process.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 12	Implementing Rules on Staff Regulations, other rules and decisions - Update on Implementing Rules
Presenter	Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD
Took the Floor	-

The **Head of CSD** has informed the MB that there are numerous developments in process regarding the implementing rules on the staff regulations. Shortly after summer, there will be a new Commission decision on the mission guide. This will be adopted by CEPOL the soonest possible. Closing his speech he announced that the ED has appointed **Ms Ioanna Pliota** as new data protection officer in CEPOL.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 13	Annual Assessment of the Executive Director (closed session)
Presenter	Chair
Took the Floor	Executive Director

At the end of the closed session the **Chair** has announced that the Executive Director's annual appraisal was adopted, and congratulated him. The **Executive Director** has thanked the positive feedback.

Conclusion: The MB has adopted the annual appraisal of the Executive Director.

ITEM 14	AOB
Presenter	n/a
Took the Floor	Germany, Executive Director, Belgium, Poland, Estonia, Deputy Director, Portugal.

Germany referred to the rules of Management Board regarding the submitting of the documents for MB meetings and proposed for future meetings not to discuss and consider documents that were not sent out at least two weeks before the meeting.

The **Executive Director** underlined that CEPOL submitted all the documents that were on its own responsibility in due course, i.e. one month earlier and two weeks earlier. Those, not submitted in time have been received from the Commission later than required.

According to **Germany**, in such a case the MB should postpone the topic and discuss it in the next MB meeting. It has to be understood that – especially in the case of bigger countries, like Germany - a voting member has to discuss the given issues with many stakeholders within the country. Germany's proposal has been supported by **Belgium, Poland** and **Estonia** too.

Vis-à-vis the circulation of documents **Belgium** expressed its concerns regarding the technical problems in receiving some of the papers. There were some problems with the links, generating time consuming correspondence with the Agency. Therefore, Belgium proposed to go back to the previously used Document Management System (DMS), provided that all working documents for meetings are placed on the secure part of the website, so that people could get and upload them there.

The **Deputy Director** reminded to CEPOL's outdated IT infrastructure, and the fact that CEPOL's e-NET has been hacked few years ago. Hence, the DMS system, i.e. the most vulnerable part of e-NET had to be switched off and the e-NET went through a considerable development. CEPOL is

currently looking for technical options that can replace the DMS functionalities. One of the options is a safe section under the new e-NET, but CEPOL is also studying more comprehensive solutions in line with the overall IT security architecture.

Regarding the police leadership seminar **Germany** asked the reasons why it was cancelled, and expressed the inconveniences such a cancelling can cause, especially when it comes to the scheduled participation of high ranking leaders. As the organiser of the activity, **Portugal** explained that it had to be cancelled due to the low number of registered participants (only 7-8 registrations). According to the comment of **Estonia**, the invitation had been sent out only 5 weeks before the event, which is too late for such high level persons. Based on the initiative of Germany the **Chair** confirmed that this topic will be put on the agenda of the next MB meeting.

Conclusion: CEPOL is asked to find a proper technical solution for the distribution of the meeting documents; the cancellation of the leadership seminar of May will be discussed in the next MB meeting.

ITEM 15	Date of future meetings
Presenter	Chair
Took the floor	N/A

Chair has announced that the 3rd MB meeting will be in Estonia between 15 and 16 November 2017, and an Extraordinary MB meeting in Budapest possibly in September 2017.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 16	Presidency Priorities
Presenter	Incoming Chair, Incoming Presidency
Took the Floor	n/a

Mr Norbert Leitner, incoming Chair has thanked the members of the Management Board for entrusting him with the challenging but honourable task of chairing the Management Board for the next one and a half year. He is aiming to continue the successful work of the current chair and looking forward to have a good cooperation with the Commission, with CEPOL management and with the Trio Presidency Estonia and Bulgaria.

The main aim of the three presidencies during the upcoming eighteen months will be to save and secure Europe by taking forward the work on the European agenda on security, as well as taking also into consideration EU's global strategy on foreign and security policy in order to build a genuine security union. Besides, each incoming presidency will further elaborate and specify their individual program in the area of freedom, security and justice, in particular regarding CEPOL's relevant business priorities.

Regarding CEPOL, the incoming Trio Presidency will support the election of the new Executive Director, the implementation of the new business model, as well as the STNA and TNA. Moreover, a step by step approach to an e-governance as a supporting tool of everyday CEPOL activities.

Estonia has also presented its 3 individual presidency priorities:

- An exchange of experiences, skills and best practices for prevention of terrorist attacks via the explosive or CBRN materials in EU
- Joint digital exercise platform research development
- Development of CEPOL e-governance and administration

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 17	Closing of the meeting
Presenter	Chair
Took the floor	Executive Director

The **Chair** has expressed her honour of being the chair for eighteen months and thanked the voting members' confidence and active involvement, underlining that CEPOL is the network of

member states, hence, their active involvement is crucial. She has also thanked to the current trio partners: *Mr Marek Kordik* Vice-Chair, and *Mr Mario Spiteri*, Maltese Presidency, as well as to CEPOL staff, especially *Prof.h.c. Dr. Ferenc Banfi*, Executive Director. She has also wished a successful 18 months for the next Trio.

Finally, the **Executive Director** has also expressed his sincere respect and gratitude to the *Chair*, as well as his honour to work together with her and her team in the past eighteen months.

The **Chair** thanked the attendees for their participation and officially closed the meeting.

Done at Tallinn, 15 November 2017

Done at Tallinn, 15 November 2017

<Signature on file>

<Signature on file>

*Ms Frederike Everts MPA
Former Chair of CEPOL Management Board*

*Mr Detlef Schroeder
Acting Executive Director of CEPOL*

Annex 1: List of Meeting Participants

Chairperson of the Management Board:

Netherlands	Frederike	EVERTS
-------------	-----------	--------

Members/Alternate members (with voting right):

Country	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Norbert	LEITNER
BELGIUM	Alain	RUELLE
BULGARIA (alternate member)	Svetlozar	MARKOV
CROATIA	Danijela	PETKOVIC
CYPRUS	Georgios	FANGOS
CZECH REPUBLIC	Petr	NOVAK
ESTONIA	Priit	HEINSOO
European Commission – DG HOME (alternate member)	Victoria	AMICI
FINLAND	Marko	VIITANEN
FRANCE	Sophie	HATT
GERMANY	Matthias Ernst	ZEISER
GREECE (alternate member)	Dimitrios	KRIERIS
HUNGARY	Emese	HORVACZY
IRELAND (alternate member)	Brian	CONWAY
ITALY by proxy	Maddalena	REBAI
LATVIA	Gatis	SVIKA
LITHUANIA (alternate member)	Karolina	VAICIENE
LUXEMBOURG	Marc	WELTER
MALTA	Mario	SPITERI
NETHERLANDS	Sandra	WIJKHUIJS
POLAND	Irmina	GOLEBIEWSKA
PORTUGAL	Isabel	POLONIA NICO
ROMANIA	Ovidiu	MACOVEI
SLOVAKIA	Marek	KORDIK
SLOVENIA	Damjan	ZAGAR
SPAIN (alternate member)	Eduardo	BOROBIO
SWEDEN	Max	LUTTEMAN

Member State observers:

AUSTRIA	Gerhard	HABERLER
BELGIUM	Isabelle	BORREMANS
CROATIA	Zalimir	RADMILOVIC
CYPRUS	Georgios	CHRISTOPOULOS
CZECH REPUBLIC	Lukas	MACKE
ESTONIA	Elmar	NURMELA
FINLAND	Pasi	KEMPPAINEN
FINLAND	Antti	TALVITIE
FRANCE	Eric	BOISNAUD

GERMANY	Lars	WAGNER
HUNGARY	Jozsef	BODA
IRELAND	Philip	RYAN
ITALY	Massimo	TULINI
LATVIA	Dina	TARANE
LITHUANIA	Rasa	SEJONIENE
LUXEMBOURG	David	CHENUT
MALTA	Jurgen	VELLA
NETHERLANDS	Cor	van der LUGT
POLAND	Piotr	GRZYWINSKI
PORTUGAL	Eduardo	FERREIRA
ROMANIA	Alina	BOICU
SLOVAKIA	Ingrid	WEISSOVÁ
SPAIN	Gabriel	VALLEJOS
SWEDEN	Ulf	SYDORF

Other observers:

European Commission – DG HOME	Merit	VERTMANN
European Commission – DG BUD	Derek	DUNPHY
European Commission – DG BUD	Dana	RADU
Audit Panel	Karin	HOCHHAUS

CEPOL:

Executive Director	Ferenc	BÁNFI
Deputy Director	Detlef	SCHRODER
Head of CSD	Roeland	WOLDHUIS
Legal Advisor	Ioanna	PLIOTA
Governance Assistant (Outcomes)	Gyorgy	ISPANKI
Governance Support Assistant	Katalin	TAGSCHERER

Apologies:

ITALY	Michele	ROCCEGIANI
-------	---------	------------