

**Outcomes of Proceedings of the  
3<sup>rd</sup> CEPOL Management Board Meeting  
15-16 November 2017  
Tallinn, Estonia  
Chair: Mr Norbert LEITNER**

**ITEM 1. Welcome by the Chair**

*Presenter* : Mr Norbert LEITNER, Chair

*Took the Floor* : -

The **Chair** welcomed the delegates to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Management Board meeting and announced that the meeting will be recorded.

**ITEM 2. Welcome by the Presidency**

*Presenter* : Mr Priit Parkna, Deputy Director General, Police and Border Guard Board, Estonia

*Took the Floor* : -

In his welcoming speech, **Mr Parkna, Deputy Director General** underlined the importance of modern technologies in Law Enforcement cooperation. In order to make a step towards the first digitally signed document in CEPOL - on behalf of Mr Andres Anvelt, Estonian minister of Interior and former member of the CEPOL Governing Board - he solemnly handed over 3 EU residency cards to Mr Norbert Leitner, Mr Detlef Schroeder and Ms Aija Kalnaja.

**ITEM 3. Adoption of the Agenda**

*Presenter* : Chair

*Took the Floor* : Poland

The **Chair** informed the participants about the voting procedure during the meeting. Since there are 26 Member States and the Commission present, the total number of votes is 27. Hence, for a two-thirds majority 18 votes while for simple majority 14 votes will be needed.

He has also announced that there are 3 room documents (for item 6.1, 9.1 and 9.2) and reported about one proxy vote: **Ms Lucia Kurilovská** gave the Slovak proxy vote to **Ms Ingrid Weissová**.

For AOB **Poland** proposed to include a discussion on the integrated guidelines for CEPOL courses.

**Conclusion:** The MB adopted the agenda.

**ITEM 4. Draft Outcome of Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Management Board Meeting, St Julians, Malta**

*Presenter* : Chair

*Took the Floor* : Ms Victoria Amici, European Commission

The Commission recommended some rectifications, which were distributed to all participants.

**Conclusion:** The MB adopted the Outcomes with the recommended rectifications.

## ITEM 5. Announcements by the European Commission

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

Regarding the progress towards consolidating a Security Union **Ms Amici** informed that in July a comprehensive assessment was published on the union's actions in the area of internal security, stating that EU actions and instruments in internal security are appropriate, relevant and effective. Particular importance was attached to facilitating information exchange, especially regarding the Schengen Information System, Joint Investigation Teams, the European Arrest Warrant, the policy cycle in serious and organised crime, as well as the work of the agencies, including Europol, Eurojust and CEPOL.

As main shortcomings, the assessment identified the still incomplete implementation of some of the EU policies in the area of security, the complexity of some of the measures and tools adopted at EU level. Besides, limited capacities at national level were recognised calling for increased pooling of resources and expertise at EU level. The assessment has also highlighted the importance of training in order to increase end-users' knowledge regarding existing instruments at EU level and understanding of how to use them effectively and has emphasised CEPOL's role in this regard.

As far as interoperability of information systems and data are concerned Ms Amici informed that the Commission will put forward a legislative proposal aiming at ensuring a more effective and efficient data management with streamlined access to relevant information. These will also affect the way how current and future central systems for data management will operate.

Among future challenges Ms Amici underlined the fighting against violent extremism, preventing and countering radicalisation both online and offline. Most recently, the Commission has published a comprehensive package on counterterrorism and the European Parliament has set up a Special Committee on terrorism with Commission's involvement.

Finally, on behalf of the Commission, but also on personal basis, she expressed her gratitude to Mr Detlef Schroeder, Acting Executive Director for the efforts he made during the last months in his acting capacity, and underlined the successful results achieved by Prof.h.c. Dr. Ferenc Banfi, Executive Director as well as his legacy to the agency.

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

## ITEM 6. Reporting

### ITEM 6.1 Agency progress report – to end of September

<i>Presenter</i>	: Executive Director, and Acting Executive Director
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: Germany, France, Belgium, CEPOL AHoOD, Poland, Estonia

Upon the **Chair's invitation** CEPOL's **Executive Director Prof.h.c. Dr. Banfi** presented his draft handover note summarising the achievements of CEPOL during his 8 years of directorship.

In his speech, the **Executive Director** gave a comprehensive overview on the Agency's main achievements including the smooth preparation to the new legal mandate, the effective management of CEPOL's relocation, the successful completion of CEPOL's evaluations, the considerable increase in CEPOL's activities, and more efficient budget implementation. In his speech he devoted particular importance to eNET, CEPOL Exchange Programme (CEP), European Joint Masters Programme (EJMP), the developments in CEPOL's external relations, as well as CEPOL's certification to the Management System Standard ISO 9001:2015. Closing his speech, he thanked the help and considerable contribution of all Management Board

members, the 16 EU presidencies he worked with, as well as the Acting Executive Director and all other CEPOL colleagues.

**Mr Detlef Schroeder, Acting Executive 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. Regarding the implementation of Budget 2016 he informed that based on the latest forecast, the real implementation will be around 93%, mainly due to the underspending in courses and seminars. As far as Budget 2017 is concerned, until the end of September 2017 96% of the C1 budget has been committed, out of which 57% has already been paid.

**Germany** has recommended to find solutions to the problem that in 2017 only 67% of Framework Partners implemented an activity. In his answer **Acting Executive Director** pointed out that CEPOL is already analysing this and comparing data with 2016, however, it is too early to draw consequences. It is already seen that in many cases not the same Framework Partners are inactive in these two years. CEPOL is working on convincing also new Framework Partners by offering additional training so that they can also get familiar with the system and hopes that CEPOL Knowledge Centres (CKCs) will give a solid basis in this regard.

**France** agreed with Germany and underlined the importance of the successful implementation of the CKCs, besides, called upon the implementation of the audit recommendations regarding recruitment. France has also requested an explanation why no online courses are indicated under e-learning in the report.

As for recruitment, the **Acting Executive Director** informed that EU Agencies have already made a concrete proposal to the Commission, and a slight increase in the correction coefficient is also foreseen, that might have a positive effect. Besides, CEPOL is making further steps to make CEPOL posts more attractive. Regarding e-learning the **Acting Head of Operations Department** explained that until end September none of the online courses have been completed, hence, all the implementation will be in the last quarter of the year.

**Belgium** asked about the foreseen opportunities to make joint efforts with Frontex in the field of the exchange programme, and remarked that the visits within the MENA project should be much more productive, especially in such important fields, like counterterrorism. In his response, the **Acting Executive Director** informed that according to current negotiations, CEPOL will cooperate with Frontex from the next year in a way that border guards related exchanges will be financed by Frontex and administered by CEPOL. Regarding MENA, CEPOL has already addressed this problem to the partners and is working on solutions to get more accurate contacts.

**Poland** asked about possible measures to make the CEPOL Experts database a more popular and useful tool, since, according to the report it has been used 11 times, only. According to the **Acting Executive Director** the database was meant as a supporting tool and CEPOL has already made efforts to promote it. If this tendency of low interest continues then CEPOL should not invest more into it, however, it worth trying to use it not exclusively for CEPOL, but team up with other agencies having similar databases available.

**Estonia** supports the initiatives regarding Framework Partners' increased involvement and requests more flexibility regarding the timeframe of CEP. Especially for high level officials and chiefs it is difficult to find more than 3 days for the exchange, however, the current limit is 5 days. In her answer the **Acting Head of Operations Department** explained that there is a specific segment in CEP for commanders, and for them this flexibility is already built in.

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

## ITEM 6.2 Change Management Plan - progress report by the Acting Executive Director

*Presenter* : Acting Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : Germany, Chair

The **Acting Executive Director** reminded that following the entry into force of the CEPOL Regulation, the Governing Board adopted a Change Management Plan to outline the necessary steps for the implementation of its legal mandate. In his review, he highlighted only those elements that are still to be achieved, including CKC, STNA, OTNA, as well as a full overview of all existing GB, MB and ED decisions.

**Germany** remarked that according to the report on the Change management plan there is no reference to third countries' engagement, even though a high proportion of CEPOL's budget seems to be dedicated to external projects. The **Chair** proposed to discuss this remark under agenda Item 10.

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

## ITEM 6.3 Update on CNU workshops

*Presenter* : Mr Elmar Nurmela, Presidency Chair, Ms [REDACTED] expert of EPBGB

*Took the Floor* : Germany, France, Acting Executive Director, Greece, Poland, Estonia

**Mr Nurmela** gave a summary of the 3 workshops held during the 3<sup>rd</sup> CNU meeting (10-11 October, Budapest 2017). Workshop 1 has reviewed the opportunities of a *Joint digital exercise platform research development*, Workshop 2 focused on the *Development of CEPOL E-governance and administration*, and Workshop 3 discussed possible *Future approaches for Common Curricula*.

Concerning *Workshop 1* Mr Nurmela highlighted that currently only the Netherlands, Estonia and Portugal uses the XVR simulation platform as a teaching tool for simulating crises scenarios, while in Germany the German Police University is developing crisis simulation solutions within the Horizon 2020 Research Project. Hence, to have a common understanding between MS is practically impossible at this stage.

In *Workshop 3*, the most important conclusion was that the existing CEPOL Common Curricula cannot be expected to be transposed entirely or partly to member states' law enforcement training schemes. However, Common Curricula could be turned into European vocational, thematic courses for national implementation and attendance could result in a European certification, where CEPOL could be the certifying authority.

As a conclusion, the Estonian Presidency would like to propose to the Chair of the Management Board to launch a written procedure on a decision on establishing a Working Group or expert group for the development of a CEPOL training certification policy.

Regarding *Workshop 2* **Mr Nurmela** concluded that EU agencies should cooperate more in the field of E-governance and E-administration related developments. Considering the Member States' e-governance related developments he underlined that without cooperation, countries might arrive to different systems, which will be difficult to be connected under the umbrella of CEPOL. As an opinion, he expressed his dissatisfaction about CEPOL's IT development process with special emphasis on the CEPOL's expert database and the CRM tool.

On behalf of the Estonian Presidency he proposed to the Chair of the Management Board to launch a written procedure on a decision initiating a pilot project using the Adobe system and the Estonian E-residency card system for e-signature until the next MB, when both systems can be evaluated.

In order to introduce the Estonian Digi-ID system he invited **Ms** [REDACTED] expert of the Estonian Police and Border Guard Board, to give a short presentation. Using the MB Chair's

EU residence Digi-ID card Ms ██████████, expert of EPBGB demonstrated the practical steps to be followed for electronically signing a document.

**Germany** and **France** expressed their concerns regarding both the technical and the legal implementation of such a joint system at this stage. According to **France**, even if Member States have their capacities to connect different administrative platforms, due to security reasons it is not advisable to connect different administrations.

**Acting Executive Director** informed that as a first step CEPOL would like to amend the rules of procedure for the MB in a way that the MB decisions can be signed electronically by the Chair or Deputy Chair, hence, the electronic signatures of the individual MB members have not been taken into consideration at this stage. To find the best technical solution for this, is a different step where Adobe Certificate seems as easy solution. It is foreseen only in the future, that CEPOL moves on with other tools, respecting the legal and security requirements of the different national systems. Regarding CEPOL Common Curricula he explained that there is no need for a Written Procedure, CEPOL can simply invite Member States to nominate experts for an expert group responsible for the further elaboration of the proposal of the CNU on the future of Common Curricula.

As far as the simplification of current templates are concerned he informed that CEPOL will use the CRM system, making participant administration much easier for all parties.

Regarding digital signatures **Greece** shared the concerns of Germany and France, but should these signatures only relate to the signing of MB decisions, then Adobe Certificate could be a good solution, because in this case all the MB members can see via their Adobe Reader that the signature of the MB Chair is certified. Should digital signatures be broadened to all Member States then Greece recommends asking how this is managed and dealt with by the Commission, and prefers not to have more systems running parallel, at the same time.

Regarding digital signatures **Poland** shared all the legal and security related concerns mentioned before and indicated that it would support the idea of a pilot project in this field only if it is meant for countries interested. In terms of Common Curricula, Poland supports the initiative to establish a working group on it, but certification process should be carefully thought through, since it is a complex matter in all countries.

**Estonia** underlined that the main idea of the pilot project on digital signatures is to filter out the problems and difficulties and to find a common solution, the software is free of charge and the 102 EUR per Member State should be affordable for all countries.

**Ms ██████████** emphasised that according to current legislation EU Member States already have to recognise each other's digital signatures and there is no need to update any equipment. It should be kept in mind, that in line with EIDAS, Member States should cross-use each other's e-services soon.

Regarding Workshop 3 **Germany** indicated that the original outcome was not to create a certification policy, but to create one European course on a specific subject based on common curricula, which could be certified. Hence, Germany would not support the creation of a WG which have to deal with the general question of certification, and recommends sticking to the result of the Workshop.

Referring to Estonia, **Poland** underlined that the issue is not the 102 EUR, but the IT upgrades, mentioned, as well as opportunities to use CEPOL money for Framework Partners' investments into infrastructure. They would be more interested if such expenses would be covered, as they already are in several other financing schemes.

In his response, the **Acting Executive Director** informed that CEPOL does not have the legal framework for supporting Framework Partners to invest into their infrastructure. CEPOL can work on this, but it is also a question, if CEPOL's budget is calibrated to invest into this. Regarding Working Group vs. Expert Group, he pointed out that it is much easier and less time consuming for CEPOL to initiate an expert group than a WG. As a starting point he agreed with Germany in sticking to the originally proposed scenario of Workshop 3.

Referring to the already existing EU rules stating that Member States have to recognise each other's digital signatures, **Estonia** announced that they will send out all their documents concerning CEPOL with digital signature only.

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

**ITEM 6.4 Update on the Action Plan for the recommendations following the five-years external evaluation**

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

The **Acting Executive Director** explained that the timeline for the implementation of the Action Plan spans over a period of two and a half years between mid-2016 to end of 2018. As it is summarised in the related meeting document, out of the total 32 actions 20 activities have been completed, 5 activities are ongoing, and 7 activities are pending.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

**ITEM 7. Planning and budgeting**

**ITEM 7.1 Financial perspective of EU / Potential consequences of BREXIT**

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

In her presentation **Ms Amici** informed that compared to previous information regarding Brexit there are no changes that CEPOL should anticipate, as the UK is not part of CEPOL. Since 29 March 2017 - when the notification of the UK has been submitted on its intention to withdraw from the EU - negotiations have not produced any conclusive results, hence, it is still unknown how the shape and the content of the withdrawal agreement will look like. Until the end of the 2-year period - when the withdrawal comes into effect - the UK continues to be a member of the EU.

Since CEPOL has 2 members of staff with UK citizenship, they should remain in their position until details on the full agreement on Brexit and its consequent conditions are known. Regarding procurements, UK companies could be eligible, but they should be informed that subject to the outcome of the negotiations they could be at some point ceased to receive EU funding or would no longer be part of procurements.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

**ITEM 7.2 CEPOL Single Programming Document 2018**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Acting Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Commission, France, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland</i>

The **Acting Executive Director** presented key aspects of the SPD's. He reminded that final allocation of 2018 resources is yet to be confirmed and most likely there will be other budget figures by the end of November 2017. Finally, he addressed the Commission to kindly comment on CEPOL's budget.

Regarding the SPD 2018 document the **Ms Amici** told that the Commission supports the adoption of the current version on condition that it will be updated as soon as possible in the light of Commission opinion on CEPOL programming document 2018-2020 adopted on 15 November and results of the budget conciliation process. She informed that the budgetary procedure is similar to previous years, however, this year the EU Parliament proposed for

CEPOL three additional establishment plan posts, and an additional 3.3 million EUR budget. The discussions between the two arms of the budgetary authorities (Parliament and Council) is still ongoing and expected to be over by end November. This will allow the Agency to finalise its budget and make any consequent adjustments.

**Finland** has welcomed the positive news and wondered, how can CEPOL manage to deal with a 30% budget increase and what will it mean for the planning of next year's activities in such a short period of time, since this might require dozens of additional activities.

The **Acting Executive Director** reminded that the negotiation is still ongoing, and the final budget will be somewhere between the currently known amount and this 3.3 Million EUR as a maximum. He also highlighted the positive sign of this increase, acknowledging CEPOL's achievements and offering excellent opportunities. As far as existing plans are concerned, he told that CEPOL has no fixed plans, since the budget is still unknown and CEPOL needs time to prepare comprehensive plans based on the final budget and final number of new posts.

**Germany**, supported by **the Netherlands** and **Belgium**, questioned the cutting off the original budget by 3 million EUR while allocating similar amount to 3<sup>rd</sup> country projects indicates a shift from CEPOL's operational budget to external activities without any strategic discussion with the Management Board.

The **Acting Executive Director** referred to Article 4 of CEPOL Regulations stating that the Agency should provide training for law enforcement officials from third countries and implement funds dedicated to the capacity building of third countries. As far as CEPOL budget is concerned these projects have no impact, project budgets are completely separated and accounted. There is one establishment post dedicated to CEPOL projects, however, engagement in projects is a positive sign assuring a constant contact with third countries directly, rather than via external contractors, as done in earlier times. This also indicates, that the EU recognises CEPOL as a training provider, and such cooperation can give considerable potential for CEPOL in the field of areas, third countries are more experienced, e.g. counterterrorism.

**Germany** agreed that single projects are acceptable and are in line with the CEPOL regulation, however, at the current extent it seems to become the second core business of CEPOL and this should be discussed by the MB.

According to **Poland** there are other means of cooperation with third countries, like service contracts and twinning projects that allow more type of training related costs, including equipment, making these activities more attractive from the organisers' point of view.

In his reply, the **Acting Executive Director** explained that for these projects eligible costs are described by the fund providers and not by CEPOL and the current projects do not contain budget for equipment.

**The Netherlands** requested to make the changes to KPIs and PIs visible in the SPD meeting documents and improve the quality of written procedures. The agency agreed with these points raised and will provide an overview of changes. In relation to written procedures CEPOL is currently working on the revision of the process and will come up with a proposal for the MB.

**Germany** asked explanations regarding the differences between Cybercrime project mentioned on page 17 and Digital Forensic training on page 96, which the agency confirmed were the same, also regarding a third AD 11 post mentioned on page 103. The agency clarifies that the additional AD 11 post aims to ensure the opportunity for reclassification of existing AD 10 staff on board.

#### ***Voting results:***

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

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted SPD 2018**

### ITEM 7.3 CEPOL Single Programming Document 2019

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Acting Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Finland, Belgium, Commission, the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland</i>

CEPOL **Acting Executive Director** presented the actual status of the first draft of SPD 2019, also referring to the considerable uncertainties regarding the final budget figure for 2018 and its possible effect for year 2019.

According to **Finland**, in view of the future of CEPOL the budget figures look very positive, however, resulting from these figures, CEPOL activities will be increased considerably, questioning the capacity of the CEPOL network to implement all these activities. CEPOL might need new tools to increase commitment capacities and make overall implementation feasible.

**Belgium** has underlined the experienced lack of commitment from the training institutes taking care of CEPOL activities and supported **Poland's** earlier proposal of making some training related equipment costs eligible in the framework contract of CKCs, such as investments to course materials, e.g. DVI training materials, upgrade of computer software and hardware, etc. The agency clarifies that it is possible to cover consumables within an activity - e.g. body bags and other consumables related to a DVI course - legal limitations are related to standard equipment. Besides, Belgium invites to address the duration of activities.

**Ms Amici** announced that the Commission will abstain from voting, since it will be consulted formally at the subsequent stage. She considered the new layout of the document promising as a preliminary positive comment and pointed out that the current voting is on the *draft* SPD 2019. The latter was supported by **the Netherlands**.

Answering Finland, the **Acting Executive Director** expressed his hope that CKCs will give a better future for forward planning, and reminded, that currently the Agency implements more than 30 activities, hence, reviewing the expectations of the MB on the Agency's own training delivery, the better combination of methodologies, the repetition of different training activities might help to increase network capacities and lower the overhead costs. Referring to Belgium he told that CEPOL cannot cover equipment costs, since it has no legal framework to finance Framework Partners' infrastructural investments. But CEPOL can already cover all costs for consumables, like the mentioned body packs. He also noted that CEPOL is basically financing the training of Member States' officers, which is also an interest of the countries. He agreed to review course durations and considered CKCs as a good environment to do so.

**Finland** has asked if it would not be better to invest time in training the networks on how to plan and implement residential activities and then put a little more pressure on them. This could increase the number of active partners, who will really take part in these efforts.

The **Acting Executive Director** confirmed that the voting is about the *Draft* SPD 2019, and this will be indicated in the title of the decision and in the Outcomes, too. Referring to Finland he explained that CEPOL has already organised such trainings earlier this year, even contacted the non-active partners directly. Still, the Agency will make additional efforts in this regard, besides, reviewing the current business model, combining methods, repetition of training courses and changes in durations might also help to increase this figure.

#### **Voting results:**

**In favour:** 25 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 2, Belgium and Commission

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted draft SPD 2019**

## ITEM 8. Audits and Internal Control matters

### ITEM 8.1 Internal Audit Panel

*Presenter* : Acting Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : Germany

The **MB Chair** and the **Acting Executive Director** thanked to the Internal Audit Panel (IAP) for the excellent and professional cooperation, particularly to Ms Karin Hochhaus, Chair of IAP, who is leaving the Panel by the end of 2017. They have also welcomed Ms Katarzyna Klimczak-Sych, member of IAP, who has accepted to take over the chairing role of the IAP from January 2018 onwards.

Summarising the content of the draft IAP report **Acting Executive Director** noted that CEPOL should have received the necessary budgetary and human resources to fulfil its new mandate and that the implementation of EJMP is an excellent model and a very positive initiative.

**Germany** has asked why the report refers only to the UK (under page 4 paragraph 5), if there were study visits to several other countries within the MENA project, not only to the UK.

In his answer **Acting Executive Director** has pointed out that CEPOL will ask the author of the draft report and correct it accordingly, however, according to his understanding the statement might be based on the sample taken for the audit and not referring to the whole MENA project.

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

### ITEM 8.2 European Court of Auditors

*Presenter* : Acting Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : France

**Acting Executive Director** informed that in May 2017 CEPOL received observations from the European Court of Auditors (ECA) on the financial year of 2016, that were containing mainly positive elements with only 2 remarks, one on the high carry over in Title 2 and one on the high staff turnover. Besides, ECA visited CEPOL in September 2017, on which CEPOL has received positive feedback; CEPOL is acknowledged as a low-risk agency. In 2018 ECA does not plan to visit CEPOL, and will complete its audit on 2017 transactions based on a desk review.

**France** considered it a positive report, but underlined that the low staff grades, the relocation of the agency to Budapest, and the related low coefficient rate generates high staff turnover and imbalanced distribution of CEPOL staff. Commission has to take efforts to resolve this situation experienced since 2015 onwards.

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

### ITEM 8.3 Internal Audit Service

*Presenter* : Acting Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : -

The **Acting Executive Director** informed regarding the Final Report of the Internal Audit Service (IAS) on "Training Needs assessment, planning and budgeting". The report pointed out that CEPOL should further address the utilisation of the JHA Training Matrix, the training needs assessment survey methodology, formulating objectives and performance indicators, as well as the budget planning methodology. He informed that CEPOL will address these recommendations by the end of the year.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

#### ITEM 8.4 Update on Internal Control Plan 2017

*Presenter* : *Acting Executive Director*

*Took the Floor* : -

In his update **Acting Executive Director** told that Internal Control Plan for 2017 scheduled 5 ex-post controls (desk reviews) inside CEPOL and 2 on the spot controls at the premises of Grant Beneficiaries. He thanked involved Framework Partners for their cooperation (Police Department under the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania and the State Police of Latvia) and informed that results of the ex-post controls did not reveal any amounts to be recovered.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

#### ITEM 8.5 Revised Anti-fraud Strategy

*Presenter* : *Acting Executive Director*

*Took the Floor* : *France, Poland*

The **Acting Executive Director** presented that a renewed strategy including an action plan has been drafted for the MB's adoption.

**France** remarked that on page 3 the location should be "Tallinn", and **Poland** indicated that on page 9 the "Governing Board" should be changed to Management Board.

#### **Voting:**

With these changes decision **33/2017/MB** has been unanimously adopted.

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 33/2017/MB**

#### ITEM 8.6 ISO 9001 - 2015 Certification

*Presenter* : *Acting Executive Director*

*Took the Floor* : *Finland, Slovakia*

The **Acting Executive Director** informed that the ISO standard requires the implementation of regular internal audits to maintain the certification conditions. This quality audit was implemented between 29 and 30 August by the Special Adviser on Quality Assurance from the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA). The audit resulted in a positive opinion stating that the audited processes are well defined and documented, and no non-conformities were found. The next external surveillance audit will be implemented by Lloyd's on 10-11 January 2018.

**Finland** asked why there is an audit of Lloyd's scheduled for 2018 January if the certificate is valid for 3 years, to which the agency clarified that continuous accountability is a requirement of ISO certification.

Responding to **Slovakia** the **Acting Executive Director** confirmed that the certification costs - app. EUR 30k - are covered from CEPOL's budget. It is already seen that other auditors take this ISO certificate as a reference point for their audits.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

## ITEM 9. Core Business

### ITEM 9.1 Grants Procedure 2018

*Presenter* : Acting Head of Operations Department

*Took the Floor* : Germany

**Ms. Aija Kalnaja, Acting Head of Operations Department** presented the status of Grant Procedure 2018. Next year there will be two parallel grant processes, one is a normal call for applications and the other is the call for the establishment of CKCs. For the normal call there were 83 activities available for the call and CEPOL has received 64 applications, while CKCs will cover 17 activities. As further steps – if current budget situation remains – it is proposed to withdraw 4 activities, which did not receive any application.

She underlined that the commitment of the network has increased by 10% and thanked the efforts and contributions of the Austrian and Estonian presidencies regarding the successful Framework Partners' meetings.

Responding to **Germany**, **Ms Kalnaja** informed that CEPOL will launch a call for Member States for experts for the evaluation group tasked to set up the evaluation mechanism for the pilot. In addition, there will be a representative from CEPOL and Commission will be invited to take part.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

### ITEM 9.2 CEPOL Knowledge Centres

*Presenter* : Acting Head of Operations Department

*Took the Floor* : see Item 9.1

In line with the distributed room document this Item has been covered together with agenda Item 9.1, above.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

### ITEM 9.3 Update on EU-STNA

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

*Took the Floor* : Czech Republic, Poland, Germany, France

In her presentation the **Acting Head of Operations Department** gave an update regarding the recent developments in EU-STNA. The methodology had been completed by Deloitte in July 2017. The first EU-STNA, covering the period 2018/2021, will be a pilot exercise. The process started in October 2017 and will last maximum 1 year. The first evaluation of the EU-STNA is foreseen in 2020. She underlined that EU-STNA is an EU product to find out the capability challenges to be addressed by training at the EU level and to define those training needs, require priority. Hence, the contribution of Member States is paramount for ensuring relevance.

Considering that contact points for EU-STNA are appointed by LEWP, the **Czech Republic** asked if there is any advice for CNUs to follow. The **Acting Head of Operations Department** explained that EU-STNA is meant for decision makers hence the involvement of LEWP in nominating contact points that said, the establishment of contact points for EU-STNA is a national prerogative and CEPOL does not envisage involving CEPOL CNUs.

**Germany** and **France** informed that their EU-STNA contact points will be with the CNUs, however in Germany the final decision is not yet taken.

Responding to Poland, the agency clarifies that every effort will be made where possible to combine meetings of professional networks with the EU-STNA meetings to alleviate the costs. **France** thanked the Commission and CEPOL for the EU-STNA.

**Conclusion: The MB took note on the update.**

**ITEM 9.4 MB Decision 32/2017/MB on OTNA**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Acting Head of Operations Department</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>the Netherlands, Acting Executive Director</i>

The **Acting Head of Operations Department** presented the OTNA methodology, key stages of the development so far and the draft timelines for the implementation of the pilot OTNA on counterterrorism and CSDP Mission training. Finally, she has requested the voting members’ opinion and consideration for adopting MB Decision 32/2017/MB on OTNA.

According to **the Netherlands** the cover letter and text refers to strands 1 and 2, which are the responsibilities of the Member States and not CEPOL, hence recommended the following correction on page 8 of the decision’s annex:

*Old text:*

“Additionally, MS will be provided with the possibility of including training needs pertaining to strands 1 and 2 of the LETS with a view to CEPOL’s possible supporting role as detailed in the LETS.”

*New text:*

„Additionally, *where explicitly asked by Member States they will be provided with the possibility of including training needs pertaining to strands 1 and 2 of the LETS with a view to CEPOL’s possible supporting role as detailed in the LETS.*”

**Voting:**

With the mentioned correction, decision **32/2017/MB** has been unanimously adopted.

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted 32/2017/MB**

**ITEM 10. External Relations**

**ITEM 10.1 Update on Working Arrangements**

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Acting Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Germany</i>

As an introduction, the **Acting Executive Director** informed that since the previous MB meeting CEPOL has concluded Working Arrangement (WA) with FYROM and Serbia, OSCE, and ESDC, while the WA with INTERPOL is likely to be signed by the end of the year. Besides, there are ongoing negotiations with Ukraine and Colombia, EUIPO, ENFSI, FRONTEX, UNODC.

**Germany** proposed to discuss the Working Arrangements during the next MB meeting (e.g. should it be processed in written procedures or during the regular MB meetings? Which countries to be contacted? etc.).

**Conclusion: The MB took note of the update and the proposal of Germany will be included in the agenda of the next MB meeting.**

## ITEM 10.2 Capacity building projects

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Acting Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Commission, Belgium, France, Poland</i>

The **Acting Executive Director** informed that the operational phase of the MENA project on counter terrorism will be closed very soon and informed about its continuation with 2 more countries (Algeria and Morocco) starting from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018.

Besides, from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 CEPOL will start another project on financial investigations in cooperation with UNODC, covering the Balkan region. In 2018 CEPOL will also start a project on digital forensics, taking it over from OLAF, in the context of the Hercules program.

The **Commission**, supported by **Belgium, France and Poland**, proposed to extend the discussions of the next MB agenda point on Working Arrangements and capacity building projects in 3<sup>rd</sup> countries to have a strategic discussion on agency's external relations in general.

**Poland** asked why digital forensic project is not included in the 2018 SPD. In his response the **Acting Executive Director** explained that the agency will initiate the amendment of SPD 2018 to the MB once the draft contract with OLAF is mature enough.

**Conclusion: The MB took note and will include Commission's proposal for the next MB agenda point**

## ITEM 11. Legal matters

### ITEM 11.1 Update on Implementing Rules

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

**Head of CSD** informed that there has been discussion between the Standing Working Party of the Agencies and DG HR on the precise scope of application of Article 110 of the Staff Regulation. It is also a point of contention that if the Agencies have opted out of a General Implementing Provision (GIP) or adopted a model decision, a decision of the Commission amending the GIP does not apply to the Agencies. However, the Commission has firmly rejected this approach and believes that the amending Commission Decision does apply by analogy.

He has also reviewed the latest Implementing Rules on staff regulations adopted and Communicated by the Commission, He underlined the importance of the Implementing Rules regarding **Contract Agents** since CEPOL already has a high number of contract agents and there is an additional need to recruit many more for the externally funded projects.

**Conclusion: The MB took note on the update**

### ITEM 11.2 Information on MB Decision on handling classified information

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

**Head of CSD** informed on a forthcoming MB Decision on handling classified information, in line with Article 30 of CEPOL regulation, i.e. Security rules on the protection of classified and sensitive non-classified information. CEPOL has to apply the Commission's security rules for protecting European Union Classified Information (EUCI) and sensitive non-classified information, as set out in Commission Decisions 2015/443 and 2015/444.

In May 2017 the MB adopted its decision on the application by analogy of Decision 2015/443 – on Security. Now working continues on the draft MB decision on the application by analogy of Commission Decision 2015/444 on the security rules for protection of EU classified information. On the foundation of these MB decisions CEPOL has to set up a security training plan for staff, security notices giving guidance to staff and specific training for staff dealing with EUCI. Besides, CEPOL needs to develop an SLA with DG HR on security related cooperation.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

### ITEM 12. Task of CEPOL National Units

*Presenter* : Ms Ingrid Weissova, Slovakia

*Took the Floor* : Acting Executive Director, Poland

**Ms Weissova** expressed the apology of Mr Marek Kordik for not being present and read his statement regarding the outcomes on the tasks of the CNU. According to the statement the document has been circulated among CNUs several times incorporating all comments, then the procedure has been finalised by CNU Slovakia in February 2017 and forwarded to CEPOL HQ for circulation among all CNU. (Circulated on 17 February 2017).

**Poland** advised the recirculation of the document among the MB for consideration. In his answer, the **Acting Executive Director** recommended that since this document has already been distributed as a meeting document for this agenda item, the MB can take note of it, already at this stage. In this way it will become part of the documentation. He reminded that it can only be considered as guidance for the national authorities, because setting up of CNU is a national responsibility.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

### ITEM 13. Cancellation of the Leadership seminar

*Presenter* : Hugo Tavares, Portugal

*Took the Floor* : Malta, Estonia, Germany, the Netherlands

**Portugal** informed that the official information received from the organiser of the seminar has been distributed to all MB meeting participants. On CNU level there is no additional information so far, but if it is needed, the Portuguese CNU is ready to seek for it. Furthermore, he informed that the CNU will take additional steps to provide additional training to the new Framework Partners on course organisation, since the CNU philosophy is to keep the high standards of quality for the courses, Framework Partners organise.

**Malta** noted that in the distributed information Malta is listed as having nominated a member to participate in this course, however, it was not the case.

According to **Estonia**, supported by **Germany** and **the Netherlands**, delays in sending out invitations is a more general problem even though CEPOL rules state that course invitations must be sent out 3 months before the event starts. In case of such a high-level course, invitations should be sent out 1 year before the event.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 14. AOB

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Chair of Selection Committee (SC) for new CEPOL Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Poland, Ms Frederike Everts, Mr Eric Boisnaud</i>

### A) Online meeting with the Chair of the Selection Committee for new CEPOL ED

The **Chair of SC** summarised the main steps of the selection process. 34 applications from 14 Member States have been received, 7 from Italy, 6 from Spain, 3 from Greece, 3 from Portugal, 2-2 from Finland, France, Germany Belgium and Poland, and 1-1 from Croatia, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Slovenia, Romania.

Following Commission's assessment, 12 candidates fulfilled the eligibility criteria, which was confirmed by the Selection Committee. Based on the Selection Committee's further analysis, 6 candidates were invited to the assessment centre and these 6 candidates have also been invited to an interview in front of the Selection Committee. As a result, 3 candidates have been selected to be invited for a final interview in front of the Management Board on 19 December 2017.

**Belgium** and **Latvia** asked why these 3 final candidates cannot be named at the current stage, and by when the names will be known for the MB.

In his answer the **Chair of SC** told that the Selection Committee would like to inform the candidates themselves first and only then circulate the results among the MB. The **Chair of CEPOL MB** told that the names of the 3 final candidates will be sent to the MB members by 24 November.

The **Chair of SC** has thanked the MB for their trust and expressed his appreciation for the efforts of CEPOL HR team. The **Chair of CEPOL MB** reminded to the confidentiality of the material that will be distributed to MB and to the sensitivity of the related data.

### B) Integrated guidelines for CEPOL courses

Based on preliminary consultations with some other countries **Poland** expressed, that the integrated guidelines for CEPOL courses should be adopted by the MB. They also foresee possible conflicts between candidates selected by CNUs and the final choices of the course manager.

**The Acting Head of Operations Department** informed that it is a living document so CEPOL is ready to take recommendations on board to update the guidelines for future calls. The **Acting Executive Director** added that the MB already decided with the current approach and is the Integrated Guide is too much a technical document to be discussed on MB level.

**Poland** accepted the replies and asked for the recirculation of the document.

### C) Leaving Members

**The Chair** announced that 2 members will leave the MB. **Ms Frederike Everts** expressed her honour to be a member and then a Chair of the MB, underlining that the future of our society is safety and development. **Mr Eric Boisnaud** as alternate member of the MB expressed his proudness on the developments achieved together and his deeper thanks to all members, as well as to his mentor, Mr. Perez.

**Conclusion: The MB took note on the information**

### ITEM 15. Date of future meetings

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

It has been agreed, that the next MB meeting will take place on 15-16 May, 2018 in Bulgaria.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

### ITEM 16. TRIO Presidency Priorities

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Svetlozar Markov, incoming EU Presidency</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

**Bulgaria** gave a short introduction to the priorities of the Bulgarian presidency. The Bulgarian Ministry of Interior has three priorities: 1. Effective management of migration; 2. Active police cooperation, exchange of information between law enforcement agencies and the best use of European database services; 3. Effective cooperation between EU and the Western-Balkan countries. As a presidency activity, Bulgaria will organise a course on cross-border surveillance with a study visit to a police-custom cooperation centre.

A video clip has also been played introducing Bulgaria and Sofia.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

### ITEM 17. Closing of the meeting

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

In the name of the Estonian Presidency **Mr Priit Heinsoo** expressed his warm farewell wishes to the participants and the **MB Chair** thanked the Estonian Presidency, the participants, presenters and CEPOL for their work and officially closed the meeting.

*Vienna, 22 January 2018*

*Budapest, 30 January 2018*

*<Signature on file>*

*<Signature on file>*

*Mr Norbert Leitner*

*Mr Detlef Schroeder*

*Chair of CEPOL Management Board*

*Acting 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 (alternate member)	Svetlozar	MARKOV
CROATIA	Danijela	PETKOVIC
CYPRUS	Georgios	FANGOS
CZECH REPUBLIC (alternate member)	Lukas	MACKE
ESTONIA	Elmar	NURMELA
European Commission – DG HOME (alternate member)	Victoria	AMICI
FINLAND	Kimmo	HIMBERG
FRANCE (alternate member)	Eric	BOISNAUD
GERMANY	Matthias Ernst	ZEISER
GREECE (alternate member)	Dimitrios	KRIERIS
HUNGARY	Emese	HORVACZY
IRELAND	Margaret	NUGENT
ITALY	Gennaro	VECCHIONE
LATVIA	Gatis	SVIKA
LITHUANIA	Tomas	BIKMANAS
LUXEMBOURG	Marc	WELTER
MALTA	Mario	SPITERI
NETHERLANDS	Frederike	EVERTS
POLAND	Irmina	GOLEBIEWSKA
PORTUGAL	Isabel	POLONIA NICO
ROMANIA	Ovidiu	MACOVEI
SLOVAKIA (representative with proxy)	Ingrid	WEISSOVA
SLOVENIA	Damjan	ZAGAR
SPAIN (alternate member)	Eduardo	BOROBIO
SWEDEN (alternate member)	Ulf	SYDORF

**Member State observers:**

AUSTRIA	Gerhard	HABERLER
BELGIUM	Isabelle	BORREMANS
CROATIA	Valerija	BENCERIC
CYPRUS	Georgios	CHRISTOPOULOS
ESTONIA (MB Deputy Chair)	Priit	HEINSOO
ESTONIA	Priit	PÄRKNA
ESTONIA	Eva	ALLIKSOO
ESTONIA	Malle	TIIRUSSON
ESTONIA		
FINLAND	Pasi	KEMPPAINEN
FRANCE	Emmanuel	GRAVIER
GERMANY	Lars	WAGNER
GERMANY	Eva	DWERTMANN
HUNGARY	Bence	MESZAROS
IRELAND	Alan	MCLEISH
ITALY	Massimo	TULINI
LATVIA	Inguna	TRULE
LITHUANIA	Karolina	VAICIENE
NETHERLANDS	Sandra	WIJKHUIJS
POLAND	Anna	GRUNT
PORTUGAL	Hugo	TAVARES
ROMANIA	Alina	BOICU
SPAIN	Gabriel	VALLEJOS

**Other observers:**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>
European Commission – DG HOME	Merit	VERTMANN
Audit Panel	Katarzyna	KLIMCZAK-SYCH

**CEPOL HQ:**

<b>Function</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>
Executive Director (ED)	Ferenc	BANFI
Acting Executive Director (AED)	Detlef	SCHRODER
Head of Corporate Services Department (HoCSD)	Roeland	WOLDHUIS
Acting Head of Operations Department (AHoOD)	Aija	KALNAJA
Governance Assistant (Outcomes)	Gyorgy	ISPANKI
Governance Support Assistant	Cecilia	DUBOIS