



**Outcomes of Proceedings of the
5th CEPOL Management Board Meeting
19-21 November 2018
Vienna, Austria
Chair: Mr Norbert LEITNER**

ITEM 1. Welcome by the Chair

Presenter : Mr Norbert LEITNER, MB Chair

Took the Floor : -

The **Chair** welcomed the delegates and guests to the 5th Management Board meeting, introduced the new MB members, CEPOL's management team members, and announced that the meeting will be recorded.

ITEM 2. Welcome by the Presidency

Presenter : Mr Norbert LEITNER, MB Chair

Took the Floor : Ms Mailis PUKONEN, Head of Operations Department and Ms Agnieszka BIEGAJ, Head of Training and Research Unit

The **Chair** regretted to inform participants that the Director General of the Ministry of Interior was not able to attend the meeting due to prior commitments. Hence, the opening speech of the presidency was given by the Chair, on behalf of the Ministry of Interior.

In his welcoming speech, the **Chair** underlined that in line with its motto of "A Europe that protects", the Austrian Presidency put emphasis on areas where the EU has a particular protective role, such as the strengthening of the EU's external borders, establishing a crisis resistant EU asylum system, removing the breeding ground for violent extremism and terrorism, as well as guaranteeing digital security. As part of the six-month roadmap, Austria has hosted several key events in these fields with all actors involved. Besides, several ongoing dossiers have been featured prominently, such as the BREXIT, the inter-institutional negotiations of a new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021-2027, the reform of the EU and other important legislative proposals in the area of justice and home affairs.

Regarding CEPOL's core business, the Austrian presidency strongly supported CEPOL in the implementation of its work programme, and widely advocated the Agency's initiative for a comprehensive approach towards a Quality Assurance System for CEPOL's training products.

Finally, the **Chair** thanked the Deputy Chair, Mr Elmar Nurmela for the great support as well as the excellent work done by the Estonian presidency during the second half of 2017 as well as by the Bulgarian Presidency in the first half of 2018 in bringing forward the ambitious EU agenda in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice. Closing his welcome speech he gave the floor to **Ms Mailis PUKONEN**, new Head of Operations Department, and **Ms Agnieszka BIEGAJ**, new Head of Training Unit, who have shortly introduced themselves.

ITEM 3. Adoption of the Agenda

Presenter : Chair

Took the Floor : -

The **Chair** reported about one proxy vote from Sweden, given to the MB Chair. Regarding the voting procedure he told that including the proxy vote all 27 Members are represented, i.e. the total number of eligible votes is 27. Hence, for a qualified (two-third) majority 18 votes while for simple majority 14 votes will be needed. Finally, he announced that regarding Item 10.1.1, Item 10.1.2 and Item 10.2, room documents have been distributed.

After summarising the voting rules the **Chair** invited Voting Members to vote on the draft Agenda.

Voting results: In favour: 27 members; Against: 0; Abstained: 0

Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft Agenda

ITEM 4. Announcements by the European Commission

Presenter : Ms Victoria Amici, European Commission

Took the Floor : -

Ms Amici provided an update on the ongoing work since the 4th MB meeting of May 2018 in the area of security. She referred to Mr President Juncker's State of the Union Address in September 2018, calling for leadership in completing the security union. Supporting the President's message, the Commission presented proposals aiming at strengthening security and reinforcing the protection of EU borders. In this regard the Commission presented a legal framework allowing the swift removal of terrorist content off the web and proposed a regulation aimed at pooling resources and expertise in cyber technology through the creation of a dedicated network of cyber security competence centres. Besides, the Commission submitted an initiative to extend the tasks of the newly established European Public Prosecutor's Office to include the fight against terrorist offences, affecting more than one Member State. Furthermore, the Commission put forward proposals to strengthen the protection of external borders by extending the competences of European Border and Coast Guard and by reinforcing its capacity to act.

She underlined, that the upcoming months will be rather decisive from the interinstitutional point of view, in order to advance on pending legislative proposals. Agreement has been reached on several items, e.g. on the European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS), on strengthening the Schengen Information System (SIS), as well as on reinforcing the mandate of Eu-LISA. Besides, agreement has been reached on the most stringent rules to criminalise money laundering.

Still, there are further steps needed regarding the proposal on interoperability of information systems at EU level, the proposal on the European Criminal Record on Information System (ECRIS), as well as the latest proposals on European Dactyloscopy (Eurodac). She also reminded, that concerning the directives on Passenger Name Record (PNR), on Data protection in law enforcement, and on security of Network Information Systems (NIS), the transposition work is still not completed by all Member States.

Regarding budget she announced that as a top-up of CEPOL's 2018 subsidy a transfer of 1.2 MEUR took place, allowing the Agency to upgrade its IT system. Regarding next year's budget she told that no agreement has been reached in the conciliation procedure between Parliament and Council. As a result, the Commission needs to propose a new budget. If the annual budget is still not adopted at the beginning of the next year, the system of provisional twelfths applies.

Concluding her speech she congratulated the recently appointed CEPOL colleagues and informed that since September, DG HOME has a new Director for Security, Mr Laurent MUSCHEL, as former Director Mr Luigi SORECA has been appointed as Head of the EU Delegation to Albania. Mr MUSCHEL will visit CEPOL in early January 2019.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the announcements.

ITEM 5. Management Board Matters

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

Presenter	: MB Chair and Ms Victoria Amici, European Commission
Took the Floor	: Mr Kimmo Himberg

The **MB Chair** explained that following the incoming Trio Presidency's nomination on behalf of the Presidency Trio, *Mr Kimmo Himberg* (Finland) is the candidate for the incoming Chairperson of the Management Board, and *Ms Danijela Petkovic* is the candidate for the incoming Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board. In line with Article 2 of the rules of procedures of the MB, the Chair invited Ms Amici, to chair this agenda item. **Ms Amici** informed that this election requires a 2/3 majority of votes in favour of the candidates and invited the Voting members to vote first on the incoming Chairperson, and then for the incoming Deputy Chairperson.

Both *Mr Kimmo Himberg* and *Ms Danijela Petkovic* have been elected unanimously. The **Chair** congratulated both the incoming Chair and Deputy Chair for their election. The **incoming Chair** thanked the strong trust expressed and told that the incoming Trio has already had its first meeting to harmonise their priorities, that will be presented under Item 13.

Voting results regarding the new incoming MB Chair:

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

Voting results regarding the new incoming MB Deputy Chair:

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

Conclusion: Effective from 1 January 2019 the new MB Chair and Deputy Chair have been elected.

ITEM 6. Orientation Debates

ITEM 6.1 Comprehensive Quality Management of CEPOL Activities

Presenter	: Executive Director, Mr Gerhard Haberler, AT Presidency
Took the Floor	: all members

The **Executive Director** welcomed all participants and gave a short introduction to the orientation debate on Comprehensive Quality Management of CEPOL Activities. He underlined that CEPOL's core tasks cannot be fully accomplished unless its training and learning services are of excellent quality and invited participants to discuss possible ways to develop a comprehensive Quality management framework for CEPOL's training portfolio.

The **Chair** also invited Mr Gerhard Haberler, Chair of the 5th CNU meeting to provide additional information to the MB based on the CNU workshop on Quality assurance. (See also Item 11.1)

During the debate the following two questions have been discussed:

- **Question 1:** *Do the Members of the Management Board agree that CEPOL needs to further improve the quality of its training in a comprehensive way to achieve excellent results?*
- **Question 2:** *What would be the main principles along which CEPOL shall develop a comprehensive quality management system for its activities, and what would be a reasonable timeframe to do that in cooperation with the CNUs?*

Following the **Chair's** invitation, **all members** shared their views regarding the raised questions. The first question has been unanimously supported by all delegates, while question 2 raised several ideas, proposals and remarks:

According to **Austria** (supported by **Belgium, Luxemburg, Latvia, Slovakia** and **Estonia**) experts delivering training activities should be trained on how to use more effective training methods. **Romania** underlined the importance of consistent and coherent training activities, with an improved cooperation between CEPOL and the CNUs. **Finland** – supported by **Portugal**, and **the Netherlands** - proposed to define quality for CEPOL activities, in order to ensure that all approaches

are relying on the same principles. In this regard a Knowledge Management System (KMS) would also be welcome. **Croatia** pointed out that even though the selection procedure is functioning well, the rules laid down in the Integrated Guidance Note are not always followed and activity managers tend to replace the 1st candidate without consulting the CNU. **Hungary** and **Italy** supported the CNU's key role in the selection process, as well, while **Sweden**, **Belgium** and **Lithuania** proposed to clarify the role of activity managers, since sometimes they have a more holistic view on the composition of the training participants.

According to **Germany**, teaching methods to be applied in a course should be the decision of the teacher/trainer, while the term "excellence" should rather be used in a higher educational context. For tailor-made courses it is advisable to ask the participants' line managers regarding the expected learning outcomes.

Portugal, **Sweden**, **Spain**, **Estonia**, **Luxemburg** and **Latvia** proposed more flexibility in the number of training days and seats provided. According to **Slovenia**, **Sweden** and **Hungary** the outcomes of CNU Workshop 1 is an excellent starting point to find solutions for quality development, and the first few steps could already be taken before the next MB meeting.

France, **Belgium** and **Greece** were wondering about the scope of the debate, since following the last MB meeting in Sofia, cyber activities have been excluded after the strategic debate without the formal approval of any strategic paper by the MB. As far as the scope of the training needs are concerned, these have been analysed by the quality initiatives of EU-STNA and OTNA. **France** and **Estonia** also supported the certification of CEPOL products based on the recommendations of the expert group on EQF. According to **France**, **Estonia**, **Spain**, and **Czech Republic**, sharing experiences could also be useful in order to improve the quality of recurrent activities, while the development of testing, selection and systematic payment of trainers would also support quality improvement.

Czech Republic is struggling to nominate and motivate the right people for improving their skills and competences, while language barriers are also creating significant bottlenecks. **Belgium** noted that certification is not a guarantee for good quality and highlighted the importance of adult training aspects, like flexibility in training and learning methods in order to avoid monotonous presentations after each other. These apply to CEPOL's internal/network meetings, as well. Establishing CKCs had quality improvement related purposes, as well.

According to **Cyprus** the outcomes of the work of the expert group on EQF is a prerequisite for answering quality related questions, and further steps in quality development should also be defined by experts familiar with this field.

Poland highlighted that even though quality development is a permanent process, more attention should be given to the development of trainings, to the selections of target groups, and to motivational benefits of activity managers, as key persons of quality development. On the other hand, the effectiveness of external audits is questionable.

Ireland noted that CEPOL activities are highly graded by the participants, which is a good indication of quality. Hence, Member States should be complemented in relation to their work achieving such an outcome. Ireland provides trainings also based on a blended approach ensuring that the participants of the programs must engage in the learning development programme with pre-course and post-course work. The outcome of the expert group on the accreditation of CEPOL activities might create the necessary requirements for more robust quality assurance systems combined with external examination of programs.

According to **Lithuania** and **Latvia**, pre-testing and post-testing of training participants would help to select the right people, while CKCs could solve content and training material related problems, as well.

Greece reminded that a list of templates serves the standardization of procedures, e.g. the T05 curriculum template requires from the activity manager to include the objectives, teaching methods,

needs for presentation tools, outcomes, target groups, etc. Hence, quality aspects are ensured by the templates.

The Netherlands underlined that a quality management system is not an automatic guarantee for an improved quality, there should also be quality specific questions answered. Besides, the outcomes of the EU-STNA and OTNA, as well as the forthcoming evaluation of CKC pilots could provide inputs for an analysis on the quality improvement needs for CEPOL. Hence, the means of implementation should be defined via a step-by-step approach.

Slovakia and **Estonia** reminded that less is more, hence, the volume of CEPOL courses should be considered, in order to find a good balance between quality and quantity. A bit less focus on quantity would give more room for concentrating also on quality.

Regarding teaching methods **Malta** underlined that blended learning contributes more to learning achievements, since participants learn best when they are active and engaged. Hence, the flipped learning approach should also be considered for residential activities, in a way that participants are introduced to the learning material prior to the training event, and classroom time would then be devoted to deepening understanding, discussion with colleagues, and joint problem solving, facilitated by the nominated experts.

The **Commission** welcomed the opportunity for having such orientation debates where Voting Members alongside with CNU representatives can discuss topics of common interest. Resulting in concrete steps towards the quality improvement of CEPOL activities would considerably promote excellence in EU level training activities for law enforcement.

In his response, the **Executive Director** informed that CEPOL needs to improve its evaluation system, ensuring that it gives a good basis for developing future curricula. He agreed to support experts with effective training methodologies and to find a more flexible solution for the number of seats and days. Answering **France**, he pointed out that the orientation debate is a very important instrument to get a comprehensive picture on MB members' strategic interests and propose directions for development. He reminded that cyber activities have been excluded based on the decision of the MB on the list of 2019 grants, and not because of the former strategic debate. He welcomed the proposal of **Malta** on a flipped classroom even if it requires different teaching and moderating abilities and profiles. Replying to **Estonia** he agreed that CEPOL will need the right IT infrastructure in order to enable blended learning and hoped that the planned IT developments will provide the necessary resources for implementing it.

Following the debate, but also in the context of quality assurance, **Ms Katarzyna Klimczak-Sych, Chair of IAP** made a short summary statement concerning the Audit Panel's annual work, and informed that according to a forthcoming draft decision, the IAP's mandate would be reduced to ad hoc audits, only. She reminded that the Audit Panel is a tool of the MB, however, such a reduction would make IAP mostly inactive.

ITEM 6.2 Future business implementation model for CEPOL – CKCs and possible alternatives

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director, Mr Gerhard Haberler, Chair of CNU meeting</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>all members</i>

In his introductory speech the **Executive Director** underlined that CEPOL must be able to provide top quality learning and training opportunities in an agile, flexible and successful manner in terms of business and budget implementation. To achieve this, more responsive training models should be developed that could serve in a complementary way to the currently tried CKC model for the sustainable development of content of activities. He recommended to consider the centralization of some of the required, training related administrative issues. This could completely take away the overhead of Grant Agreements.

During the debate the following question has been discussed:

- **Question:** *Does the Management Board agree that the Agency should develop until the next MB meeting concrete proposals for alternative business models for the implementation of the CEPOL portfolio, in line with the principles of sound financial and administrative management, as well as that of the primacy of quality of learning and training?*

Even though members agreed that the availability of additional training solutions - especially to cover urgent needs - is useful, delegates raised several ideas, proposals and remarks:

Malta - supported by the **Netherlands, Greece, Poland, Hungary, Belgium, Sweden, France, Germany, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Portugal, Germany, Croatia,** and **Finland** - proposed to wait for the results of the expert group's evaluation, change should not be done just for the sake of changing, but only when it brings an enhanced impact. **Malta** – supported by **Bulgaria, Estonia, Luxembourg, Italy, Lithuania, Cyprus, Italy, Greece, Luxembourg, Hungary, Belgium, Sweden, Slovenia, Portugal, and Croatia** - believed that centralising administrative aspects in the implementation of training may lead to more efficiency. According to **Finland**, centralized administrative processes are rather fine-tuning the current model than a novel business model. This is not a solution, which will shorten the time span from idea to implementation: there are still many time-consuming steps in planning and implementing training activities even when administration is centralized.

Slovakia – supported by the **Netherlands, Latvia, Greece, Ireland, Poland, Czech Republic, Sweden, Slovenia, Portugal,** and **Croatia** - reminded that centralised administrative activities of remote companies are not provided for free (usually 10 % fee is charged), and still, several, related tasks are expected to be arranged locally. Hence, in order to make a sound decision, the MB should also be informed about the procedure and foreseen expenses of such a service.

According to **Ireland**, in case of a centralised administration the time required for tendering and procurement would have an impact on the grant agreement timeline each year. The systems existing at national level can get better value, since Framework Partners can be proactive in dealing with service providers, hotels, transport companies, etc.

Poland and **France** believed that even if centralisation is worth serious consideration, the final decision on a centralised or decentralized model of administration should be made by the respective member state responsible for the organisation of the activity. **France** - supported by **Austria** - also reminded that when training activities organised within the Member States, participants benefit not only from the learning content, but also from the national experience of the hosting institutions, and from intensive professional exchanges. **Austria** also underlined the positive aspects of the grant system, including its transparency and clear selection criteria.

Germany recommended to talk about “further models” instead of “alternative models” and believed in the principle of subsidiarity, meaning that organisation should be done at local level and the central authority should only step in when tasks cannot be performed at a more local level. **Romania** will submit a proposal for an alternative business model by end January 2019.

Belgium asked about the possible extension of the mandate of the expert group until the end of 2019, in order to give an assessment not only on the implementation phase, but also on the implemented activities' quality of the CKC. Regarding the centralised administration of the FPs' activities Belgium wondered about the capacity of the Agency to fulfil such tasks.

In his reply, the **Executive Director** expressed that one of the debate's aim was to discuss how CKCs' administrative responsibilities could be simplified in order to have more capacity to content development related work. The proposed alternative solution for the administration of the activities is not a contradiction to the further development of the CKC's approach. CKCs could be the key instrument for the content in the assigned areas. Considerations for the financial administration of the activities can be completely independent from this. The Agency plans to provide the MB with a concrete proposal in this regard for the next MB meeting, while the implementation is only foreseen from 2020 onwards.

He also stressed that within the actual circumstances CEPOL's budget implementation is handed out to Framework Partners, therefore, spending cannot be followed up closely. Hence, the 95% implementation rate required from the Agency is not ensured. This is one of the main reasons why CEPOL is looking for other administrative solutions. Besides, more flexible training models are also needed, in order to react on urgent needs immediately.

Answering **Ireland** and **Germany** he noted that no additional procurement is needed, however, the capacity of the Agency needs to be analysed. Replying **Belgium** he told that if budget allows, both the scope and the duration of the expert group's mandate can be extended, but only on a step-by-step basis, based on the usefulness and the quality of the reports delivered within the existing time frame.

ITEM 7. Agency Progress report

ITEM 7.1 Agency progress report – to end of September

Presenter : Executive Director

Took the Floor : -

The **Executive Director** gave an overview on the core business of CEPOL, with special emphasis on residential training activities, webinars, online learning modules, as well as participations in exchanges. In addition to the business figures provided for the MB, he underlined, that the 2018 budget envelope of CEPOL is reaching its absolute limits, resulting in the postponement or cancellation of some of the activities in order to balance the budget. He pointed out that while CEPOL is operating under the same budget year by year, the market has moved on, prices have been increased, sometimes radically, especially regarding flight tickets and accommodation. Since there are no considerable budget increases foreseen, CEPOL needs to take decisions on how to manage its available funds.

He informed that according to recent calculations CEPOL can expect a higher than 95% budget implementation rate for 2017, hence, there won't be an automatic budget cut due to underspending.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report.

ITEM 8. Planning and budgeting

ITEM 8.1 CEPOL Single Programming Document 2018

Presenter : Executive Director

Took the Floor : -

The **Executive Director** informed, that CEPOL will receive an additional 1.2 MEUR subsidy from the Commission to be spent on its ICT infrastructure, hence, an amendment of SPD 2018 is foreseen soon. For this reason, no meeting document has been prepared for this agenda item, and the MB will be asked to vote on the amended SPD 2018 via written procedure.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 8.2 CEPOL Single Programming Document 2019

Presenter : Executive Director

Took the Floor : Poland, Portugal, Germany, Estonia, Commission

The **Executive Director** informed that the multi-annual programming and annual work programme 2019 (SPD 2019) tabled for the Management Board needs to be withdrawn from voting, due to technical reasons. Namely, due to insufficient grant applications from Member States, CEPOL need to re-adjust the list of activities to be implemented by CEPOL with implication on HR and budget resources.

The **Commission** added that CEPOL will soon receive the Commission's Opinion on the draft multi-annual programming and annual work programme 2019, which also needs to be analysed and considered in the final draft.

Answering questions and comments of **Poland, Portugal, Germany** and **Estonia** on the actual draft version of the document the **Executive Director** explained that due to the tight budget it is unlikely to cover training activities from the reserve list. Regarding the number of additional posts, he reminded that CEPOL is repeatedly requesting 8 additional posts in order to fulfil its new tasks generated from the new mandate. Project related human resources are additions to these, fully covered by the project funds. The change from half-board to B&B for participants of CEP is resulting from the fact that it is difficult and expensive to find hotels offering half-board, besides, exchangees

are not often taking the provided dinner at the hotel but they are invited to dinners offered by their hosts.

The **Chair** informed the Management Board that the SPD 2019 document will be launched for voting via written procedure.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 8.3 CEPOL Draft Single Programming Document 2020

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

The **Executive Director** presented the actual status of the first draft of SPD 2020, also referring to the considerable uncertainties regarding the final budget figure for 2019 and its possible effect for year 2020. He recommended to adopt this draft document, since it has to be submitted to Council, Parliament and Commission by the end of 2018. Of course, the document will be further elaborated during next year.

Answering **Poland**, he explained that CEPOL is planning to employ 3 SNEs in SPD 2020; if there is a mismatch in this regard, it will be corrected. The term “*new organisation model*” is used, because the CKC model is not evaluated yet, hence, a more general term is used for the time being.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision **33/2018/MB**.

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

Conclusion: The MB has adopted 33/2018/MB

ITEM 8.4 Update on new CEPOL Building

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

The **Executive Director** informed that since the relocation of CEPOL to Budapest, constraints of the current building due to its size became evident. Beyond the limited office space, the given number of function rooms is a considerable challenge as well, taking into account the increase in volume of trainings delivered at the HQ, and the growing number of visits and events hosted. This has been signalled to the Hungarian Government and the Minister of Interior showed commitment to find a new building for the Agency in Budapest that would provide CEPOL with a long-term, sustainable solution. So far, the Hungarian partners have presented two potential possibilities, and further consultations are still ongoing.

He told, that in this agenda Item the MB is asked to task the Executive Director to further pursue consultations and later negotiations with the host country towards a solution on a new building for the CEPOL HQ in close cooperation and coordination with the Commission.

Answering **Belgium**, he informed that the actual estimations for future building size requirements are considered based on a 10-year needs forecast. The Hungarian government provides the actual facilities for free of charge, including reception, maintenance, 24/7 security services, as well as utilities (except for the telecommunication costs). Costs of a future building are not discussed yet and current cooperation is based on a still valid headquarter agreement.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 9. Core Business

ITEM 9.1 Grants Procedure 2019

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

The **Executive Director** gave a short introduction to the Grants Procedure 2019. He told that out of the 53 available activities, only 40 were applied for. The Agency is currently assessing the resources that would be necessary to take over those activities, framework partners have not (or not

successfully) applied for. Should the necessary resources be made available, CEPOL may be in the position to implement the activities in question, on top of its planned workload for 2019. This is the main reason for withdrawing the tabled SPD 2019 from voting on it at its current stage.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 9.2 Summary on EU-STNA

Presenter : Mr Stefano Failla, Head of Project Management Unit

Took the Floor : the Netherlands, Finland

Mr Stefano Failla, Head of Project Management Unit presented the EU-STNA results achieved so far. In 2018, CEPOL implemented the active phase of the EU-STNA, namely expert consultations and identification of the EU level training needs, consultations with the stakeholders and prioritisation of the identified training needs by the Member States, as well as sharing the preliminary list of identified training needs with the potential training providers for further training coordination.

During the expert consultations, 495 participants took part in the workshops from the EU member states, other countries and EU institutions/agencies. All in all, 184 training needs were identified in 21 main thematic categories and 1 category encompassing other, either specific or horizontal training needs. The EU-STNA report will be presented to the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament in late November.

The **Netherlands** expressed its compliment for the work being done. Despite its complexity the methodology seems to work well. **Finland** underlined the importance of the fact that even in the EU-STNA, training quality has been identified.

Conclusion: The MB took note.

ITEM 9.3 Update on Capacity Building projects

Presenter : Mr Stefano Failla, Head of Project Management Unit

Took the Floor : Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Belgium, Slovakia, Executive Director

Mr Stefano Failla, Head of Project Management Unit informed that CEPOL has successfully concluded the first counter terrorism training partnership project with four countries of the Middle East and North Africa region and the Agency has already started the implementation of two new, 3rd country capacity building projects on counterterrorism and financial investigations. Via these activities the Agency has been able to make a name for itself also as the deliverer of a common and harmonized EU message to its partners in key regions for the external relations of the European Union.

Answering **Germany** and **Poland**, he told that for the MFF 2021-2027 the programming is still ongoing, hence, it is not known at the current stage, if additional countries will be included in future projects, or not. According to ongoing discussions with the MSs and the Commission, possible enlargements towards ENP-East and ENP-South countries are considered, however, no concrete answer can be given at this early stage of the discussions. The profile and thematic focus of the future programmes are also not known yet, regarding ENP-East the profile will be elaborated via a desk review planned for the 1st quarter of 2019. Replying to **Bulgaria** on the reason why the WB FI Exchange Programme time frames have changed, he promised to come back to Bulgaria, due to the specificity of the question.

Belgium noted that the deadline for announcing interest in hosting an activity is end November, however, the results of the grants procedure will not be known by then. This means that it's difficult to accept to host an activity if it is not known, how many physical courses should be implemented. In his answer the **Executive Director** told that the deadline can be extended by few weeks.

Slovakia expressed opposition to the meeting document, because Slovakia does not recognise Kosovo, as a country.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 9.4 Update on the implementation of the two CKC Pilots

Presenter	: Executive Director
Took the Floor	: -

The **Executive Director** referred to the meeting document providing a factual overview of information on the CKC activities in 2018 and aims regarding the training portfolios for 2019 and asked the partners representing the consortia of the 2 CKCs, should there be anything to be added to the document. No comment or question has been raised by the participants.

Conclusion: The MB took note on the update

ITEM 10. Regulatory matters

ITEM 10.1 Update on Implementing Rules

Presenter	: Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department
Took the Floor	: Germany

Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department introduced the three draft MB decisions tabled to the MB. He noted that concerning the draft decisions on *Outside activities*, and on the *Function of Adviser* room documents have been distributed including detailed information on some small changes made since the upload of the documents. Regarding the draft decision on *Whistle blowers* he told, that even though it will be summarised in his presentation, voting will be requested via written procedure, due to the need for some further corrections in the document.

He informed that there are 3 Commission Decisions in different stages of preparations: 2 of them are model decisions (on *Contract agents 3a & 3b*; and on *Types of posts and post titles*), while the third will be a decision on Administrative enquiries and disciplinary procedures.

Answering **Germany**, he explained that the decision on special advisers is stemming from the fact that the Commission has made a decision as a general implementing provision on the Staff regulation with regards to special advisers and based on Article 110 (2) of the Staff regulation, this decision will also be entering into force for CEPOL. Advisers are not envisaged within the budget of CEPOL for the near future, however, at a later stage it can happen, that CEPOL would need the expertise of someone being in an AD 13+ grade, as a special adviser.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision **27/2018/MB** on *Outside activities*.

Voting results: In favour: 27 members; Against: 0; Abstained: 0

Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 27/2018/MB

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision **28/2018/MB** on *the Function of Adviser*.

Voting results: In favour: 27 members; Against: 0; Abstained: 0

Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 28/2018/MB

ITEM 10.2 Draft decision 12/2018/MB on application by analogy of Commission decision 444/2015 on the security rules for protecting EU classified information

Presenter	: Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of CSD
Took the Floor	: -

The **Head of Corporate Services Department** introduced the tabled draft decision. He explained that CEPOL regulation states in article 30 that CEPOL shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, the Commission's security rules for protecting European Union Classified Information (EUCI) and sensitive non-classified information. The Commission security rules on EUCI are laid down in Commission Decision (EU, Euratom) 2015/444. The tabled draft MB decision provides the CEPOL version of this decision, laying down the framework for processing EUCI.

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

Voting results: In favour: 27 members; Against: 0; Abstained: 0

Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 12/2018/MB

ITEM 10.3 Voting on draft MB Decisions

Presenter	: Executive Director
Took the Floor	: the Netherlands, Finland, Poland, Belgium

10.3.1 20/2018/MB On repealing 20/2014/GB

Answering **the Netherlands**, the **Executive Director** explained that the current decision is aiming to repeal the old *Governing Board Decision 20/2014/GB Laying Down Rules Governing the Organisation of Meetings*, since it became outdated. After the approval of its repealing, an Executive Director's decision is supposed to lay down the rules governing the organisation of meetings. For transparency reasons the related draft Executive Director's decision (53/2018/DIR) has also been included in the meeting documents.

Replying **Finland**, he told that the planned reduction of meal costs are stemming from the adjustment towards the mission guide, maximising the meal costs to be calculated for missions. Answering **Poland** and **Belgium**, he explained that the travel bookings for the Management Board meetings will not be changed, and the local transport arrangements for residential activities organised by Framework Partners are not stipulated by this decision. Still, he recommends to FPs to take into consideration of using public transport opportunities instead of other, more expensive means of transport. For activities taking place in Budapest, CEPOL is already excluding the coverage of local transport for training participants.

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

Voting results: In favour: 26 members; **Against:** 0; **Abstained:** 1 (Belgium)

Conclusion: The MB has adopted 20/2018/MB

10.3.2 25/2018/MB On the meeting calendar for 2019 - 1st half

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

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

Conclusion: The MB has adopted 25/2018/MB

10.3.3 26/2018/MB On adopting the revised CEPOL internal control framework

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

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

Conclusion: The MB has adopted decision 26/2018/MB

10.3.4 30/2018/MB On adopting the online module Policing Major Events

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

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

Conclusion: The MB has adopted 30/2018/MB

10.3.5 31/2018/MB On adopting the updated online module THB

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

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

Conclusion: The MB has adopted 31/2018/MB

ITEM 11. Reporting

ITEM 11.1 Update on CNU workshops

<i>Presenter</i>	: Mr Gerhard Haberler, Austrian Presidency
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: Estonia, Executive Director

Mr Haberler summarised the two workshops held during the 5th CNU meeting (9-10 October, Budapest, 2018). *Workshop 1* - summarised before the relevant orientation debate - discussed how CEPOL can strengthen its quality assurance via the building-up of a systematic quality management system that guarantees the high-quality and the development of CEPOL learning and training actions in a multi-annual cycle. *Workshop 2* reviewed the key aspects and the future of the Lecturers, Trainers and Researchers (LTR) Database.

Participants of *CNU Workshop 1* underlined that quality in general is seen as a selling point of CEPOL's products, and the approach for the certification of CEPOL products will be seen positively. It should be recognized though, that CEPOL is in competition with other training providers, and any form of audits of training actions could be a helpful quality assurance mechanism. Hence, the concept of a general assessment strategy for all CEPOL activities should be further improved, and CEPOL's training activities should be developed via a strengthened, multidisciplinary approach.

Regarding the *Future of the LTRdb* **Mr Haberler** highlighted three possible options identified by the participants. *Option A*: CEPOL could make the necessary financial investments to continue and develop LTRdb; *Option B*: without major investments, CEPOL could design it in a more user-friendly manner via small changes; *Option C*: CEPOL could discontinue the LTRdb platform and find experts via public procurement or specific calls - similar to the practice of the MENA project.

The **Executive Director** added that by the current stage he is in the opinion to close down the database, because there is a new Learning Management System (LMS) under development and the integration of the old LTRdb into it would be rather challenging. Besides, the business figures show a very low interest in using the LTRdb. The new LMS might better address such a need via a different approach. **Estonia** added that in its current form the LTRdb is not useful, because it does not offer the possibility for the participants to evaluate the experts, and to give feedback regarding the lecturers and trainers.

Conclusion: The MB took note of the report

ITEM 12. AOB

ITEM 12.1 Brexit and UK nationals employed by CEPOL

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

The **Executive Director** told that CEPOL has at present 2 staff members with (only) a UK nationality, and following the legal consequences of BREXIT their contracts need to be ended. Since the Executive Director is empowered to make an exception to the nationality principle, he will follow the process tabled to the MB. This process gives sufficient opportunity to document the interest of the Agency to continue or terminate the contract of employment of these two staff members with (only) a UK nationality, in a transparent way.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 12.2 Probation period report of the Executive Director

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

The **Commission** informed that the administrative rules require that the newly appointed Executive Director undergo a probationary period. The probationary period has been assessed by a panel of reporting officers, via a midterm and a final report.

The reporting procedure of the panel was carried out according to the rules. Mr Detlef Schröder's report was very positive, hence, the panel decided to confirm him in his appointment.

The **Executive Director** expressed his gratefulness for the trust, and for the opportunity to lead the Agency.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 12.3 Handling a complaint received under Article 90 of the Staff Regulation

Presenter : *Chair*

Took the Floor : -

The **Chair** informed that in June 2018 he received a complaint from a candidate participating in a recruitment procedure for the post of human resource assistant, who has been placed on the reserve list but has not been offered the job. The complainant questioned the credibility of the work performed by the selection committee in relation to the shortlisting of another candidate. The Chair informed that he dismissed the complaint by referring to the following points. According to article 6 of annex III to the Staff Regulation the proceedings of a selection panel are covered by secrecy. Therefore, it was not possible to provide any information linked to the assessment of the other candidates. It is settled case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union that selection panels enjoy a wide margin of discretion when determining whether a candidate's qualification or professional experience corresponds to the level required by the Staff Regulation and the vacancy notice. When assessing candidates, selection panels express a valued judgement of the performance of the candidates and such judgement falls within the wide margin of discretion accorded to the selection panel.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 12.4 Honourable good-bye

Presenter : *Chair*

Took the Floor : *Ms Victoria Amici, Mr Elmar Nurmela, Mr Mario Spiteri*

The **Chair** announced that **Ms Victoria Amici, Mr Elmar Nurmela, Mr Mario Spiteri and Mr Matthias Zeiser** will leave CEPOL community soon. In their farewell speeches **Ms Amici, Mr Nurmela and Mr Spiteri** thanked the trust and cooperation of the Management Board during their membership period.

The **Chair** and the **Executive Director** thanked their work and commitment and wished success in their future career.

Conclusion: The MB thanked the committed work of its leaving members

ITEM 13. Trio Presidency Priorities

Presenter : *Mr Kimmo Himberg, incoming MB Chair, Mr Ovidiu Macovei, incoming Presidency*

Took the Floor : -

Mr Kimmo Himberg, incoming MB Chair presented the draft governmental level priorities of the incoming Presidency Trio, including the finalisation of the still outstanding files of the current Strategic Agenda, and the commitment to the common values of the Union, with special emphasis on the rule of law, cohesion, and respect for fundamental rights.

In the field of *A Union of Freedom, Security and Justice*, in the area of migration the Trio would like to continue to strengthen the control of the EU's external borders, to introduce the new information systems EES and ETIAS, and to implement the necessary quality control mechanisms and the development of the Integrated Border Management Strategy. Regarding Internal Security, priority will be given on Enhancing law enforcement cooperation, Combatting organised crime, Reinforcing the fight against terrorism, Interoperability of information systems, and Cybersecurity. Concerning justice, priorities will include the strengthening of mutual recognition, the advancing of digitalisation, and continuing the effective implementation of EU law.

Within CEPOL MB, the incoming Trio Presidency Priorities will focus on an improved visibility, ensuring the necessary human and financial resources for CEPOL, in order to match the demands of the European LE community. Besides, strategic level discussions will be continued to support CEPOL's active contribution to the internal security of the EU, and to develop CEPOL's new Business Model. Furthermore, emphasis will put on engaging partners, developing a comprehensive

quality management and assurance system for CEPOL, as well as enhancing cooperation with other JHA Agencies.

Representing the incoming presidency, **Mr Ovidiu Macovei** gave a short introduction to the priorities of Romania. The incoming Presidency's motto of "*Cohesion – a common European value*" expresses the will of a holistic approach, recalls the principle of unity of the Member States and outlines the importance of cohesion policy and its key role in attaining the objective of reducing economic, social and territorial disparities among the Member States, regions and citizens of the European Union. The Presidency's programme will focus on four pillars, namely *A converging Europe; A safer Europe; Europe, as a global actor; and A Europe of common values.*

In the name of the incoming Romanian Presidency he kindly invited the MB for its 6th Meeting to be held in May 2019 in Bucharest, at the House of Parliament.

Conclusion: The MB took note

ITEM 14. Closing of the meeting

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

The **MB Chair** thanked the Austrian Presidency team - especially Mr Gerhard Haberler, Ms Carina Meyer, and Ms Jennifer Pandul - for the organisation of the meeting and the 18 month long continuous support during his MB Chairmanship. He also thanked the fruitful cooperation for the Trio partner presidencies - especially Mr Elmar Nurmela, as MB Deputy Chair -, then he officially closed the meeting.

Vienna, 6 March 2019

Budapest, 11 March 2019

<<signature on file >>

<<signature on file >>

Mr Norbert Leitner

Mr Detlef Schroeder

Former Chair of CEPOL Management Board

Executive Director of CEPOL

Annex 1 – List of Meeting Participants

Annex 1. List of Meeting Participants

Chairperson of the Management Board:

Country	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Norbert	LEITNER

Members/Alternate members (with voting right):

Country	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Peter	LAMPLOT
BELGIUM	Alain	RUELLE
BULGARIA (alternate member)	Simo	MIHOV
CROATIA	Danijela	PETKOVIC
CYPRUS	Themistos	ARNAOUTIS
CZECH REPUBLIC (alternate member)	Veronika	RUNDOVÁ
ESTONIA	Kalvi	ALMOSEN
European Commission – DG HOME (alternate member)	Victoria	AMICI
FINLAND	Kimmo	HIMBERG
FRANCE (alternate member)	Emmanuel	GRAVIER
GERMANY	Matthias Ernst	ZEISER
GREECE (alternate member)	Dimitrios	KRIERIS
HUNGARY (alternate member)	Andras	GAAL
IRELAND	Patrick	MURRAY
ITALY	Gennaro	VECCHIONE
LATVIA	Gatis	SVIKA
LITHUANIA	Rimantas	BOBINAS
LUXEMBOURG	Marc	WELTER
MALTA	Mario	SPITERI
NETHERLANDS	Sandra	WIJKHUIJS
POLAND (alternate member)	Piotr	SOCHACKI
PORTUGAL	Paulo	PELICANO
ROMANIA	Ovidiu	MACOVEI
SLOVAKIA (alternate member)	Stanislav	STRAKA
SLOVENIA	Danijel	ZIBRET
SPAIN (alternate member)	Carlos	MORAN FERRES
SWEDEN (proxy given to MB Chair)	- proxy -	- proxy -

Member State observers:

AUSTRIA	Gerhard	HABERLER
BELGIUM	Bart	D'HOOGHE
BULGARIA	Nikola	STALEV
CROATIA	Aleksandar	CUBRILO
CYPRUS	Floris	NIKANDROU
CZECH REPUBLIC	Iva	KRÁKOROVÁ
ESTONIA	Dorel	KAOSAAR
FINLAND	Pasi	KEMPPAINEN
FINLAND	Antti	TALVITIE
FRANCE	Magali	CHASSERIAU
FRANCE	Cindy	BOURGEOIS
GERMANY	Guido	KATTERT
IRELAND	Brian	CONWAY
ITALY	Massimo	TULINI
LATVIA	Inguna	TRULE
LITHUANIA	Rasa	SEJONIENE
MALTA	Angelo	GAFA
NETHERLANDS	Ronald	BRON
POLAND	Anna	GRUNT
PORTUGAL	Rui	PEREIRA
ROMANIA	Calin	BALAEI
SLOVAKIA	Ingrid	WEISSOVA
SLOVENIA	Egidij	GLAVIC
SPAIN	Jose Alberto	RAMIREZ VAZQUEZ
SWEDEN	Ulf	SYDORF

Other observers:

Institution	First Name	Last Name
European Commission – DG HOME	Giulia	CAMOZZINI
Audit Panel - Chair	Katarzyna	KLIMCZAK-SYCH
CEPOL MB Deputy Chair	Elmar	NURMELA

CEPOL HQ:

Function	First Name	Last Name
Executive Director (ED)	Detlef	SCHRÖDER
Head of Corporate Services Department	Roeland	WOLDHUIS
Head of Operations Department	Mailis	PUKONEN
Head of Training and Research Unit	Agnieszka	BIEGAJ
Head of Project Management Unit	Stefano	FAILLA
Governance Assistant (Outcomes)	Gyorgy	ISPANKI
Governance Support Assistant	Cecilia	DUBOIS