

**Outcomes of Proceedings of the  
7<sup>th</sup> CEPOL Management Board Meeting  
19-20 November 2019, Tampere, Finland  
Chair: Dr Kimmo Himberg**

### **ITEM 1. Welcome by the Chair**

*Presenter : Mr Kimmo HIMBERG, MB Chair*

*Took the Floor : -*

The **Chair** welcomed the delegates and guests to the 7<sup>th</sup> Management Board meeting, introduced the new MB voting/alternate members, CEPOL's management team members, and announced that the meeting will be recorded.

### **ITEM 2. Welcome by the Presidency**

*Presenter : Mr Seppo Kolehmainen, Finnish National Police Commissioner*

*Took the Floor : -*

In his welcoming speech, **Mr Seppo Kolehmainen, National Police Commissioner** underlined that hosting the Management Board in Tampere is an extraordinary occasion, since almost exactly 20 years ago the European Council decided during its meeting in Tampere that a common European Police College for law enforcement training was needed. Nr. 47 of the so-called Tampere conclusions meant the establishment of CEPOL, and the Agency has now an important role in fostering law enforcement cooperation, networking, and making law enforcement officers capable to respond to new challenges in their operative environment.

He underlined that some of the Agency's actual challenges (e.g. lack of resources, new business model) cannot be responded to by the Agency alone, Member States also have a key role in designing and making the necessary steps.

### **ITEM 3. Adoption of the Agenda**

*Presenter : Chair*

*Took the Floor : -*

The **Chair** reported about three proxy votes (from Croatia, Ireland and Sweden), given to the MB Chair. Regarding the voting procedure he told that including the proxy votes all 27 Members are represented, i.e. the total number of eligible votes is 27. He announced that a slightly modified Draft Agenda (including sub-item 8.2.1 and 8.3.1), and two room documents have been distributed (a proposal from Finland regarding Item 8.2.1 *Supporting the creation of a new CEPOL Business model by an Expert Group*, and a letter of the LIBE Committee in relation to *Item 8.3 on CEPOL Single Programming Document 2020-2022*).

Finally, 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

### ITEM 4.1 Announcements by the European Commission

Presenter	: Mr Laurent MUSCHEL, European Commission
Took the Floor	: -

**Mr Laurent MUSCHEL** provided an update on the ongoing work since the 6<sup>th</sup> MB meeting of May 2019 in the area of security.

He informed that on 30 October 2019, the Commission adopted its *20th Progress Report towards an effective and genuine Security Union*. Since the new Commission will start its work on 1 December, this report also serves as a review on the security related achievements of the outgoing Commission, including legislation in several important counter terrorism areas, in order to make it harder for terrorists to access explosives, firearms, and prevent the dissemination of terrorist content online, as well as terrorism financing. It became also clear that a joint effort is indispensable to tackle common threats and that IT systems should be looked at in a holistic manner, in order to find synergies and possible gaps, and making them interoperable.

Since the implementation of the interoperability proposals is a key priority for the Commission, the report also calls on the European Parliament and the Council to reach swift agreement on all pending legislative proposals on security information systems, including the technical implementation of ETIAS and the strengthened Visa Information System.

He also recalled that several Member States have not yet fully implemented numerous, key EU security laws on terrorism and cybercrime. These are crucial files, such as the exchange of Passenger Name Record (PNR) data, the Directive on combatting terrorism, the EU rules on stricter access to firearms and the EU anti-money laundering provisions. In addition, several Member States are still not enforcing EU rules on criminalising child sexual abuse and some Member States are not complying with EU legislation on attacks against information systems. The report urges Member States to take the necessary measures and ensure full implementation of all EU security laws.

In the field of CEPOL and its training activities, he underlined the persisting issue of CEPOL's limited resources and the complex challenges ahead of the Agency. He recalled that the discussions on the new MFF are still ongoing, hence, DG HOME is doing its best to raise the issue of resources in all relevant fora. Similarly, he invited MS delegates to contact their national authorities, with a view to supporting a budgetary envelope for the Agency, which should be fully in line with its mandate and increasing tasks.

#### Conclusion: The MB took note

### ITEM 4.2 Strategic statement of the Executive Director

Presenter	: Dr.h.c. Detlef SCHROEDER, Executive Director
Took the Floor	: -

The **Executive Director** welcomed all participants and presented his strategic point of view regarding CEPOL's mid- and long-term perspectives and key challenges.

He informed that the Agency's operational activities are running very smoothly, and it is foreseen that by the end of 2019 CEPOL will train 35000 people via different tools. From the qualitative point of view the ISO certifications are expanded also to electronic services, while some selected activities have already gone through an ISO 29993 certification. Besides, CEPOL is also working on an EQF certification, however, it will take 2-3 years to achieve the expected results. Regarding CEPOL's projects everything is progressing according to the plans, furthermore, the Agency experiences an increasing demand towards its services, including study visits to the Agency from various institutions, and countries.

Regarding his plan to visit all CEPOL Member States by the end of 2019 / beginning 2020 he expressed his sincere gratefulness for the hospitality of all hosting countries. These visits give a unique opportunity to see national level needs and provide a useful guidance for further developing CEPOL's strategy towards tailor made training approaches. During his visits he also noticed, that the working conditions in the training institutions, as well as the challenges are very different from

one MS to the other. In line with this, the instruments used by CEPOL to analyse training needs should be sharpened, in order to better define the specific needs of a given region or country. For the long term, the Agency needs to review its actual “one seat per country” approach and consider offering its programmes based on relevance. Even more, there might be areas, e.g. Artificial Intelligence, where joint approaches would be more effective and efficient on a European level. In order to understand the actual training needs, a constant dialogue would be required with the MS.

From a broader stakeholder perspective he informed about the Agency’s high-level visits to the European Parliament including LIBE Committee Chair and several LIBE members, EU Presidencies, the European Council, and meetings with the Executive Directors of other agencies. Besides, the Agency has just opened its Liaison Office in Brussels.

He also informed that the Agency is still in the process of finding its new HQ building, with 3 times more functional rooms and considerably more office space, too. According to the Hungarian Minister of Interior, the Ministry will work closely together with the Agency and with the European Commission to find a fruitful solution.

Regarding the 2020 budget, he told that CEPOL will get one post dedicated to interoperability training, but no additional support is foreseen for the other areas. He also underlined that the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) will be a key document for the 2021-2027 programming period and related budget. Since its approval is not likely before the end of the German Presidency, it is now the right moment for MS to support CEPOL’s budget increase within their national authorities and Council discussions. In this context, he referred to the considerable increase of budgets and responsibilities in some other JHA agencies, i.e. Frontex, Europol and Eurojust.

The Executive Director also informed that 21 courses for 2020 do not yet have organisers, and encouraged the MS to organise the courses in question.

Regarding the Agency’s relevant risks, he highlighted the lack of human resources, which also inhibits CEPOL from fulfilling its compulsory responsibilities, e.g. ensuring security activities by a security officer or archiving and document management by an archivist. Besides, there are several undervalued functions, e.g. human resources management and IT system maintenance are fully implemented by assistant level posts, while the Cyber Academy is run by contract agents (CA) and one Seconded National Expert (SNE) instead of AD7 or AD8 level temporary agents (TA).

Closing his statement, he underlined that it was an excellent reason why 20 years ago Europe has decided to establish CEPOL, and now, 20 years later the Agency has an exceptional opportunity to ensure a financially secured operation within its expanded mandate.

## **Conclusion: The MB took note**

### **ITEM 5. Orientation Debates**

#### **ITEM 5.1 The future direction of EU Internal Security – CEPOL’s role in it**

<i>Presenter</i>	<i>: Executive Director, Mr Pasi Kemppainen - Assistant to the Chair</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	<i>: Finland, Romania, Croatia, Executive Director, Chair</i>

The **Executive Director** gave a short introduction to the orientation debate on the future focus of CEPOL services in relation to the future direction of EU internal security. He underlined that the debate is initiated on the basis of the related background papers, distributed as meeting documents (The future direction of EU internal security: new technologies and internal security (12496/19), as well as a former room document prepared by the European Commission for a related workshop, held recently.)

Following the Executive Director’s introduction, **Mr Pasi Kemppainen** explained the process of the debate, and invited the delegates to split into 3 groups, to be moderated by the representatives of the Trio Presidencies (Ms Lotta Parjanen, Finland, Mr Ovidiu Macovei, Romania, and Ms Danijela Petković, Croatia).

During the debate, the following three questions have been discussed:

- **Question 1:** *To ensure that EU law enforcement is in a position to address the EU level challenges mentioned in the meeting document, what should be done by the Agency with regards the current and future training in LE?*
- **Question 2:** *What could be CEPOL's supportive role to the Member States taking into account the current mandate and current and future perspective of its resources situation?*
- **Question 3:** *To think if in this context CEPOL's mandate should be reviewed to better cater for current and future needs?*

In the wrap-up session **Ms Lotta Parjanen** and **Mr Antti Talvitie** (Finland) summarised the discussion results of Group 1 (Commission, Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, *CEPOL (observer)*). According to the group, it is important to remain focused, and ensure that the different specialist courses are provided to the correct target groups. Concerning the second question, CEPOL can support the MS by providing them with the pooling of resources, including specific eLearning courses and exchanging information on trainings. To accomplish this, CEPOL also needs correct and adequate resources to be able to provide activities, in line with its mandate. The group also underlined the importance of coordination, in order to avoid overlapping work/activities, and ensure cooperation with relevant actors, including the private sector. Regarding Question 3, the group believed that the issue is not the mandate, but the financing of everything included in the mandate. Besides, it is important to be focused on topics, target groups, as well as specialisation, while narrowing the mandate has its risks, too.

According to **Mr Ovidiu Macovei** (Romania) moderator of Group 2 (Commission, Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, *CEPOL (observer)*) the group highlighted that CEPOL needs to offer more training, provided that it has the required resources. Also, the Agency should identify its current, successful educational products and make them broadly available, and should create new educational products in order to fulfil the challenges related to new technologies (e.g 5G mobile networks). Furthermore, CEPOL should support the development of integrated trainings. Besides, in cooperation with relevant EU bodies, CEPOL shall support the MS' joint training for law enforcement including the interoperability package.

Regarding the second question the group underlined that CEPOL should develop manuals for its trainings, and apply flexible and tailor-made approaches, while the collection of best practices is also needed. CEPOL should also support training in foreign languages, and integrated trainings with other JHA agencies.

Concerning the third question the group believed that each MS should contribute to the evaluation activity, due next year. Even if the lack of available resources remains an important obstacle to the realization of its aims, CEPOL has to identify its own way. In relation to its mandate, the Agency should support the MS' efforts in developing and updating a user-friendly training content. Besides, CEPOL should develop training activities on cross-cutting issues of common interest, while it should also have research capability to find answers on future trends and transform technology forecasting in education and training.

As stated by Group 3, moderated by **Ms Danijela Petković**, (Croatia) (Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Slovakia, *CEPOL (observer)*), CEPOL should focus on few specific topics (e.g. cybercrime, new modern technologies, specific questions in relation to leadership and maintenance skills), since it is not possible to cover all the aspects of LE training. It is also important to avoid overlaps in training and other initiatives between other EU JHA agencies and networks. Besides, in order to react quickly and with a close focus on the operational environment, there is a need for a CKC devoted to new technologies, in close cooperation with CEPOL Cybercrime Academy,

Concerning the second question the group emphasised the importance of trainings on topics that are relevant for the MS and are not yet delivered by other agencies. It is also important to identify training priorities, and related resources needed for CEPOL, in order to act as a training facilitator.

Regarding the third question, the group underlined, that the reviewing of the mandate is the task of the European Commission, however, such a revision seems to be necessary, since CEPOL's current mandate is very wide, creating challenges in covering all the aspects, topics, and target groups. In this regard it is recommended to focus on senior law enforcement officers, as a target group.

In his reaction, the **Executive Director** noted that this is just the starting point of an ongoing discussion, since the 5-year evaluation of CEPOL will take place next year, followed by further consultations to decide if the current mandate needs to be amended. Nevertheless, the outcomes of the current discussion will be further analysed to see the aspects that can be taken on board even within the current mandate.

Concerning the groups' recommendations, he agreed with the necessity of needs assessment tools in order to identify topics to be focused on, and that a narrowed mandate might also generate new risks. However, the explicit mentioning of some specific, key topics in the mandate (e.g. cybercrime), could contribute to the allocation of the necessary resources. Regarding research capability he underlined that the Agency should be able to develop competency profiles for officers, dealing with challenges generated by new technologies.

Concerning the need for up-to-date information on the ever-changing operational environment he informed that ENLETS (European Network of Law Enforcement Technology Services) is already providing the Law Enforcement agencies with forecasting services.

Referring to the idea of focusing on senior law enforcement officers, he recalled that internal security requires a close cooperation between specialists of various levels and fields, requiring trainings adequate to these, cooperative situations.

**The Chair** highlighted 4 points emerging from the group reports: mandate; resources; focus; coordination, and reminded that the first three points (mandate; resources; focus) are basically intertwined, while coordination is needed also to avoid overlaps between agencies and their limited resources. The MB members should be able to communicate the existing situation to their ministers. The main reason of CEPOL's existence is the fact that there are growing, and rapidly changing competence needs in the field of law enforcement. If the focus is too narrow, CEPOL will not be able to respond to the competence needs of the European and EU arena. Hence, MS should convince their decision makers that perhaps a few percent of the total resources directed to other LE agencies should be put on the account of CEPOL, so that it could respond to its mandate.

## **ITEM 6. Agency Progress report**

### **ITEM 6.1 Agency progress report – to end of September 2019**

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

<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Germany, Bulgaria</i>
-----------------------	----------------------------

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. He underlined the results of the EJMP and the achievements of the two, still running CEPOL projects in the area of CT and FI.

Answering **Germany** he told that the resources required for the further development of the LEED platform in 2020 cannot be estimated at the current stage, however, the SPD 2020 will need an urgent revision in early December via written procedure, and in that version the estimated figure will be included. Regarding research and science, in the new CEPOL Regulation it is clearly spelled out that CEPOL can be a beneficiary partner in Horizon Europe projects, obviously in a consortium with other partners.

**(Update by the Commission:** Please note that the eligibility for CEPOL to receive funding through the EU research programme is not dependent upon the research programme regulation itself. It depends upon the capacity of CEPOL to receive EU funding, therefore on their own statute. As such, if their statute allows, they would be eligible already under the current programme.)

Answering **Bulgaria**, he corrected the typo in the cover sheet, saying that “*Between 1 Jan – 30 Sep, 223 activities have been implemented*”.

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

## ITEM 7. Funding opportunities for training purposes

### ITEM 7.1 Internal Security Fund (ISF) and the related perspectives for law enforcement training

*Presenter* : European Commission and Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : -

**Mr Laurent Muschel** gave a presentation on the Internal Security Fund (ISF). The specific objectives of the Fund are to increase the exchange of information, intensify cross-border joint operations and strengthen capabilities to combat and prevent crime. The total budget of ISF for the 2021-2027 programming period is 2.5 billion EUR, which is about the double of the budget of the previous period. Each MS will receive a one-time fixed amount of 5 million EUR to ensure a critical mass at the start of the programming period, plus an amount varying according to a distribution key.

The **Executive Director** added that the aim of this agenda item was to inform about possible ways to complement CEPOL activities and to strengthen CEPOL’s network function by using alternative ways and seeking for additional resources. In this regard, MS could finance organisation and participation in training activities via ISF.

The **Chair** highlighted that the annual amount of ISF will be around 350 million EUR per year, and ISF is a relatively straightforward fund in terms of application, implementation and administration. Hence, he strongly recommended to get acquainted with the new period of the programme, as well.

**Conclusion:** The MB took note

### ITEM 7.2 Horizon Europe

*Presenter* : European Commission and Executive Director

*Took the Floor* : Germany, Chair

**Mr Laurent Muschel** gave a presentation about Horizon Europe, the EU Research & Innovation Programme that will follow Horizon 2020 and that will be operational as of 2021. Compared to Horizon 2020, the Commission’s proposal for Horizon Europe includes a much larger Research and Innovation Programme, with an estimated budget increase from 77 billion to some 100 billion EUR. The programme will encompass a dedicated “*Civil security for society*” cluster including security research in fighting crime and terrorism, with the involvement of law enforcement authorities, and with the requirement of training material related outputs and impacts. He underlined that the majority of MSs depend entirely on the EU regarding security research, since only eight MS (AT, DE, FI, FR, NL, PL, SE, UK) have national security research programmes, while Horizon 2020 is representing the 50% of the overall public funding in this area.

The **Executive Director** added that Horizon Europe could contribute to CEPOL’s research activities if the CEPOL community could manage to set up effective research consortia. In Horizon Europe it is possible for the Agency to become an eligible partner; hence, CEPOL will come up with ideas and will look for partners among the MS. Likewise, he encouraged MS to contact CEPOL with their possible research initiatives. Answering **Germany**, he told the delegate that since the new regulation for Horizon Europe is not finalised yet, the exact details of CEPOL’s possible participation are not known, either. However, it is expected, that the Agency can participate in projects as a partner of consortia.

**(Update by the Commission:** Please note that the eligibility for CEPOL to receive funding through the EU research programme is not dependent upon the research programme regulation itself. It depends upon the capacity of CEPOL to receive EU funding, therefore on their own statute. As such, if their statute allows, they would be eligible already under the current programme.)

**The Chair** highlighted that in his experience Horizon has been a very useful tool for internal security education institutions and noted that 80% of the Finnish Police Academy’s research programmes are run via Horizon and ISF funding.

**Conclusion:** The MB took note

## ITEM 8. Planning and Budgeting

### ITEM 8.1 Update on CNU workshops

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Mr Pasi Kemppainen, Chair of the CNU meeting, Finnish Presidency</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Netherlands, Executive Director</i>

**Mr Pasi Kemppainen**, Chair of the CNU meeting reminded that during the 6<sup>th</sup> MB meeting the Management Board advised CNUs to discuss the Agency's new business model. In his presentation he summarised the outcomes of the related workshop discussions held during the 7<sup>th</sup> CNU meeting (30 September - 02 October, Budapest, 2019).

Answering the **Netherlands**, the **Executive Director** told that several recommendations of the CNU workshops have already been integrated in the meeting documents for Item 8.2, while some other aspects are expected to be discussed under the next agenda point. **Mr Pasi Kemppainen** gave some examples for such, MS related aspects, including the possibilities for making their participation more attractive, providing opportunities to have more influence on content, possible ways to become part of the network, and finding solution for covering those 21 activities that are currently not covered.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

### ITEM 8.2 Pilot phase of the new CKC model 2020

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director, Finland</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Germany, Finland, Austria, Belgium, France, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Greece, European Commission, Chair</i>

In his presentation the **Executive Director** summarised the state of the art regarding the planning of the new business model and CEPOL's recommendation for a pilot model for 2020, including the roles and responsibilities of the different actors, e.g. CEPOL, CNUs, Sending Authorities, and Hosting institutions. He underlined that the work is still in progress, hence there are already some new items in the plan, compared to the last CNU meeting, including the Network of CEPOL Partner Institutions, since according to the mandate, CEPOL should bring together a network of MS training institutes. He noted that the experts of the Expert Groups would not be individual experts, but representatives of their institutions, similar to the participation of experts in EMPACT.

#### 8.2.1 Supporting the creation of a new CEPOL Business model by an Expert Group

Based on the room document submitted by the Finnish presidency as Item 8.2.1 **Finland** summarised its initiative on "*Supporting the creation of a new CEPOL Business model by an Expert Group*". It is expected that with the help of the expert group the model can get a valuable input from the MS, especially regarding training relevance, network cooperation, awareness, and quality. He underlined that the network institutions should be well motivated for taking part in training delivery under the circumstances of the new business model, as well. The proposal invites the Executive Director to establish the Expert Group and report to the Management Board on the work, it achieves.

**Germany** asked the Executive Director about the future partner institutions and their possible status, and informed him about severe HR shortages concerning experts due to an ever-increasing demand for trainers on national level, as a result from recruitment offensive and demographic change factors.

Answering Germany the **Executive Director** told that CEPOL will offer the opportunity for active FPs to continue, while, it will be open to new partners, too. The availability of experts is often very challenging, however, there is also a need for continuity in the process, which can be better ensured by groups of experts than by individual ones. Regarding the foreseen tasks for CNUs he added that apart from the presented tasks, no other CNU tasks are planned, however, in various cases CNUs are also representing the hosting institution, and then, the related tasks will also occur. When the hosting institution is different, then the tasks will be split, as presented. Concerning the already expressed interests of the existing CKCs in hosting activities he assured, that these interests will be taken on board.

Replying to **Finland** the **Executive Director** informed that the former evaluation group did not recommend a formal further evaluation of the model. Still, the MB will be asked in the May meeting if the model is mature enough for introducing it from 2021 onwards. Currently there are many unknown factors, including all the administrative and budgetary impacts on CEPOL.

Answering **Austria**, the **Executive Director** explained that if experts would be paid then they should be selected via procurement, where confidentiality rules apply. Also, expert fees would reduce the budget, available for training activities. He underlined that all CKC related administration shall be done by the Agency, CKCs cannot be engaged in the administration of the activities and in any kind of contracting, either. Besides, experts cannot define, which institution should be taken for the implementation of a given activity. He also told that CNU's will be requested to co-sign the terms of reference in order to express a shared commitment in relation to a successful implementation of the activities. Regarding the timeline for 2021 he agreed that the time is too short between the call for experts (end of 2020) and the first CKC meeting already in spring 2021, hence, the timing will be properly adjusted during the pilot phase, once the available resources are better known.

The **Chair** underlined the importance of finding the right incentives for both institutional and expert level participation.

Replying to **Belgium** the **Executive Director** told that the actual plans for amending the existing pilot CKC model are in line with the CKC evaluation group's recommendation to split between administration and content. Answering the **Commission** and **Austria** he said that if the new model cannot be implemented due to the lack of resources, then a Plan B could be to go on with a mixed structure, where both CKCs and grants are run, but then new FP selection and agreement would be needed, and the already known risks would go on, e.g. less and less activities would be covered.

**France** welcomed the new model and volunteered for hosting a future training course. France also underlined that the new model must remain flexible and well-resourced in order to respond to new training needs and emerging threats. The **Executive Director** appreciated France's support, and agreed that resources, budget and operational planning should go hand in hand, however, this is not predictable for the next years to come. In this regard he also asked MS to support the Agency's budget increase during the MFF related negotiations. Even if the requested budget increase is proportionally high, its baseline is very low.

The **Netherlands** also supported the new model, and proposed MS to send their remarks to the Expert Group in written form, so that these can be discussed and solved. The **Netherlands** - supported by **Portugal** - also endorsed the evaluation of the new model as raised by Finland, since it is necessary to keep on evaluating also during the pilot phase, to see how the implementation is going.

The **Executive Director** did not support the evaluation of the new pilot model by the Expert Group, because in this case advisory tasks would be mixed up with evaluatory tasks.

Answering **Spain**, the **Executive Director** informed that Framework Partnership is a legal basis to apply for CEPOL grants, hence, the expiring of the FP contracts by mid-2020 will not prevent them from implementing their already granted activities. Replying to **Greece** he told that the Expert Group will receive all available information and experiences gained already from the very beginning of the new pilot phase, also, some of them might even be engaged, if coming from a host institution.

The **Chair** informed that the main reason for initiating the Finnish proposal was their concern regarding the motivation of participating institutions and experts. He invited the MB members to vote on the Finnish initiative distributed as an item 8.2.1 room document.

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

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the Finnish initiative on inviting the Executive Director to establish an Expert Group and to report on the achieved results.**

### ITEM 8.3 CEPOL Single Programming Document 2020 - 23/2019/MB

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Finland, Belgium, Portugal, Germany</i>

The **Executive Director** informed that according to CEPOL's mandate, the MB shall, by 30 November adopt SPD 2020. The tabled document takes into account the opinion of the Commission,



however, since many training activities have not been applied for, the decision will need to be amended in early December, via written procedure. The amended version will include those activities that the Agency can take on board, including the related additional human resources (SNEs and interim staff), as well as the expenses of a mandatory IT recovery solution for the system, and the increased expenses of mandatory Commission services (e.g. user fees for corporate tools and services). Besides, the amended SPD will also incorporate the recommendations of the European Parliament's LIBE Committee (distributed as a room document).

Answering **Finland**, he thanked them for spotting the typos - which will be corrected in the amended version - and confirmed that CEPOL is planning its Research and Science Conference with 80 participants and is expecting an additional number of 80 self-payers. Replying to **Belgium** and **Portugal**, he told them that in the framework of CSDP missions four activities are planned: two residential on-site activities, and two online ones.

### 8.3.1 CKC CSDP Missions Courses planned for 2020

**Germany** explained the reasons for initiating this agenda item: in the original planning of the CKC CSDP missions 2 residential activities were designed, hence, the CKC has already planned the implementation of 2 set activities as residential activities, including curricula aspects. However, according to the most recent information, these activities will be implemented by CEPOL, in Budapest, and there is no possibility for MS to organise these residential activities. Germany expressed its willingness and readiness to implement the set activities as a residential activity and asked for the Executive Director's explanation.

In his answer the **Executive Director** explained that the Agency had to send out the call for grants already in June-July so that all partners could apply for them, and in the sequence of events it was known only later on, which activities would be preferred to be implemented in the topic of CSDP missions. Therefore, it did not get into the call for grants and will now be implemented by the Agency. However, it is not the explicit intention to do it in Budapest, and if Germany wishes to be CEPOL's partner in hosting an activity, it is possible, and CEPOL will offer the hosting of CSDP activities like for the other one. This will not be run as a grant agreement, though, since the financial implications will be dealt directly by CEPOL.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on CEPOL's Single Programming Document 2020 - **23/2019/MB**.

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

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 23/2019/MB**

### ITEM 8.4 CEPOL Draft Single Programming Document 2021 - **25/2019/MB**

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

The **Executive Director** informed that in the draft SPD 2021 the Agency is seeking for additional resources, in line with CEPOL's multiannual planning and the new MFF. The document will be further developed before it will be finally submitted to the MB next November.

The **Commission** announced that it will abstain from voting and will later on issue an official Commission position, and noted that the increased budget does not seem to be realistic.

In his answer the **Executive Director** explained that the budget increase is deriving from the increased business volume and responsibilities, however, it is based on a concise business planning. He also underlined that the 8 additional posts requested by CEPOL are based on official Commission documents.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the Draft CEPOL Single Programming Document 2021 - **25/2019/MB**

**Voting results: In favour: 25 members; Against: 0; Abstained: 2 (Belgium, Commission)**

**Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 25/2019/MB**

## ITEM 8.5 CEPOL Liaison Office in Brussels

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Ms Annika Talmar, Liaison Officer (via video message)</i>

Via a short video, the **Executive Director** introduced CEPOL's new Liaison Officer to the MB. **Ms Annika Talmar** will represent CEPOL in Brussels for a pilot period of two years.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 8.6 Update on the new CEPOL Building

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

The **Executive Director** informed that the renting prices for suitable office buildings are booming in Budapest, hence, the Agency has not found appropriate solution so far. Last week he met the Hungarian Minister of Interior, who promised that he will look for a solution, hopefully by the end of the year.

Answering **Finland** he told that according to the original agreement with the Hungarian authorities the current office building is provided for free of charge for 10 years, and after 8 years new negotiations can be started on a new contract. He added that on the top of the premises, important additional services are also provided free of charge, including reception, maintenance, cleaning and security. At this stage there is no information regarding the possible financial implications of the HQ building after the initial 10-year period.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 9. Core Business

### ITEM 9.1 Update on STNA and the way forward

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit, Executive Director</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Belgium, Mr Pasi Kemppainen - Chair of the CNU meeting</i>

In her presentation **Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit** reviewed the implementation of the EU Strategic Training Needs Assessment and training needs analyses conducted by CEPOL on the operational level. She informed that the EU-STNA is planned to be evaluated in 2020, in order to adjust the methodology before the next cycle will be initiated covering the period of 2022-2025. The new STNA will be launched in 2021 in line with SOCTA. Cooperation of MS and CNUs is required throughout the evaluation process. Concerning the operational training needs analyses (OTNAs) she informed that besides CSDP missions and Counterterrorism, this year Cyber-attacks on information systems has also been added to be analysed based on the new OTNA methodology. Unfortunately, the response rates to CEPOL's related surveys were relatively low.

The **Executive Director** added that the Agency would like to further develop these instruments, however, there is a limited number of input coming from the MS. Hence, he was kindly asking the MS to put extra effort in providing feedback.

**Mr Pasi Kemppainen**, Chair of the CNU meeting reminded, that in order to support the process some points have already been raised during the last CNU meeting.

**Ms Agnieszka Biegaj** thanked the CNUs' valuable input during the related interactive sessions and hoped that the results will already be seen in the first bunch of new OTNAs.

**Belgium** proposed to amend the evaluation questionnaire of the residential activities, asking the attending specialists about their priority topics, to be covered next year. Likewise, CSDP mission beneficiaries could be asked about the main issues when it comes to the lack of training. These could be added to the already available sources of information.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

## ITEM 9.2 Update on International cooperation projects

Presenter	: Executive Director
Took the Floor	: -

The **Executive Director** informed that CEPOL achieved a very good level of cooperation with all countries participating in the CTII and FI project during the last years. One of the most important aspects of these projects is to build bridges between MS' and beneficiary countries' services, hence, it is especially welcoming, that MS are considering their participations more and more as an opportunity to establish new relationships.

**Conclusion: The MB took note.**

## ITEM 9.3 CEPOL EJMP – action plan following IAS recommendations

Presenter	: Executive Director
Took the Floor	: Germany, Chair

The **Executive Director** reminded that prior to the last Management Board meeting in May 2019, the Internal Audit Service examined the European Joint Master Programme and issued a report with a critical finding regarding the EJMP grant procedure. Thanks to CEPOL's immediate action by suspending the programme, the Agency could avoid a discharge procedure, and this item is already closed in the system of IAS.

Regarding the future of Higher Education within CEPOL the Agency tends to work together with its partners, via inviting them for a workshop early next year, where the best ways of integration of Higher Education within the framework of CEPOL could be discussed. This would give a good opportunity to better see the already available trainings in the market, and if CEPOL should continue its actual Master Programme. The conclusions will be fed into the planning of the next years to come, including related procurement and budgetary aspects.

Answering **Germany**, he told that it is too early to estimate the possible continuation of the programme, since the mentioned workshop has not yet taken place.

The **Chair** took note on the last paragraph of the meeting document, saying that *"It is considered of high importance that CEPOL will be able also in the future to provide a higher education training programme"*, since this is an important product of CEPOL.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 9.4 Update on CEPOL's Digitalisation Strategy and Digital Learning Services

Presenter	: Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit
Took the Floor	: -

**Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit** presented CEPOL's Comprehensive Strategy towards the Digitalisation of the Agency, addressing the digitalisation needs of CEPOL and the core business services, enabling the Agency to follow up the latest technological trends in order to provide advanced and innovative training. The objective of this future-facing strategy is to define a holistic, long-term vision up to five years, on the development of a technology-enhanced business model and learning system in line with CEPOL's mandate. The project was fully implemented, and invoices have already been signed.

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

## ITEM 9.5 Presentation on the Law Enforcement Education (LEEd) platform

Presenter	: Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit
Took the Floor	: Germany, Greece, Executive Director

**Ms Agnieszka Biegaj, Head of Training and Research Unit** introduced CEPOL's new e-Learning platform, LEEd (Law Enforcement Education). After reviewing the main concept, the design principles and the main functionalities of the new platform, she highlighted the main changes

compared to eNET, including user centred navigation, thematic areas of activities, integrated nomination procedure, detailed reporting possibilities and CEPOL branded mobile app.

Replying to **Germany** and **Greece** she thanked both for their supporting words and informed that LEEd managers will already be trained in November, while CNU's will be informed regarding their specific online training in mid-December.

The **Executive Director** added that the development is also aiming to serve as a multi-tenancy arrangement, meaning, that other users can use the platform for the purpose of the MS. This will be offered to partners from the second half of next year.

#### Conclusion: The MB took note

#### ITEM 9.6 Possible impact of Brexit

Presenter : Executive Director

Took the Floor : Commission

The **Executive Director** informed that regarding Brexit the Commission is providing the agencies with up-to-date information including operational instructions. From the human resources point of view, ( )<sup>1</sup>. As the UK is not included in CEPOL's regulation, operationally there is only a very limited impact of Brexit, e.g. procurement and contracting means. British users have been deleted from eNET and won't be included in LEEd. Hence, the Agency is well prepared for Brexit.

The **Commission** added that in case of no-deal the Commission has to adopt some contingency measures, including security partnership. This is currently under preparation; in case of a deal, there will be more time to design the future relationship.

#### Conclusion: The MB took note

#### ITEM 10. Regulatory matters

#### ITEM 10.1 Update on Implementing Rules

Presenter : Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department

Took the Floor : Belgium, Chair

**Mr Roeland Woldhuis, Head of Corporate Services Department** gave a presentation on the five draft MB decisions, tabled to the MB. He also informed about two, already adopted Implementing rules on the *maximum duration for the recourse to non-permanent staff* and on *procedures for dealing with professional incompetence*, and 2 additional implementing rules being in the adoption process: one on the *duties of Commission drivers* and the other on the *transfer of pension rights*. Besides, he also mentioned some additional Implementing Rules, that are in various stages of the preparation process.

Following the presentation, the **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision **26/2019/MB** *On Setting up a Staff Committee*.

All these decisions need to be officially submitted to the Commission in inter-service consultation, hence the need for Commission to abstain.

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

#### Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 26/2019/MB

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision **27/2019/MB** *On opting out from Commission rules on administrative enquiries and disciplinary proceedings*.

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

#### Conclusion: The MB has adopted the draft decision 27/2019/MB

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision **28/2019/MB** *On rules on parental leave*.

<sup>1</sup> The part in brackets has been removed from the public version due to personal data protection reasons.

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted the draft decision 28/2019/MB

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision 30/2019/MB *On rules on family leave.*

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted the draft decision 30/2019/MB

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on draft decision 24/2019/MB *On rules on family allowances.*

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted the draft decision 24/2019/MB

**Belgium** proposed to vote on regulatory matters via written procedure in the future, in order to save some space for core business discussions.

(**Update:** Following-up the request of Belgium, from the next meeting on the **Chair** would like to introduce an accelerated voting procedure: members will be invited to indicate if they are against or abstaining, already at the beginning of the given voting session. It should be noted, that according to the Rules of Procedures, the normal way of voting is via oral proceedings, while written procedures are mainly in place for urgent matters.)

## ITEM 10.2 Voting on draft MB Decisions

Presenter	: Executive Director
-----------	----------------------

Took the Floor	: Chair
----------------	---------

### 10.2.1 20/2019/MB on repealing 13/2012/GB on Working Groups

The **Executive Director** reminded that during the 6<sup>th</sup> Management Board Meeting the MB concluded that the workflow envisaged in Decision 13/2012/GB became obsolete, since there are more efficient ways of addressing business needs in relation to pooling of expertise. Hence, the tabled draft Decision is aiming to repeal Decision 13/2012/GB.

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision 20/2019/MB.

**Voting results:** In favour: 26 members; Against: 1 Germany; Abstained: 0

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted 20/2019/MB

### 10.2.2 29/2019/MB on the meeting calendar for 2020 1st half

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision 29/2019/MB.

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted 29/2019/MB

### 10.2.3 31/2019/MB on adopting the updated online module on Darknet

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision 31/2019/MB.

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted decision 31/2019/MB

### 10.2.4 19/2019/MB on adopting the updated online module on Money Laundering

The **Chair** invited the MB members to vote on the draft decision 19/2019/MB.

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

**Conclusion:** The MB has adopted 19/2019/MB

## ITEM 11. AOB

### ITEM 11.1 Training Manual for SPOC Operators (Project Athena) - CEPOL Training Needs

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Belgium</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Netherlands, Italy, Slovenia, Belgium</i>

**Belgium** gave a presentation on a recently developed training manual for Single Points of Operational Contact (SPOC) Operators in the framework of the Athena project, funded by ISF. The module covers a basic and an advanced level training course for SPOC Operators, which will also be translated into French and some other languages, so that it can support MS for their national training.

**Italy** informed that they applied for the implementation of a training activity on police information exchange for SPOC included in CEPOL's training catalogue 2020. In case the SPOC training manual is also adopted by CEPOL's Management Board, Italy would develop a training curriculum based on two levels.

**Slovenia** expressed its full support regarding the SPOC training manual.

The **Executive Director** reminded that even though this training is included in CEPOL's 2020 portfolio, due to its unknown budget situation CEPOL cannot plan beyond 2020. He also underlined the importance of engaging CEPOL in similar project initiatives in the framework of ISF or the future Horizon 2027 programme, so that the Agency can have sufficient time to take on board such initiatives.

**Belgium** proposed to organise a written procedure in order to formally adopt the SPOC manual to be used for the development and implementation of future courses on SPOC. The **Executive Director** took note of the request.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

### ITEM 11.2 Behind enemy minds – a Belgian proposal for a new training activity

<i>Presenter</i>	: (██████████) <sup>2</sup> <i>Police Zone, Ghent, Belgium</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: <i>Executive Director</i>

(██████████) presented the specific integrated training concept called Behind Enemy Minds. The concept combines observation, perspective-taking, risk-assessment, and purposeful action in order to add an extra layer of security to sites, to actively prevent crime, and successfully disrupt ongoing attacks or steps in a criminal planning cycle or strategy. It is based on the validated theories of predictive policing and red teaming, reinforced by additional scientific and empiric insights and shaped into a practical, teachable technique.

The **Executive Director** told that CEPOL will further analyse the proposal for future business planning.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

## ITEM 12. Croatian Presidency Priorities

<i>Presenter</i>	: <i>Ms Danijela Petković, incoming Presidency</i>
<i>Took the Floor</i>	: -

**Ms Danijela Petković**, Deputy Chair gave a short introduction to the priorities of the incoming Croatian Presidency. She underlined that in line with its motto of "A strong Europe in a world of challenges", the Croatian Presidency prioritises a Europe that develops, connects, protects, and which is also influential. Regarding Home Affairs, emphasis will be put on a sustainable and efficient migration management, a strengthened external border control returning to the normal functioning of the Schengen Area, interoperability of information systems and internal security, sustainable framework for fund allocation, as well as a strengthened Union Civil Protection Mechanism in the area of prevention and disaster response.

**Conclusion: The MB took note**

<sup>2</sup> The part in brackets has been removed from the public version due to personal data protection reasons.

### **ITEM 13. Closing of the meeting**

*Presenter* : *Chair*

*Took the Floor* : -

The **MB Chair** thanked the Finnish CNU team, the participants, presenters and CEPOL for their work and officially closed the meeting.

*Tampere, 31 January 2020*

*Budapest, 7 February 2020*

*<< Signature on file >>*

*<< Signature on file >>*

*Dr Kimmo HIMBERG*

*Chair of CEPOL Management Board*

*Dr.h.c. Detlef Schroeder*

*Executive Director of CEPOL*

**Annex 1** – List of Meeting Participants

## Annex 1. List of Meeting Participants

### Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board:

Country	First Name	Last Name
FINLAND (Chair)	Kimmo	HIMBERG
CROATIA (Deputy Chair)	Danijela	PETKOVIC

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

Country/Institution	First Name	Last Name
AUSTRIA	Norbert	LEITNER
BELGIUM	Alain	RUELLE
BULGARIA (alternate member)	Simo	MIHOV
CROATIA	- proxy to Chair -	- proxy to Chair -
CYPRUS	Themistos	ARNAOUTIS
CZECH REPUBLIC (alternate member)	Veronika	RUNDOVÁ
ESTONIA	Kalvi	ALMOSEN
European Commission – DG HOME (alternate member)	Laurent	MUSCHEL
FINLAND	Lotta	PARJANEN
FRANCE (alternate member)	Ingrid	PEYRATOU
GERMANY (alternate member)	Guido	KATTERT
GREECE (alternate member)	Maria Areti	KYRITSI
HUNGARY	Emese	HORVACZY
IRELAND	- proxy to Chair -	- proxy to Chair -
ITALY (alternate member)	Lorena	CAPOLUPO
LATVIA	Inese	VOLOSEVICA
LITHUANIA	Rimantas	BOBINAS
LUXEMBOURG (alternate member)	David	CHENUT
MALTA	Angelo	GAFA
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)	Jose Alberto	RAMIREZ VAZQUEZ
SWEDEN	- proxy to Chair -	- proxy to Chair -



**Member State observers:**

AUSTRIA	Gerhard	HABERLER
BELGIUM	Bart	D'HOOGHE
BULGARIA	Nikola	STALEV
CROATIA	Valerija	BENCERIĆ
CROATIA	Ksenija	VUJČIĆ
CYPRUS	Floris	NIKANDROU
CZECH REPUBLIC	Jan	PECHÁČEK
ESTONIA	Dorel	KÄOSAAR
FINLAND	Pasi	KEMPPAINEN
FINLAND	Antti	TALVITIE
FRANCE	Serge	LUCAS
FRANCE	Thomas	PETIT
GREECE	Dimitrios	GIANNAKIS
HUNGARY	Andras	GAAL
ITALY	Massimo	TULINI
LITHUANIA	Martynas	AUSTYS
NETHERLANDS	Ronald	BRON
PORTUGAL	Rui	PEREIRA
ROMANIA	Calin	BALAEI
SLOVAKIA	Ingrid	WEISSOVA
SLOVENIA	Egidij	GLAVIC
SPAIN	Roberto	WHYTE FLORES
SWEDEN	Ulf	SYDORF

**Other observers:**

Institution	First Name	Last Name
European Commission – DG HOME	Cristina	CALABRÓ

**CEPOL HQ:**

Function	First Name	Last Name
Executive Director	Detlef	SCHRÖDER
Head of Corporate Services Department	Roeland	WOLDHUIS
Head of Training and Research Unit	Agnieszka	BIEGAJ
Legal Officer	Ioanna	PLIOTA
Governance Assistant (Outcomes)	Gyorgy	ISPANKI
Governance Support Assistant	Cecilia	DUBOIS