



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 11 January 2011

5241/12

**GENVAL 3
COPEN 6
EUROJUST 3
EJN 2**

NOTE

From : Presidency
To : Working Party on General Matters including Evaluations (GENVAL)
Subject : Sixth round of mutual evaluations - Questions to Eurojust and the European
Judicial Network

In line with Joint Action 97/827/JHA, adopted by the Council on 5 December 1997, the Working Party on General Matters including Evaluations (GENVAL) decided in the meeting on 22 June 2011 that the sixth round of mutual evaluations will be devoted to the practical implementation and operation in the Member States of the Decisions on Eurojust and the European Judicial Network.

The sixth round of mutual evaluations is not an evaluation of Eurojust or the European Judicial Network (EJN). However, there are questions that should be addressed to both Eurojust and the EJN which would support a better understanding of how the overall system works.

It is proposed that Eurojust be provided with a questionnaire, which can be found in the Annex of this note. It should be noted that during the third round of mutual evaluations, a similar questionnaire was addressed to Europol.

GENVAL is invited to adopt the questionnaire to Eurojust.

The EJM will not be provided with a specific questionnaire. However, the EJM Secretariat will be involved as partner throughout the process, *inter alia* by being asked to provide up-to-date information about the particular Member State ready to be visited. The EJM contact points will be addressed throughout the exercise, specifically during the missions to the Member States, as they form part of the Eurojust National Coordination System (ENCS).

GENVAL is invited to endorse the involvement of the EJM in the exercise.

6th round of Mutual Evaluations
**Practical implementation and operation of the Decisions on Eurojust and the European
Judicial Network in criminal matters**

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE DIRECTED TO EUROJUST

A. Questions related to the tasks of Eurojust acting as a College

- A.1. According to Article 7 of the Eurojust Decision, a number of tasks have been conferred to Eurojust acting through the College. Please describe how the college operates in practice in relation to the tasks listed under this article.
- A.2. With respect in particular to Article 7.1 (e), how does Eurojust acting as a College cooperate in practice with the European Judicial Network? Has Eurojust already consulted the European Judicial Network (its secretariat or any national contact points or national correspondent(s) of the European Judicial Network), including by making use of and contributing to the improvement of the EJM documentary database? What is your experience so far?
- A.3. With respect in particular to Article 7.1 (f), how does Eurojust acting as a College cooperate in practice with Europol? Has Eurojust already provided assistance to Europol, in particular by providing it with opinions based on analyses carried out by Europol? What is your experience so far?
- A.4. With respect in particular to Article 7.2, how are cases of conflict of jurisdiction dealt with by Eurojust? Has Eurojust acting as a College already been asked to issue a written non-binding opinion in this respect?

B. On-call coordination (OCC)

B.1. The on-call coordination has been operational since 4 June 2011. Have already requests from national authorities been processed through the OCC? Please explain.

C. Statistics.

Eurojust is invited to provide specific answers for each Member State to the following questions.

C.1. For each Member State, please indicate which kind of criminal offences are most frequently referred to Eurojust and in relation to which other countries?

C.2. For each Member State, could you give, if available, a statistical overview for the past two years of the information sent to Eurojust (e.g. volume of information transferred? Kind of cases?) or any estimation in this respect? If needed, please make a distinction depending on whether the new Eurojust Decision has already been implemented in the Member State concerned or not.

C.3. For each Member State, could you give, if available, a statistical overview for the past two years of the information sent to competent national authorities from Eurojust (e.g. volume of information transferred? Kind of cases or trends mainly expanded upon?) or any estimation in this respect? If needed, please make a distinction depending on whether the new Eurojust Decision has already been implemented in the Member State concerned or not?

C.4. Could you give, if available, a statistical overview for the past two years of the number of coordination meetings each Member State participated in? Please, specify between, on the one hand, the estimated number of coordination meetings where the Member State concerned took the initiative and, on the other hand, the estimated number of coordination meetings where the Member State concerned was invited?