



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 10 June 2014  
(OR. en)**

**10611/14**

**ENFOPOL 167**

**NOTE**

From:	Presidency
To:	Law Enforcement Working Party
No. prev. doc.:	7791/14, 8844/14
Subject:	Outcome of the self-evaluation of the European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (ENPPF)

At the meeting of experts of the European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (ENPPF) held in the framework of the LEWP on 8 April 2014 in Brussels (see doc. 8844/14), delegations were *inter alia* invited to discuss the questions raised in the discussion paper on the future of the ENPPF and the self-evaluation of the network (doc. 7791/14) and to provide their feedback in writing.

The overview of oral and written contributions from 14 Member States and Europol together with the conclusion by the Presidency is set out below.

## OVERVIEW OF MS CONTRIBUTIONS

### Organisation of the network and its meetings:

- a) Most MS (9) generally consider that having a lead country to coordinate the activities of the network could be useful and the active involvement of experienced MS as lead countries could significantly contribute to the efficiency of ENPPF. Among these, 3 MS believe that a lead country should be appointed to lead the activities on all specific topics emanating from the work programme of the ENPPF.

4 MS mentioned that they would not be able to become the lead countries for internal reasons while 2 MS also raised a question whether appointing lead countries would be compatible with the Council Decision setting up ENPPF<sup>1</sup> which states that "the Network activity shall be promoted by the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council".

- b) Roughly half of MS which responded to the question on the need for interpretation at the ENPPF meetings could agree to organising the ENPPF meetings without interpretation to save costs and to allow more flexible scheduling, while some of them also noted that this could have a negative impact on the active participation of the experts and lead to misunderstandings. 1 MS suggested to at least limit the number of languages for interpretation.

A number of MS consider that interpretation is a precious element contributing to the success of the ENPPF. One delegation therefore pointed out that the gain in flexibility should be more beneficial than the loss in comprehension and efficiency if discontinuation of the full interpretation regime was considered. The interpretation would be even more important if the meetings were attended by the heads of responsible services, as suggested by 1 MS.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Decision 2002/956/JHA of 28 November 2002 setting up a European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (OJ L 333, 10.12.2002, p. 1) as amended by Council Decision 2009/796/JHA of 4 June 2009 amending Decision 2002/956/JHA setting up a European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (OJ L 283, 30.10.2009, p.62)

- c) Most MS agree that organising conference calls, video or web conferences or written correspondence, e.g. via the Europol Platform for experts (EPE), to discuss issues that do not require personal attendance would be a good idea, which would help the network become more dynamic and operational and should be exploited as much as possible, for example, in the preparation of the ENPPF meetings. However, while the idea of using EPE is found particularly attractive, some MS have doubts about the usefulness of video conferences and the technical possibilities to organise them and would rather favour written correspondence, in particular for circulating questionnaires and collecting relevant information.

Planning of the work of the network:

- d) Almost all MS agree to the need of drawing up a work programme for the ENPPF for a limited period of time (for example 2-3 years), which, they believe, would contribute to ensuring the continuity of the activities of the ENPPF, help anticipate and facilitate the work of the network. 1 MS suggested that the work programme should be flexible enough to allow including new topics when needed. The following work programmes should be drawn up on the basis of the results of the previous ones.

A few MS suggested that a work programme should be drawn up either by an ad hoc working group or by the Presidency, supported by a lead country. 1 MS is not fully convinced that ENPPF would function better if it had a work programme.

- e) Almost all MS agree that systematic EU funding for the activities of ENPPF would be advantageous. 1 MS believes that currently ENPPF does not perform any activities that would require systematic funding.

Cooperation with Europol, CEPOL and other LEWP expert groups and networks:

- (f) Most MS agree that addressing Europol in order to create EPE dedicated to ENPPF would be useful, in particular if it serves as a forum for discussions, exchange of information, statistics and best practices and as long as it is secure enough and does not become a merely formal website for contact information.

A few MS do not see such a need or are rather cautious whether this possibility would be within the mandate of Europol, whether there would be any added value of such cooperation and would like to test the effectiveness of EPE first.

- (g) Most MS agree that cooperation with CEPOL could be useful in particular in the following areas: using CEPOL's e-library to exchange relevant documentation and/or publications, creating a common curriculum for training law enforcement personnel in protecting public figures (in particular for basic training or training on tactics and communication, on protection measures for foreign protectees, on theory of protection and for training for middle management responsible for the organisation of protection for state leaders), offering online training.

Some MS also mentioned that creating a common curriculum might be difficult and would require a lot of effort due to the differences in MS legislation. 1 MS has doubts about the possibility of online training in this particular field.

- (h) All Ms are supportive of cooperating with other LEWP-related expert groups and networks, while a few MS mentioned that such cooperation is ongoing: for example, radio communications experts group once made a presentation at the ENPPF meeting. 1 MS suggested to consider organising joint meetings or organising informal exchanges via a virtual platform.

#### General evaluation of the network:

- (i) Most MS agree that ENPPF achieves the goals set by the Council. In particular, the preparation of the Handbook of the ENPPF was mentioned as a good example in facilitating a better understanding among the members of the network. On the other hand, a few MS mentioned that the success of ENPPF is limited and that MS should be more committed and more active in achieving the goals of the network. 1 MS mentioned that the Council Decision did not set enough goals allowing to evaluate its success.

- (j) Most MS agree that the network is functioning effectively, but they expect more practical results of its activities and believe that it could become more dynamic if there were closer or more informal contacts among the members, more active participation by MS or better use of communication channels, such as EPE or SIENA. These elements would contribute to the better spread of best practices.
- (k) As to other possible improvements in the working practices of ENPPF, MS made the following suggestions:
- ENPPF should not meet on the Council premises as the meetings there tend to be too formal. Another possibility would be to split one-day meetings to 2 working sessions - the afternoon session the first day and the morning session the following day so as to allow for more informal contacts in between these sessions;
  - the members of the network should be better involved in the preparation of the meetings;
  - in addition to the work programme, an action plan with specific objectives to be achieved should be prepared;
  - working groups with the participation of a few experienced countries in order to achieve the goals set in the work programme should be set up;
  - the Presidency of the network should be elected for 2 years;
  - a management board of five MS for a 3 year period should be elected to ensure better efficiency of the network;
  - a web platform and/or online library in order to improve the dissemination of information to the members of the network (similar to the one used by the ATLAS network) should be set up;
  - SIENA should be used for the exchange of messages between the members of the network;
  - joint trainings for the trainers of MS' respective services as well as trainings for mixed protection teams should be organised in order to standardise training;
  - information should be exchanged in order to determine the most appropriate criteria for selecting and training staff responsible for the protection of public figures;
  - there should be mutual secondment of staff of departments participating in the ENPPF.

## EUROPOL'S CONTRIBUTION

Europol's GDPT unit which is responsible for personal protection matters at Europol also provided its written contribution. It informed the Presidency that upon a request of the ENPPF, GDPT could provide logistical support to a working group of the ENPPF by organising its meetings at the Europol Headquarters in The Hague. The communication within the group could be facilitated through the existing secure Europol information exchange channel, with a possible support of liaison bureaus. Such a working group could develop a road map for establishing a work programme and a virtual platform for the ENPPF. Europol GDPT - as a member of the international Association of Personal Protection Services (APPS) - could also liaise with APPS under the supervision of the ENPPF Presidency.

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of the contributions set out above, the Presidency invites the LEWP to:

- take note of the outcome of the self-evaluation of the ENPPF;
- agree to setting up a working group within ENPPF. The working group would be tasked to draw up a work programme for the ENPPF with concrete actions to be carried out over a limited period of time as considered appropriate by the members of the working group. Among the activities to be included in the work programme, the working group should consider addressing Europol and CEPOL with a view to exploring options for making use of their tools such as EPE, SIENA, e-library or the creation of common curriculum for training of protection staff;

If LEWP agrees to setting up a working group within ENPPF, delegations will be invited to volunteer to become members of the working group by sending the names of experts to the Presidency at [lewp@consilium.europa.eu](mailto:lewp@consilium.europa.eu) by 14 July 2014.