



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 29 July 2014
(OR. en)

9334/14
DCL 1

GENVAL 27
EUROJUST 88

DECLASSIFICATION

of document: 9334/14

dated: 8 May 2014

new status: Public

Subject: **EVALUATION REPORT ON THE
SIXTH ROUND OF MUTUAL EVALUATIONS**
**"The practical implementation and operation of Council Decision
2002/187/JHA of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to
reinforcing the fight against serious crime and of Council Decision
2008/976/JHA on the European Judicial Network in criminal matters"**
REPORT ON SLOVENIA

Delegations will find attached the declassified version of the above document.

The text of this document is identical to the previous version.



COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION

Brussels, 8 May 2014

9334/14

RESTREINT UE/EU RESTRICTED

GENVAL 27
EUROJUST 88

**EVALUATION REPORT ON THE
SIXTH ROUND OF MUTUAL EVALUATIONS**

**"The practical implementation and operation of Council Decision 2002/187/JHA of 28
February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime
and of Council Decision 2008/976/JHA on the European Judicial Network in criminal
matters"**

REPORT ON SLOVENIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Executive summary	4
2.	Introduction	9
3.	General matters and Structures.....	11
3.1	General information	11
3.2	Implementation of the Eurojust national coordination system (ENCS).....	12
3.3	National desk at Eurojust	13
3.4	EJN contact points	15
3.5	Conclusions	16
4.	Exchange of information	17
4.1.	Exchange of information within Slovenia.....	17
4.2.	Exchange of information from judicial and law enforcement authorities to Eurojust	17
4.3.	Feedback by Eurojust.....	19
4.3.1.	E-POC project.....	19
4.4.	Conclusions	19
5.	Operational aspects.....	20
5.1.	Practical experience in relation to Eurojust	20
5.2.	Allocation of cases to Eurojust or the EJN or others	21
5.3.	Experience of cases in relation to the competences attributed to Eurojust.....	21
5.3.1.	Cases related to the tasks of Eurojust acting through its national members (Article 6)	21
5.3.2.	Cases related to the tasks of Eurojust acting as a college (Article 7).....	22
5.3.3.	Cases related to the powers exercised by the national member.....	22
5.4.	Practical experience related to coordination meetings.....	22
5.5.	Use of the On-call coordination (OCC)	23
5.6.	Conclusions	24
6.	Cooperation	25
6.1.	Relation with law enforcement authorities (Europol national unit, Sirene, ...).....	25
6.2.	Cooperation with third states	27
6.3.	Practical experience of the EJN	28
6.3.1.	The EJN Website	28
6.4.	Conclusions	28
7.	Special investigative techniques.....	30

7.1	Controlled deliveries (Article 9d (a)).....	30
7.2	Other special investigative techniques (SITs).....	30
7.3	Conclusions.....	31
8.	Training and awareness raising	32
8.1.	Promotion of the use of Eurojust and the EJN.....	32
8.2.	Conclusions.....	33
9.	General observations and final remarks	34
9.1.	Ways to improve the cooperation between the Member States and Eurojust.....	34
9.2.	Conclusions.....	34
10.	Recommendations	35
10.1.	Recommendations to Slovenia.....	35
10.2.	Recommendations to the European Union, its institutions and agencies.....	37
	Annex A: Programme for the on-site visit.....	39
	Annex B: Persons interviewed/met.....	42
	Annex C: List of Abbreviations/Glossary terms.....	44

DECLASSIFIED

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. In line with Article 2 of the Joint Action 97/827/JHA of 5 December 1997, the Working Party on General Matters including Evaluations (GENVAL) decided at the Meeting on 22 June 2011 that the sixth round of mutual evaluations will be devoted to the practical implementation and operation of the Decisions on Eurojust and the European Judicial Network in criminal matters.
2. The evaluation visit to Slovenia took place from 13 to 16 January 2014. It was well prepared and well organised by the Slovenian authorities. The evaluation team met with a large number of officials including representatives from the Ministry of Justice, the Prosecutor General's Office, the Ministry of Interior, Police, and members of the Judiciary. The Slovenian National Member, Ms Malči Gabrijelčič, attended most of the meetings and provided clarification on certain matters together with any supplementary information required by the evaluators.
3. From the outset it should be noted that due to the relatively small size of the country, with a population of just over 2 million, the practical functioning of the Slovenian judicial system relies largely on personal and informal contacts among the relevant competent authorities. This was particularly evident when the evaluators examined the interaction with Eurojust, as it was clear that the National Member was well known to practitioners, who enjoy direct contact and work closely with her.

Legal Framework

4. On the legal framework, Slovenia has implemented the Council Decision 2002/187/JHA of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust and the Council Decision 2009/426/JHA of 16 December 2008 on the strengthening of Eurojust and amending Decision 2002/187/JHA setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime (the Eurojust decisions). It has also implemented Council Decision 2008/976/JHA on the European Judicial Network (the EJM decision). Slovenia has implemented the Eurojust decisions and the EJM decision through the Cooperation in Criminal Matters with the Member States of the European Union Act

(102/2007). This law was subsequently amended by the Cooperation in Criminal Matters with the Member States of the European Union Act (Ur.l. RS, št. 48/2013), hereafter, known as the Cooperation Act. In addition, provisions of the Eurojust decisions are further transposed in the State Prosecutor Act (2011) as amended. The Eurojust National Coordination System (ENCS) was established by the State Prosecutor's General Decision of General Instructions published on 2 November 2012.

5. Both Eurojust and the European Judicial Network (EJN) are widely used by practitioners in Slovenia. The Eurojust National Member and the EJN contact points work effectively and industriously in their respective roles and are well known by practitioners. The legislative framework appears sound, however as the Cooperation Act only came into force in September 2013 the evaluation team was unable to fully assess its impact.

Mutual Legal Assistance

6. Mutual legal assistance (MLA) matters are dealt with in Slovenia through the Prosecutor General's Office and the Courts and both District State prosecutors and judges can issue requests for Mutual Legal Assistance. Approximately half of the MLA requests issued each year come from prosecutors and the other half come from judges. The National Member and the national correspondent for EJN act as focal points to ensure that no overlapping requests are sent.
7. It was clear to the evaluators that all the practitioners they met are familiar with the MLA processes and actively engage with Eurojust and the EJN through the National Member and the EJN contact points, however, the team noted that there is no designated specialist within the Slovenian Prosecutor's General's Office dealing with MLA matters. All prosecutors could potentially have to deal with MLA requests in cases with a cross-border element and, as such, will have to be familiar with the relevant MLA procedures and legislation. The evaluators considered that all prosecutors and the Prosecutor General's Office would benefit from having a dedicated prosecutor responsible for MLA requests who could ensure a consistent application of the MLA instruments and provide support and guidance to prosecutors in Slovenia and the Slovenian national desk at Eurojust.

Eurojust

8. Presently the Slovenian national desk comprises the National Member, an assistant, a seconded national expert and an administrative assistant. Slovenia has been unable to recruit a Deputy National Member since 2011 despite several recruitment campaigns. The evaluation team urges the Slovenian authorities to continue with the recruitment drive as a matter of urgency and explore ways to make the position more attractive to potential candidates.

ENCS

9. Slovenia set up the Eurojust national coordination system (ENCS) by the State Prosecutor's General decision on General Instructions on ENCS of 2 November 2012 under Article 71(2) of the State Prosecutor's Office Act (Ur.l. 58/2011). According to this decision, the national correspondent for the ENCS should be the Deputy National Member. In the absence of a Deputy National Member, the ENCS did not hold its first meeting until 18 September 2013. The meeting was attended by the Prosecutor General who agreed that the National Member would be the interim head of the ENCS until a Deputy National Member could be appointed. The ENCS had held 2 meetings by the time of the evaluation visit, with a third meeting scheduled for the end of January 2014.
10. At its second meeting, the ENCS agreed that it should improve contact with the Europol national unit and, as a result, a meeting was subsequently held between the ENCS and members of the Police Cooperation Unit to consider how cooperation could be enhanced. It has also been agreed that the Europol national unit may be invited to attend the ENCS meetings when relevant issues are being discussed.

EJN

11. On the relationship between the National Member and the EJN it was clear that most people involved in MLA in Slovenia know each other well. Therefore much of the contact with the National Member and contact points works at a personal level. The team was informed that the National Member for Eurojust and the national correspondent for EJN are in regular contact and discuss case allocation to ensure that there is no overlap.

12. In addition, although the evaluation team was very impressed by the level of contact and the good communication that exists between contacts for EJM and Eurojust, it considered that it would be highly beneficial if the outcomes of this contact could be developed into information notes and guidelines for practitioners on how, when and under which circumstances to use Eurojust and the EJM. These guidelines should be made available on the intranets of each authority.

Training

13. Slovenia offers training for practitioners with a special judicial training centre providing training on national and international legislation for prosecutors and judges. Annual seminars are held for criminal and investigative judges and annual prosecutors' training days are offered to prosecutors. Prosecutors and police usually attend separate training sessions, but some common training sessions have been organised in the past on issues of mutual interest such as controlled deliveries or special investigative techniques.
14. The evaluation team consider that as part of Slovenia's training programme, all practitioners should receive training on the Cooperation Act in terms of its application and practical implementation. This training should begin as soon as possible in order to maximise the impact of the legislation and the use of Eurojust and ENCS.

Communication

15. There are separate intranet sites for the Ministry of Justice, the Prosecutor General's Office and the court service. These intranet sites contain summaries of Supreme Court jurisprudence which are also sent to prosecutors by email, as are EJM updates and any decisions of the College. The evaluation team felt that greater use of the intranet could be made and that good practice should be captured and made available to all through the intranet of the Judiciary and Prosecutors and the Ministry of Justice. Links to the EJM and Eurojust websites should also be established and the information on the EJM website related to Slovenia should be kept up-to-date.

Operational Matters

16. Articles 53 and 54 of the Cooperation Act make provision for the establishment and functioning of JITs. Article 53 provides that the Prosecutor General has the authority to conclude JIT agreements.
17. Slovenian authorities have participated in two JITs to date, and have found that the participation of Eurojust in the JIT added value in terms of providing legal advice on the admissibility of evidence. The evaluation team urges Slovenia to continue promoting the use of JITs by highlighting their potential value to practitioners.
18. In Slovenia the entire prosecutor's file is disclosable in criminal proceedings, even if it is not used as evidence. This means that minutes of coordination meetings could be used in legal proceedings and disclosed to defense lawyers. The evaluators had concerns that other Member States who participate in these meetings may not be aware of this and that Eurojust should take steps to clarify how information from these meetings should be treated.

Overall Conclusion

19. Overall, the evaluation team was impressed with Slovenia's implementation and application of the relevant Eurojust and EJM legal instruments and it was clear that the National Member and EJM contact points work well together to ensure that the Slovenian MLA system is effective in practice.
20. In terms of how the system could be improved, the evaluators consider that several steps could be taken by the Slovenia such as; appointing a Deputy National Member as a matter of urgency; capturing and documenting existing good practice and guidance notes and disseminating to practitioners; establishing a specialist prosecutor for MLA in the Prosecutor General's Office; making better use of existing channels of information such as the intranets of the various stakeholders. From an operational perspective, the evaluators felt that the use of JITs should be promoted.

2. INTRODUCTION

Following the adoption of the Joint Action 97/827/JHA of 5 December 1997, a mechanism for evaluating the application and implementation at national level of international undertakings in the fight against organised crime has been established.

In line with Article 2 of the Joint Action, the Working Party on General Matters including Evaluations (GENVAL) decided on 22 June 2011 that the sixth round of mutual evaluations should be devoted to the practical implementation and operation of the Council Decision 2002/187/JHA of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime and of the Council Decision 2008/976/JHA on the European Judicial Network in criminal matters.

The evaluation aims to be broad and interdisciplinary and not focus on Eurojust itself but rather on the operational aspects in the Member States. This is taken into account to encompass, for instance, how police authorities cooperate with Eurojust national members, how the Europol national units will cooperate with the Eurojust National Coordination System and how feedback from Eurojust is channelled to the appropriate police and customs authorities. The evaluation emphasises the operational implementation of all the rules on Eurojust and the EJM. Thus, the evaluation will also cover operational practices in the Member States as regards the first Eurojust Decision, which entered into force in 2002. Experiences from all evaluations show that Member States will be in different positions regarding implementation of relevant legal instruments, and the current process of evaluation could provide useful input also to Member States that may not have implemented all aspects of the new Decision.

The questionnaire¹ for the sixth round of mutual evaluations was adopted by GENVAL on 31 October 2011. As agreed in GENVAL on 17 January 2012, Eurojust was also provided with a questionnaire². The questionnaire to Eurojust was adopted by GENVAL on 12 April 2012.

¹ Doc. 12384/3/11 GENVAL 76 COPEN 176 EUROJUST 106 EJM 87.

² Doc. 5241/2/12 GENVAL 3 COPEN 6 EUROJUST 3 EJM 2.

The order of visits to the Member States was adopted by GENVAL on 31 October 2011.³ Slovenia was the 22nd Member State to be evaluated during this round of evaluations.

In accordance with Article 3 of the Joint Action, a list of experts in the evaluations to be carried out has been drawn up by the Presidency. Experts with substantial practical knowledge in the field were nominated by Member States pursuant to a written request on 15 July 2011 to delegations made by the Chairman of GENVAL.

The evaluation teams will consist of three national experts, supported by two staff from the General Secretariat to the Council and observers. For the sixth round of mutual evaluations, GENVAL agreed with the proposal from the Presidency that the Commission, Eurojust and Europol should be invited as observers.

The experts charged with undertaking this evaluation were Světlana Kloučková (Czech Republic), Miriam Fernandez (Spain) and Stefan Benner (Austria). Two observers were also present: Dimitar Hadzhiyski and Louise Bailey (Eurojust), together with Christina Strömholm and Nicola Murphy from the General Secretariat of the Council.

This report was prepared by the expert team with the assistance of the General Secretariat of the Council, based on findings arising from the evaluation visit that took place in Slovenia between 13th and 16th January 2014 and on Slovenia's detailed replies to the evaluation questionnaire together with their detailed answers to ensuing follow-up questions.

³ Doc. 13040/2/11 GENVAL 82 COPEN 184 EUROJUST 111 EJM 91.

3. GENERAL MATTERS AND STRUCTURES

3.1 General information

For the evaluation, the Member States were requested to indicate all relevant legal or statutory provisions, if any, they had to introduce or amend in order to bring national law into conformity with Council Decision 2002/187/JHA of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime and its amendments according to Decision 2009/426/JHA on the strengthening of Eurojust, or indicating intentions in this respect, and all relevant legal or statutory provisions, if any, which they had to introduce or amend in order to implement Joint Action 98/428/JHA of 29 June 1998 on the creation of a European Judicial Network as well as Council Decision 2008/976/JHA adopted on 16 December 2008 and repealing the Joint Action.

Slovenia has implemented the Eurojust decisions through the Cooperation in Criminal Matters with the Member States of the European Union Act ([102/2007](#)). This law was subsequently amended by Cooperation in Criminal Matters with the Member States of the European Union Act, hereafter known as the Cooperation Act. In addition, provisions of the Eurojust decisions are further transposed in the State Prosecutor Act (2011) as amended. The ENCS was established by a General Decision of the State Prosecutor on 2 November 2012.

In Slovenia both prosecutors and judges can issue requests for Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA requests). Approximately half of the MLA requests issued each year come from prosecutors and the other half come from judges. The National Member and the national correspondent for EJM act as focal points to ensure that no overlapping requests are sent.

The evaluation team noted that there is no centralised unit or designated prosecutor dealing specifically with MLA requests in the Slovenian Prosecutor General's Office.

3.2 Implementation of the Eurojust national coordination system (ENCS)

Slovenia established the Eurojust national coordination system (ENCS) by the State Prosecutor's General decision on General Instructions on ENCS of 2 November 2012 under Article 71(2) of the State Prosecutor's Office Act (Ur.l. 58/2011).

According to the Article 4 of the General Instructions on ENCS, the ENCS shall comprise:

- the national correspondent for Eurojust;
- the national correspondent for Eurojust for terrorism matters;
- the national correspondent for the European Judicial Network and up to three other contact points of the European Judicial Network; the national correspondent for the European network of contact points in respect of persons responsible for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity;
- contact points for Joint Investigation Teams;
- the contact point for Asset Recovery Offices.

No other authorities than those referred to in Article 12 of the Eurojust decision are designated.

According to the Article 5 of the General Instructions on ENCS, the national correspondent for Eurojust shall be the Deputy National Member. At the time of the visit the position of Deputy National Member had been vacant since 2011 despite several attempts to fill it. The vacancy notice for the post was published four times, on 9 December 2011 and 10 February, 16 March and 4 May 2013 but unfortunately unsuccessfully due to lack of applications.

In the absence of a Deputy, the National Member convened the first meeting of the ENCS members on 18 September 2013 at which the role of the ENCS members, coordination of their work and developments in Member States connected to the Eurojust CMS were discussed. The meeting was attended by the Prosecutor General who agreed that the National Member would be the interim head of the ENCS, assuming the role of national correspondent for Eurojust until a Deputy National Member could be appointed. A subsequent meeting was convened by the National Member in December 2013.

No formal cooperation between the ENCS and Europol national unit or any other law enforcement authorities have been established so far, however, on the initiative of the National Member a meeting between the ENCS members and the members of the Police Cooperation Unit was held in December 2013. At this meeting, it was agreed that cooperation with the Europol national unit should be improved and that the Europol national unit should be invited to attend parts of the ENCS meeting which pertain to its work.

Case files are not yet electronic in Slovenia but the case management system (CMS) was established in May 2013. The secure connection between their CMS and Eurojust's CMS is expected to be activated shortly. The access to the CMS can be granted by a decision of the National Member only.

3.3 National desk at Eurojust

Currently the Slovenian national desk at Eurojust is composed of:

- the National Member,
- the Assistant to the National Member,
- a Seconded National Expert and
- an Administrative Assistant.

In 2013, 91 cases were registered at Eurojust by Slovenia. Slovenia organised 7 Coordination Meetings in 2013 and took part in 5 Coordination Meetings organised by other Member States.

According to national law, the National Member at Eurojust must be a supreme, higher state or district prosecutor with advanced knowledge of at least one of the official languages of the EU.

Article 70 of the State Prosecutor Act (ZDT-1) provides that the National Member shall be competent to direct detection of criminal offences and carry out other procedural acts of a competent prosecutor in pre-trial investigation and criminal proceedings to the extent required for the execution of his/her duties. The National Member is appointed by the Prosecutor General for a period of 4 years, which is renewable.

The evaluation team gathered from the feedback provided by many practitioners that the current Eurojust National Member, Ms Malči Gabrijelčič, enjoys a very good standing and is considered highly competent, easily approachable and effective. She has developed regular and frequent contacts with colleagues at all levels throughout the country. In addition, she meets regularly with the national correspondent for EJM to discuss case allocation and direct each MLA request to the appropriate person(s). She also meets with the Europol liaison officers in The Hague every month to exchange data and discuss current cases.

Slovenia has been unable to recruit a Deputy National Member since 2011 despite several recruitment campaigns. The evaluation team considered that ways to make the position more attractive to potential candidates, such as easing the foreign language requirements or the possibility of bilocation between the Hague and Slovenia should be explored.

The National Member has direct access to all of the state prosecutors' databases from The Hague and can indirectly access SIENA and the OLAF database. According to the Article 207 of the State Prosecutorial Rules the National Member also has a right to access to the following databases: criminal records, minor offence register, records of prisoners, databases of the Central Securities Clearing Corporation, other electronic official databases of personal data, records or registries of public sector may also be granted by heads of the prosecutor's offices.

The National Member can also use the e-Justice Portal to receive information from the Ministry of Justice on criminal records. Most of the information that is contained in the prosecutors' databases is also available through this portal. The National Member does not have access to the judges' CMS. Technical solutions for establishing a direct access to the national prosecutor's CMS from Eurojust are currently being explored.

3.4 EJM contact points

Article 95 of the Cooperation Act deals with the appointment of EJM contact points. In Slovenia the EJM is relatively well developed at the level of the Court Service. Article 95(1) provides that the Presidents of the Courts appoint judges who are authorised to perform the function of contact points. Article 95(2) notes that prosecutors are also able to act as contact points on appointment by the Heads of the District State Prosecutors' Offices and the Head of the Specialised State Prosecutor's Office. Article 95(3) provides that the Minister of Justice can designate a civil servant to perform the tasks of EJM contact point within the Ministry. The contact points meet about 3 times a year and consult regularly.

The Cooperation Act entered into force in September 2013. Five new EJM contact points were appointed on 6 January 2014 in addition to the previous 5 -5 prosecutors and 5 from the judiciary and Ministry of Justice. There is now an EJM contact point in each of the 4 cities where there is a higher court and there is also a contact point at the Specialised State Prosecutor's Office. The first meeting of the new EJM contact points took place on 6 January 2014.

The national correspondent for EJM, who is a practising judge, liaises with EJM contacts so that judicial cooperation runs smoothly. She also prepares an annual activity report for the President of the District Court. The evaluation team learned that she performs these duties in addition to managing her own case load. No formal allowances are made for the considerable time that she devotes to EJM activities although there is some recognition of the additional work required of the national correspondent for EJM, for example, no detention order cases are allocated to her, as these require urgent action to be taken.

3.5 Conclusions

1. Slovenia has introduced a series of legislative measures to give effect to the Eurojust Council Decision which was well documented. The evaluators noted, however, that no training has been provided to practitioners to date on the new legislation and consider that it would be useful if training on the new legislation could be provided to practitioners as soon as possible.
2. In terms of the issue and execution of MLA requests, the evaluation team noted that there is no designated prosecutor at a central level dealing specifically with MLA requests. The evaluators considered that the Prosecutor General's Office would benefit from having a specialist prosecutor responsible for MLA requests who could ensure a consistent application of the MLA instruments and could also provide support and guidance to all prosecutors and the Slovenian national desk at Eurojust.
3. The absence of a Deputy National Member puts increased pressure on the National Member and the rest of the desk. The evaluators urge the Slovenian authorities to persist with the recruitment drive as a matter of urgency and explore ways to make the position more attractive to potential candidates.
4. The evaluation team noted that the ENCS has recently become operational and considers that the ENCS will benefit Slovenia in terms of coordinating the work of the various stakeholders and formalising the good communication channels which have operated on a largely ad hoc basis to date. The evaluation team noted, however, that a contact point against corruption as listed in Article 12(2)(d) of the Eurojust Council Decision 2008, has not been appointed to the ENCS.
5. The national correspondent for EJM and the National Member communicate regularly on case allocation and other relevant issues which could be considered a model of good practice. The evaluation team welcomes the appointment of additional contact points. The evaluation team considers that adequate funding should be provided to ensure that the contact points are able to participate at EJM plenary meetings.
6. In addition the evaluation team noted that the national correspondent for EJM is tasked with managing her own workload as a Judge in addition to the demanding role as national correspondent for EJM. The evaluators consider that her regular casework should be reduced to reflect this role.

4. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

4.1. Exchange of information within Slovenia

Due to its size and relatively small public administration, authorities involved in MLA are well known to each other and cooperate well. It is envisaged that the ENCS will further enhance this cooperation as it will allow all relevant stakeholders to meet together on a more formal basis.

On internal communications all contact details of the national desk at Eurojust are published on State Prosecutor's Office website together with a link to the Eurojust website. In practice, practitioners contact the National Member by email and phone. The National Member is available by these means outside of office hours and at weekends in addition to the On Call Coordination (OCC) provided by the national desk.

4.2. Exchange of information from judicial and law enforcement authorities to Eurojust

The Slovenian authorities advise that the most relevant database for practitioners is the state prosecutor's (national) CMS. Relevant databases include: the database on Letters of Request for MLA, database on extradition proceedings, registry of court investigations and criminal proceedings, database of police information.

The evaluation team was also advised that the National Member prepares forms and circulates them to the prosecutors. In addition, the National Member has prepared a general presentation on the tasks and powers of Eurojust which includes guidelines on how to approach Eurojust for assistance and details the type of information required for each type of request. She also prepared short template on what an MLA request should look like.

Article 13 of the Eurojust Decision

Article 13 of the Eurojust Decision has been implemented by Article 90(1) of the Cooperation Act which provides that:

- *The competent national authority shall notify the national representative at Eurojust without undue delay of any matters involving judicial cooperation where:*
- *The requests have been sent to at least two Member States;*
- *Joint investigation teams have been set up;*
- *Controlled deliveries are taking place in at least three countries, with at least two of them being Member States;*
- *A conflict of jurisdiction has arisen or may arise with another country;*
- *There have been recurrent difficulties or refusals concerning the execution of requests for judicial cooperation.*

Two cases have so far been notified to Eurojust using the Article 13 template. The Heads of the District Prosecution Offices have received training on the use of the Article 13 template and a refresher training course was held in November 2013, however, there is no obligation to use the Article 13 template. Slovenian practitioners have not reported major problems filling in the form, but noted that they would usually do this in conjunction with the National Member. There have been a handful of cases where prosecutors were unsure whether the notification requirement had been triggered. In these cases, the National Member helped to determine that there was in fact no obligation to report them to Eurojust.

It is envisaged that the Slovenian CMS will be securely connected to the Eurojust CMS in the future and that ultimately, information entered into the Slovenian CMS will be automatically transferred to Eurojust when it fulfills the Article 13 criteria.

4.3. Feedback by Eurojust

Slovenian State prosecutors and judges send inquiries to Eurojust on a regular basis asking for information on investigations and criminal proceedings in other Member States. The Slovenian national desk at Eurojust always provides them with feedback.

The National Member regularly inserts inquiries from Judges and Prosecutors into the CMS database and records information provided to the national authorities in the system.

4.3.1. E-POC project

Slovenia took part in the E-POC IV project and supported the exchange of information (Article 13) in an automated way.

4.4. Conclusions

1. The information exchange between the Slovenian authorities and Eurojust seem to take place in a both an informal and formal way. The evaluation team was advised that the National Member takes a proactive approach to using the CMS database and regularly inserts information received from national authorities on the system. The evaluators commended this good practice.
2. The evaluation team was also advised that the National Member had prepared a series of guidance notes and templates for Prosecutors for dealing with Eurojust. The evaluation team considers that this information should be developed further and made available on intranet sites of the State Prosecutors and Judiciary, for example, in the form of a guidance manual.
3. The evaluators noted that practitioners met were aware of the reporting requirements under Article 13 and were familiar with the template. Furthermore, the team was advised that when the national CMS is linked to the Eurojust CMS in the future, information entered into the national system will be automatically transferred to the Eurojust CMS if it falls within the criteria of Article 13.

5. OPERATIONAL ASPECTS

5.1. Practical experience in relation to Eurojust

The Slovenian desk at Eurojust keeps statistics on cases where Slovenia requests assistance from other Member States as well as when other Member States requests assistance from Slovenia. A large number of contacts are made in every case through e-mails, phone conversations and personal contacts. All of Eurojust's casework related correspondence and individual contacts are registered/recorded in Eurojust's CMS. Enquiries on general issues are registered separately.

The Slovenian national desk at Eurojust keeps statistics on the total number of cases from Slovenian authorities opened at Eurojust and provides a breakdown by requesting authority i.e. the courts or prosecutor's offices.

- According to the statistics Slovenian state prosecutors ask Eurojust for assistance particularly in pre-trial procedure, but also in a phase of court investigation and trial. State prosecutors needed help in **47 cases in 2012** and in another **47 cases in 2013** (as on 19 November).
- Slovenian Judges sought Eurojust's assistance particularly in court investigation phase of the proceedings, but also in trials. Altogether judges asked Eurojust in **22 cases in 2012** and in **32 cases in 2013**.

On MLA requests:

- In 2012 the Slovenian national desk registered at Eurojust (Slovenia as a requesting MS) 62 bilateral cases and 7 multilateral cases. The most cases were opened towards Italy (23), Austria (14), Germany (8), Romania (5), Hungary (5), UK (4), France (3) and Spain (3).
- In 2013 (until 19 November) Slovenian national desk registered at Eurojust (Slovenia as a requesting MS) 65 bilateral cases and 14 multilateral cases. The most cases were opened towards Italy (20), Germany (15), Austria (11), France (6), Bulgaria (5), UK (5), Belgium (4), Cyprus (3), Czech Republic (3), Hungary (3) Croatia (3) and Romania (3).

5.2. Allocation of cases to Eurojust or the EJM or others

The National Member liaises with the national correspondent for EJM to determine case allocation. The decision as to whether a case should be dealt with by the EJM or referred to Eurojust is made on a case by case basis taking into account the complexity of the case and the number of Member States and third states involved.

The National Member and the national correspondent for EJM have delivered training on case allocation but no internal guidance has been issued to practitioners.

Some cases which are on the face of it suitable for the EJM are dealt with by the National Member at Eurojust if urgent action is required. However, this does not happen frequently as the EJM contact points usually respond efficiently to requests for assistance.

5.3. Experience of cases in relation to the competences attributed to Eurojust

All new cases are reviewed by the National Member who records them in the CMS and assigns a member of the desk to manage each file. The National Member, Assistant and Seconded National Expert consult regularly on general matters and cooperate closely when dealing with particularly complex cases. The National Member oversees all open cases. These are reviewed at regular meetings of all three (twice per month) during which possible further action is agreed.

5.3.1. Cases related to the tasks of Eurojust acting through its national members (Article 6)

The tasks according to Article 6 are frequently exercised by the Slovenian national authorities, which respond to the National Member's requests in a cooperative manner without undue delay. Good cooperation has always resulted in efficient and effective assistance being provided to the requesting Member State. Communication takes place via email and phone and contact is maintained until the Eurojust case is closed.

5.3.2. Cases related to the tasks of Eurojust acting as a college (Article 7)

Any potential conflicts of jurisdiction have been resolved through dialogue with the competent national authorities concerned without involving the College of Eurojust. Therefore, Slovenia has had no experience of Article 7 to date.

5.3.3. Cases related to the powers exercised by the national member

The National Member frequently exercises her ordinary powers in agreement with the national authorities. Facilitation of MLA requests by providing additional information and ensuring appropriate follow up is a core task. In urgent cases, the National Member can also take responsibility for receiving and transmitting MLA requests, however, there has been no need to exercise these powers to date. The National Member provides the national authorities with necessary information and advice and, in some cases, prepares drafts of MLA requests. The evaluation team was satisfied that the Cooperation Act complies with Article 9 (a) to (d) of the Eurojust Council Decision 2008.

5.4. Practical experience related to coordination meetings

The Slovenian experience in relation to coordination meetings organised by Eurojust is very positive. The number of cases where Slovenia has organised and convened coordination meetings has risen significantly over the last few years. In 2012, Slovenia organised 1 coordination meeting and attended 2 more organised by other Member States. In 2013, Slovenia organised 7 coordination meetings in cases where Slovenia was a requesting Member State. Slovenian representatives attended 3 coordination meetings in 2013 (until 19 November) as a requested Member State. The Slovenian authorities consider that coordination meetings are the best Eurojust tool to support complex cases, address legal questions and coordinate action.

To date, the coordination meetings involving Slovenia have been organised on the initiative of the National Member after consultation with national authorities, when the case, specific challenges and desired outcomes were discussed. All coordination meetings took place between the national desks involved at which the terms of the coordination meeting were agreed. Slovenia advised that the exchange of information and evidence, clarifications on legal and practical questions related to admissibility of evidence and decisions on the best placed authority for the prosecution would not have been possible without coordination meetings.

One issue explored during the evaluation visit was the question of how information shared in the coordination meetings is used in Slovenia. The evaluators were advised that the full disclosure rules in Slovenia means that minutes of the coordination meetings form part of the prosecutor's file and are disclosed during proceedings. This raised some questions about how information is treated by other Member States in coordination meetings and whether there was a need for Eurojust to develop guidelines and mechanisms to ensure that all participants are aware of the possibility of minutes of coordination meetings being disclosed and provide the necessary consent.

5.5. Use of the On-call coordination (OCC)

National authorities have been informed about the existence of the on-call coordination by letter issued by the National Member on 4 July 2011 which advised that in urgent matters the prosecutors could continue to use the her mobile phone. In addition, prosecutors and judges were informed of the possibility of the on-call coordination by e-mail sent in August 2013. The contact details of the members of the desk are sent to prosecutors and judges regularly twice per year and are published on the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office website.

The National Member has always been and is available on her mobile phone out of working hours, during the weekends and when on leave therefore the Slovenian authorities contact the National Member directly. Until 1 September 2013 she was the only prosecutor at the desk thus the only person competent to exercise the powers provided by Eurojust decisions.

5.6. Conclusions

1. On the use of Eurojust and the EJM, as Slovenia is a small country most people involved in the provision of MLA know each other well. Therefore most contact between the National Member and contact points is on a personal level. The evaluators consider that this personal approach, can on the one hand work very well in practice and ensure effective and efficient use of Eurojust and EJM, however, on the other hand, the reliance on individuals and personal contacts without a clear structure in place to support this approach can leave the system very vulnerable.
2. On the allocation of cases between Eurojust and the EJM, it was clear that the good communication which exists between the National Member and the national correspondent for the EJM ensures that cases are directed to the most appropriate agency. The evaluation team saw huge merit in documenting this decision making process as guidelines or instructions which could be used as a reference tool for practitioners.
3. The evaluation team noted that the National Member is available 24/7 almost 365 days per year and has often been contacted when on annual leave. Although the team was impressed by the level of dedication of the National Member it considered that this situation is not sustainable in the long term.
4. The evaluation team noted that Slovenia makes good use of coordination meetings which are seen as a valuable tool to exchange information in cross-border cases. The evaluation team noted that this information is disclosed during legal proceedings in Slovenia. As a result the team recommends that Eurojust develop protocols which include guidelines on how information exchanged at coordination meetings should be treated, recorded and used by participants.

6. COOPERATION

6.1. Relation with law enforcement authorities (Europol national unit, Sirene, ...)

The National Member is regularly provided with a list of the Europol meetings. In cases involving Slovenia, the National Member can seek additional information from the Slovenian Liaison Bureau and may attend relevant meetings at Europol. Similarly, the National Member may also invite Europol to a coordination meeting organised by Eurojust, if necessary.

On OLAF, there has been one case which involved Members of the European Parliament in which the National Member closely cooperated with OLAF. The initial information on the case was provided by OLAF, and several other Member States were involved as well. One operational meeting was organised by OLAF, which was followed by 2 Eurojust coordination meetings at which OLAF participated.

The Slovenian national desk at Eurojust has not had any experience related to cooperation with Frontex to date.

Participation of national members in joint investigation teams (Article 9f)

Articles 53 and 54 of the Cooperation Act make provision for the establishment and functioning of JITs. Article 53 provides that JIT agreements may be concluded after obtaining the opinion of the Director General of the Police, between the State Prosecutor General, or his deputy, the State Prosecutor's Office, the Court, the Police or another State's competent authority. The agreement can only be concluded on the initiative of the State Prosecutor General, the head of the District State Prosecutor's Office, or the head of the Specialised State Prosecutor's Office. The National Member can take part in the negotiation of JIT agreements but the agreements can be signed by the Prosecutor General and the Deputy State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia.

In practice, prosecutors and police officers have found that coordination meetings are a good way to promote joint working and to consider together whether there is a need to set up a JIT. Slovenia considered that participating in a JIT can be a good way to gather evidence without the need to issue letters rogatory. The value of JITs in this respect has been reinforced by the decision of the Slovenian Courts that all evidence gathered through JITs is admissible in court.

Slovenian authorities have participated in 2 JITs to date and have found that the participation of Eurojust in the JIT added value in terms of providing legal advice on the admissibility of evidence. In a recent case, the participation of Eurojust helped obtain information quickly and ensure that a last minute request for hearing witnesses by video conference complied with the correct formalities for execution in the receiving Member State. The participation of Europol in the JIT also added value in terms of providing analysis of data gathered.

When the evaluation team asked why Slovenia had not made greater use of the JITs to date, it was advised that the first JIT established by Slovenia related to a particularly complicated case and may have discouraged their use in subsequent cases. As a result, many practitioners consider that it may be more efficient and cost effective to cooperate by way of coordination meetings instead of JITs in straightforward cases.

In terms of the model agreements, practitioners found that from their experience it would be helpful if the JIT agreements contained express provisions about translation and the admissibility of evidence collected by JIT members and exchanged within the JIT in order to help minimise the scope for challenges from defence lawyers.

6.2. Cooperation with third states

The competent Slovenian authorities (judges, state prosecutors) are well informed of the possibilities to access Eurojust's support and assistance in their casework involving third states. In practice, Slovenian state prosecutors and judges have sought Eurojust's assistance for the following reasons: lengthy execution of MLA requests, unresponsive authorities of the third states, the urgency of the matter and a need for coordination.

In 2012, Slovenia requested assistance from the following 8 third states: Serbia, the USA, Bosnia and Herzegovina (3 cases), Croatia, Switzerland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2 cases), Albania and Moldova.

In 2013, Slovenia requested assistance from the following 9 third states: Serbia (2 cases), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2 cases), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2 cases), Croatia (2 by 1 July 2013), Montenegro, Switzerland, Indonesia, Dominican Republic, Panama and Turkey.

The involvement of Eurojust in Slovenian cases with third states contributed to efficient and effective assistance regarding both coordination and efficiency in obtaining requested information and evidence. Experience from the casework shows that the assistance of Eurojust was of great importance and was, in some cases, essential for the successful conclusion of criminal proceedings. For example; legal provisions and their explanation from Uruguay were needed for the assessment of the admissibility of evidence during one trial; in another case this was achieved by the organisation of hearings through videoconferences in Ukraine in a case in which the Ukrainian authorities had not responded to the Slovenian MLA requests; and a third case which involved obtaining a piece of evidence from Serbia, for which several MLA requests have been issued by the investigative and penal judges, but the execution had been rejected.

Slovenia also benefits from the strategic seminars organised by Eurojust with third states. Practitioners advised that these meetings are particularly useful in terms of discussing extradition and fostering better cooperation on MLA matters with these third states.

6.3. Practical experience of the EJM

The National Member is regularly in contact with the national correspondent for EJM and regularly participates in the meetings of EJM contact points. She cooperates on casework with all of the EJM contact points in Slovenia. The national correspondent for EJM and the National Member jointly organised training in Slovenia concerning international judicial cooperation.

The evaluation team was also informed that Slovenia attends regional meetings of EJM when they are organised, for example, the annual meeting organised by Austria and finds them particularly useful.

6.3.1. The EJM Website

Slovenian judicial authorities use the EJM website and also use the EJM Atlas to find out who the responsible authorities are in other Member States. Initial contacts are usually facilitated by the national correspondent for EJM and once these have been made the judge or prosecutor usually corresponds with their opposite number directly by email. For the most part, practitioners have found that the contacts in the EJM Atlas are up to date.

The EJM Tool Correspondent is based in the Ministry of Justice. She is frequently approached by practitioners with queries regarding the use of forms and EJM tools. The templates provided on the EJM website, for example for freezing orders, are often not available in word format in all EU languages. This can cause delay for practitioners who have to seek assistance in adapting the Pdf templates for all framework decisions.

6.4. Conclusions

1. It was clear to the evaluation team that there is a good level of cooperation between the National Member and Europol which will be further enhanced through the use of the ENCS.

2. The evaluation team noted Slovenia's limited use of JITs to date and, as such, consider that the use of JITs should be promoted by the authorities and that practitioners should be advised of their potential benefits including the possibility of obtaining funding for their use. Consideration could also be given to authorising more prosecutors in the Prosecutor General's Office to sign JIT agreements and further authority could be given to the National Member to negotiate and sign JIT agreements on behalf of Slovenia.
3. The evaluation team noted that the EJM tools and website are used by practitioners and would encourage the Slovenian authorities to ensure that the information pertaining to Slovenia is kept up to date.
4. One issue raised by the EJM Tool Correspondent was the difficulties of working with Pdf documents in the EJM website in so far as they are more difficult to use and translate into other languages.
5. The evaluation team was informed of the Slovenia's positive experience of using Eurojust to assist with cooperation with third states. Slovenia has also benefitted from attending the Eurojust strategic seminars with third states.
6. In addition, the evaluation team noted that Slovenia found the EJM regional meetings particularly useful.

DECLASSIFIED

7. SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES

7.1 Controlled deliveries (Article 9d (a))

According to Article 55 of the Cooperation Act, a decision to authorise a controlled delivery falls within the competencies of the District State Prosecutor from the area where the controlled delivery is to be executed, or from the territory of which it shall be dispatched, or be issued by a Specialised State Prosecutor's Office.

The controlled delivery shall be permitted at the request of the competent authority of the Member State or in agreement with another Member State, if criminal offences are involved that satisfy the conditions for the issue of a European Arrest Warrant. A controlled delivery in the territory of Slovenia shall be implemented by the competent Slovenian authorities in such a manner as to provide permanent surveillance and appropriate action.

A controlled delivery shall not be authorised or its further implementation shall be suspended if:

- there are risks to people's life or health; or
- it is likely that further control or action in another Member State is not ensured or will not be effective.

In urgent cases and in so far as it is not possible to identify or to contact the competent national authority, the National Member may be entitled to authorise and to coordinate controlled deliveries and to execute or to propose to execute a request for judicial cooperation without the consent of the competent authority. The competent national authority shall be informed as soon as possible after the request has been authorised. The National Member has not made use of this possibility to date.

7.2 Other special investigative techniques (SITs)

National authorities cooperated with Eurojust in several cases relating to special investigative techniques, including interception of communications, secret surveillance, undercover operations etc.

Police and judicial authorities receive training on the use of controlled deliveries and other special investigative techniques including cross-border surveillance.

7.3 Conclusions

1. Slovenian legislation on controlled deliveries and SITs complies with the Article 9d(a) of the Eurojust decisions and could be used in practice if necessary.

DECLASSIFIED

8. TRAINING AND AWARENESS RAISING

8.1. Promotion of the use of Eurojust and the EJM

Slovenia offers training for practitioners and has a special judicial training centre which provides training on national and international legislation for prosecutors and judges. Annual seminars are held for criminal and investigative judges and courses are offered on a variety of topics, including English legal terminology for both beginners and advanced level English speakers.

In recent years, annual prosecutors' training days have focused on the work of Eurojust. Prosecutors and police usually attend separate training sessions, but some common training sessions have been organised in the past on issues of mutual concern such as controlled deliveries or special investigative measures. The Head of Police Cooperation meets with the National Member twice a year to decide on the training programme. Current topics are the European Arrest Warrant, cross border surveillance, controlled delivery and Joint Investigation Teams (JITs).

The national correspondent for EJM took part in Eurojust marketing seminar, organised by the National Member in 2010. On the initiative of both three trainings on judicial cooperation were organised by Centre for judicial training in January 2013. In addition, the National Member contributed with her presentations at trainings for prosecutors in 2012 and training for investigative judges in 2009.

There are separate intranet sites for the Ministry of Justice, the Prosecutor General's office and the court service. These intranet sites contain summaries of Supreme Court case law. These summaries are also sent to prosecutors by email, as are EJM updates. The use of email helps to draw recipients' attention to the contents. However, in general if practitioners have queries about MLA they can seek advice from their colleagues. Prosecutors can seek advice on difficult legal questions by requesting the opinion of the district college, or asking the office of Prosecutor General to provide guidance. The decisions of the college are also circulated to prosecutors by e-mail.

8.2. Conclusions

1. The evaluators were impressed with the cooperation between the Head of Police Cooperation and the National Member in identifying training needs and arranging same, which could be considered as a model of good practice.
2. The evaluation team did, however consider that as part of Slovenia's training programme, all practitioners should receive training on the new legislation and how it should be applied in practice. It was considered that this information dissemination and training should be organised as soon as possible in order to maximise the impact of the legislation and the use of Eurojust and the ENCS.
3. The evaluation team also noted that Slovenia makes some use of the internal intranets but understood that all relevant information on Eurojust and the EJM is not provided through these media.

DECLASSIFIED

9. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND FINAL REMARKS

9.1. Ways to improve the cooperation between the Member States and Eurojust

When asked if it had any suggestions on how cooperation could be improved between the Member States and Eurojust, Slovenia drew attention to its reservation to the 1959 MLA Convention by which it reserves the right to receive MLA requests and annexed documents with translations into Slovenian.

The costs of translating requests, and documentary evidence received in response to MLA requests, are significant and the courts do not have sufficient funds available in their budget for this. However, in order to successfully prosecute a cross-border case, it is difficult to limit the translation of evidence. For example, in a recent cybercrime investigation involving Spain, several thousand pages of evidence were received from the Spanish authorities. There was not enough money in the budget of the Slovenian Authorities to have all of the evidence received translated. In order to work around the issue, the National Members for Spain and for Slovenia reviewed the evidence disclosed together and arranged for the relevant evidence to be translated themselves. Practitioners have highlighted the scope for legal challenge arising from the use of unofficial translations in such circumstances.

9.2. Conclusions

1. Slovenia identified that the costs of translation of documents and evidence received from other Member States is substantial and suggest that more could be done at an EU level to reduce the costs involved for individual Member States, perhaps through a centralised legal translation service at Eurojust.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

As regards the practical implementation and operation of the decisions on Eurojust and the European Judicial Network in criminal matters, the expert team involved in the evaluation of Slovenia has been able to satisfactorily review the system in Slovenia. Overall, the working principles and legal framework of the system is robust and functional and the various actors are aware of their roles and responsibilities.

Nevertheless, certain recommendations can still be made, to contribute to the further development of the system in Slovenia. Furthermore, based on the various good and, without doubt, even best practices of Slovenia related recommendations to the EU, its institutions and agencies are also put forward.

Slovenia should conduct a follow-up on the recommendations given in this report 18 months after the evaluation and report on the progress to the Working Party on General Affairs, including Evaluations (GENVAL).

10.1. Recommendations to Slovenia

1. Slovenia has introduced a series of legislative measures to give effect to the Eurojust decisions which was well documented. The evaluators noted, however, that no training has been provided to practitioners on the new provisions of the 2013 amendments to the Cooperation in Criminal Matters with the Member States of the European Union Act and, therefore, encourages Slovenia to provide this training as soon as is practicable in order to ensure its full application.
2. In terms of the issue and execution of MLA requests, the evaluation team noted that there is no dedicated prosecutor dealing specifically with MLA requests in the Prosecutor General's Office. The evaluators consider that all prosecutors in Slovenia and the Prosecutor General's Office would benefit from having a dedicated prosecutor responsible for MLA requests who could ensure a consistent application of the MLA instruments and could also provide support and guidance to all prosecutors in Slovenia and the Slovenian national desk at Eurojust.

3. The evaluation team noted that the National Member is available 24/7 almost 365 days per year and has often been contacted when on annual leave. Although the team was impressed by the level of dedication of the National Member it considered that this situation is not sustainable in the long term. The absence of a Deputy National Member has placed increased pressure on the National Member and the rest of the national desk. The evaluators urge the Slovenian authorities to persist with the recruitment drive as a matter of urgency and explore ways to make the position more attractive to potential candidates.

4. The evaluators noted that practitioners met were aware of the reporting requirements under Article 13 and were familiar with the template. Furthermore, the team was advised that when the national CMS is linked to the Eurojust CMS in the future, information entered into the national system will be automatically transferred to the Eurojust CMS if it falls within the criteria of Article 13. The evaluators consider that Slovenia should continue with its technical preparations for the establishment of a secure connection to the Eurojust CMS and promote the use of the Article 13 template in the interim giving consideration as to whether there is a need to organise training for practitioners about the notification obligations.

5. It was clear to the evaluators that Slovenia makes good use of coordination meetings but by comparison Slovenia's use of JITs is limited. The evaluators recommend that Slovenia considers how the use of JITs can be promoted by the authorities and consider ways to inform practitioners of their potential benefits including the possibility of obtaining funding for their use. Consideration could also be given to authorising more prosecutors in the Prosecutor General's Office to sign JIT agreements and further authority could be given to the National Member to negotiate and sign JIT agreements on behalf of Slovenia.

6. Both Eurojust and EJM function harmoniously in Slovenia, but they lack certain formal structures which should be developed, as far as possible. Most communication between members of the EJM and the National Member is conducted informally, and although this system works in practice it could be improved. In particular, the evaluators felt that Slovenia would benefit by recording the findings/outcomes of this contact and making this material available to practitioners as a reference tool, i.e. in the Intranets.

7. The evaluation team considers that better use could be made of the intranets of the Ministry of Justice, Prosecutor General's Office and the Courts with relevant jurisprudence, templates for MLA requests, EAW certificates and guidance notes being made available to practitioners through these sites. Furthermore, the evaluation team also learned that the National Member has prepared a series of guidance notes and templates for Prosecutors use when dealing with Eurojust. The evaluation team considers that this information should be developed and made available on intranets of the State Prosecutors and Judiciary.

8. Slovenia is also encouraged to provide up-to-date information on the EJM contact points to the EJM Secretariat.

10.2. Recommendations to the European Union, its institutions and agencies

a) Recommendation to the Commission and the Member States:

1. In light of the fundamental rights issues associated with reliance on unofficial translations in proceedings and the exclusion of non-translated evidence from proceedings, consider whether there is scope to provide Member States with additional funding to carry out legal translations or whether a dedicated legal translation service could be provided by Eurojust to this end.

b) Recommendations to EJM

1. EJM templates for documents under framework decisions should be available in all EU languages and in Word format so that they can be downloaded and completed directly by practitioners.
2. Continue to consider how to make the most efficient use of Fiches Belges in order to reduce the scope for requests about national legislation and procedure.
3. To finalise the work on the new website, especially including the access to the back office for the EJM tool correspondents.

10.3 Recommendations to Eurojust

1. To continue supporting Member States in their relations with third states, particularly by organising individual meeting and strategic seminars with third states.
2. The evaluation team noted that Slovenia makes good use of coordination meetings which are seen as a valuable tool to exchange information in cross-border cases. The evaluation team noted that this information is disclosed in legal proceedings in Slovenia. As a result the team recommends that Eurojust develop protocols which include guidelines on how information exchanged at coordination meetings should be treated, recorded and used by participants.
3. Continue to work towards concluding a Memorandum of Understanding with Slovenia on establishing secure connection between the Eurojust CMS database for the Slovenian national CMS.

10.4 Recommendations to Member States

1. To consider the possibility of authorising the National Member to negotiate and sign JIT agreements, if this could improve the efficiency of their establishment.

ANNEX A: PROGRAMME FOR THE ON-SITE VISIT

13-16 January 2014, Slovenia

MISSION AGENDA

Monday, 13 January

Arrival of delegations

Tuesday, 14 January

10:00 – 10:15 Reception of delegation at the Ministry of Justice (Ministry of Justice building, Župančičeva 6, Ljubljana)

10:15 – 11:15 Meeting with representatives of the Ministry of Justice

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Acting Director General, The Directorate for legislation of the justice system
- EJN contact point at the Ministry of Justice
- National Member for Slovenia at EUROJUST

11:45 – 12:30 Meeting with prosecutors at the Office of the State Prosecutor General (Trg OF 13, Ljubljana)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Prosecutors
- National Member for Slovenia at EUROJUST

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch break

Restaurant Šestica (Slovenska cesta 40, Ljubljana)

14:15 – 15:30 Meeting with prosecutors at the Prosecutor General's Office (continued)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Prosecutors
- National Member for Slovenia at EUROJUST

15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break

15:45 – 17:00 Meeting with prosecutors at the Prosecutor General's Office (continued)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Prosecutors
- National Member for Slovenia at EUROJUST
- Additional participants for the third session: judges, members of the ENCS

Wednesday, 15 January

9:00 – 11:30 Meeting with investigative and trial judges at the District Court in Ljubljana
(Ljubljana District Court building, Tavčarjeva 9, Ljubljana)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Investigative and trial judges
- National Correspondent for EJM

10:00 – 10:15 Coffee break

10:15 – 11:30 Meeting with investigative and trial judges at the District Court in Ljubljana
(Continued)

11:30 Departure to Nova Gorica

12:50 – 14:20 Lunch break

Restaurant Pri hrastu (Kromberška cesta 2, Nova Gorica)

14:30 – 17:00 Meeting with prosecutors and police investigators at the District Prosecutor's Office in Nova Gorica (District Prosecutor's Office Nova Gorica, Prvomajska 50, Nova Gorica)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- District prosecutors
- Head of the international police co-operation division, Ministry of interior (Police)
- Investigators from Criminal police office Nova Gorica
- National Member for Slovenia at EUROJUST

15:45 – 16:00 Coffee break

16:00 – 17:00 Meeting with prosecutors and police investigators at the District Prosecutor's Office in Nova Gorica (Continued)

19:00 Dinner

Sokol Restaurant (Ciril-Metodov trg 3, Ljubljana)

Thursday, 16 January

9:00 – 12:00 Final meeting with representatives of all relevant institutions at the Ministry of Justice (Župančičeva 6, Ljubljana)

10:30 – 10: 45 Coffee break

10: 45 – 12:00 Final meeting with representatives of all relevant institutions at the Ministry of Justice (Continued)

Departure of delegation

-/-

DECLASSIFIED

ANNEX B: PERSONS INTERVIEWED/MET

Monday, 13 January

Arrival of delegation

Tuesday, 14 January

10.00 – 10.15 Reception of delegation at the Ministry of Justice

10.15 – 11.15 Meeting with representatives of the Ministry of Justice

Participants on the Slovenian side: - Andreja Lang, head of Criminal law division at the Ministry of justice

- Anja Štrovs, EJN contact point at the Ministry of Justice
- Miha Movrin, Ministry of justice
- Malči Gabrijelčič, national member at EUROJUST

11.45 – 12.30 Meeting with prosecutors of the Prosecutor General's Office

Participants on the Slovenian side:

:

- Mirko Vrtačnik, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Andrej Ferlinc, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Boštjan Škrlec, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Ivan Žaberl, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Edvard Ermenc, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Ana Bučar Brglez, District State Prosecutor's Office Ljubljana
- Malči Gabrijelčič, national member at EUROJUST

12.30 - 14.00 Lunch break

14.00 - 15.30 Meeting with prosecutors of the Prosecutor General's Office (continued)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Mirko Vrtačnik, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Andrej Ferlinc, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Boštjan Škrlec, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Ivan Žaberl, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Edvard Ermenc, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Ana Bučar Brglez, District State Prosecutor's Office Ljubljana
- Malči Gabrijelčič, national member at EUROJUST
-

15.30 – 15.45 Coffee break

15.45 – 17.00 Meeting with prosecutors of the Prosecutor General's Office (continued)

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Mirko Vrtačnik, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Andrej Ferlinc, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,

RESTREINT UE/EU RESTRICTED

- Boštjan Škrlec, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Ivan Žaberl, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Edvard Ermenc, District State Prosecutor's Office Celje
- Ana Bučar Brglez, District State Prosecutor's Office Ljubljana
- Malči Gabrijelčič national member at EUROJUST

Members of the ENCS:

- Marjeta Švab Širok, ENCS, EJM
- Lea Dukič Japelj, ENCS, EJM
- Vanja Verdel Kokol, ENCS, EJM

Wednesday, 15 January

9:00 – 11.30 Meeting with investigative and trial judges at the District Court in Ljubljana

- Marjeta Švab Širok, judge at Higher Court, Ljubljana
- mag. Alja Kratovac Prokopovič, judge at District Court, Ljubljana
- Andrej Baraga, judge at District Court, Ljubljana
- Zvezdan Radonjić, judge at District Court, Ljubljana
- Barbara Klajnšek, judge at Local Court, Ljubljana

11:30 departure to Nova Gorica

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch break

14:30 – 17:00 Meeting with prosecutors and police investigators at the District Prosecutors Office in Nova Gorica

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Branka Oven, District State Prosecutor's Office Nova Gorica
- Damjana Bandelj District State Prosecutor's Office Nova Gorica
- Dušan Kerin, Interpol, Europol, General Police Directorate
- Alan Lazar, investigators at Criminal Police Directorate Nova Gorica
- Borut Fortin; investigators at Criminal Police Directorate Nova Gorica
- Malči Gabrijelčič, national member at EUROJUST

19.00 Dinner

Thursday, 16 January

9.00 – 12.00 Final meeting with representatives of all relevant institutions at the Ministry of Justice

Participants on the Slovenian side:

- Mirko Vrtačnik, Office of the State Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia,
- Matija Vidmar, Ministry of Justice
- Anja Štrovs, Ministry of Justice
- Miha Movrin ; Ministry of Justice
- Marjeta Švab Širok, judge at Higher Court, Ljubljana
- Malči Gabrijelčič, national member at EUROJUST

ANNEX C: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/GLOSSARY TERMS

LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS	ACRONYM IN LANGUAGE OF THE MEMBER STATE	LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS
EAW	-/-	European Arrest Warrant
CMS		Case Management System
EJN	-/-	European Judicial Network
ENCS	-/-	Eurojust National Coordination System
EU	-/-	European Union
GENVAL	-/-	Working Party on General Matters including Evaluations
JITs	-/-	Joint investigation team
JHA		Justice and Home Affairs
MLA	-/-	Mutual Legal Assistance
OCC	-/-	On-call Coordination
OLAF	-/-	European Anti-fraud Office
SITs	-/-	Other special investigative techniques