



Council of the  
European Union

067780/EU XXVI. GP  
Eingelangt am 11/06/19

Brussels, 11 June 2019  
(OR. en)

8023/03  
ADD 3 DCL 1

COPEN 33

## DECLASSIFICATION

---

of document: 8023/03 ADD 3 RESTREINT UE/EU RESTRICTED  
dated: 7 May 2003  
new status: Public

---

Subject: Council Decision determining which provisions of the 1995 Convention on simplified extradition procedure between the Member States of the European Union and of the 1996 Convention relating to extradition between the Member States of the European Union constitute developments of the Schengen acquis in accordance with the Agreement concerning the Republic of Iceland's and the Kingdom of Norway's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis  
- Questions in light of the negotiation mandate given to the Presidency  
(doc. 10944/3/02 CATS 42 COPEN 41 REV 3 RESTREINT UE)

---

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

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

# RESTREINT UE



COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION

Brussels, 7 May 2003

8023/03  
ADD 3

RESTREINT UE

COPEN 33

## ADDENDUM TO NOTE

From : General Secretariat

To : Delegations

No. prev. doc. : 5853/02 COPEN 10 COMIX 71; 6300/03 COPEN 8; 8023/03 COPEN 33  
+ ADD 1 + ADD 2

Subject : Council Decision determining which provisions of the 1995 Convention on simplified extradition procedure between the Member States of the European Union and of the 1996 Convention relating to extradition between the Member States of the European Union constitute developments of the Schengen acquis in accordance with the Agreement concerning the Republic of Iceland's and the Kingdom of Norway's association with the implementation, application and development of the Schengen acquis  
- Questions in light of the negotiation mandate given to the Presidency  
(doc. 10944/3/02 CATS 42 COPEN 41 REV 3 RESTREINT UE)

Delegations will find attached the reply received by the Luxembourg delegation to doc. 6300/03 COPEN 8.

# **RESTRICTION UE**

## **Questions to the JHA Counsellors**

1. **Are there any special items that need to be considered when it comes to the extradition convention of 1996, the 2000 MLA Convention or its Protocol, or may it be taken for granted that Norway and Iceland could join the workings of these instruments without problems ?**  
**Could, in this context, a consultation mechanism be instituted between the European Union and the Member States ?**

LUX.1. Luxembourg thinks that it can be taken for granted that Norway and Iceland join the workings of the Extradition Convention and the 2000 MLA Convention without problems.

There seems to be no need for a consultation mechanism.

2. **According to the Presidency mandate, the Agreement with Norway and Iceland should "make the mechanism of the Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States applicable in the relations between Iceland and Norway and between each of those States and the Member States of the EU, without, however, necessarily incorporating all of its elements". Moreover, constitutional provisions of the Member States shall be respected. In the light of this mandate, could Member States inform the Presidency whether there are problems in relation to such an agreement in the following respects:**
  - 2.a. **surrender of own nationals,**
  - 2.b. **abandoning double criminality for the list of offences contained in Article 2(2) of the European Arrest Warrant,**
  - 2.c. **abandoning the political offence exception in relation to Norway and Iceland.**

LUX.2. There are no problems in relation to such an agreement in the 3 mentioned respects.

3. **How do Member States interpret that Norway and Iceland should join the "mechanism"? Is the mechanism limited to the transmission of a European Arrest Warrant under Article 9 of the Council Framework Decision or can it also be extended for instance to Articles 10, 17 and 23 or even beyond those provisions ?**

LUX.3. Luxembourg sees no reasons why the mechanism could not be extended to Articles 10, 17 and 23 or beyond.