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Internal preparatory discussions on framework for future relationship

Police & judicial cooperation in criminal matters

AD HOC WORKING PARTY ON ARTICLE 50 (Seminar mode)
23/01/2018
Consequences of UK withdrawal: default position

EU-27 cooperation with the UK:

- **international conventions** (CoE or UN) allowing e.g. for joint investigative teams, extradition, the fight against cybercrime
- **Interpol**,  
- **bilateral relations**,  
- **"soft" measures** (e.g. exchanges of non-personal data, global initiatives)
Transition period in the JHA area: Scope

The existing UK status in the JHA area taken into account:

UK remains bound by acts applicable to it upon its withdrawal

+ the UK may:

choose if to participate in measures amending/replacing/building upon such acts

BUT

No opt-ins to completely new measures
Transition period in the JHA area: Institutional aspects

UK:
- no longer participates in the EU institutions or in the decision-making, governance of Union agencies;

whilst

- full competences of the Union institutions, agencies and bodies in relation to the UK and UK natural and legal persons
Future relationship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EU</strong></th>
<th><strong>UK position</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership on the fight against terrorism and international crime</td>
<td>Aim: &quot;Deep and special partnership&quot; that maintains/deepens/strengthens operational and practical cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union's interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member cannot have the same rights as a member</td>
<td>AT THE SAME TIME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of rights and obligations</td>
<td>• Future <strong>third country that does not participate in the Schengen area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy of the Union decision-making process</td>
<td>• Arrangements for the free flow of data → <strong>mutual recognition</strong> (respect for UK sovereignty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dispute settlement → <strong>No direct ECJ jurisdiction</strong>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No free movement of persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors determining the degree of the EU cooperation with third countries

- EU-27 security interest
- Shared threats and geographic proximity
- Existence of a common framework of obligations with third countries (e.g. Schengen, free movement)
- Risk of upsetting relations with other countries
- Respect for fundamental rights, essentially equivalent data protection standards
- Strength of enforcement & dispute settlement mechanisms
## Police & judicial cooperation with third countries
### Overview of international agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Schengen third countries</th>
<th>Non-Schengen third countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europol</td>
<td>Access to database (not DK*)</td>
<td>Data exchange; Participation in analyses projects (if MS agree)</td>
<td>Data exchange; Participation in analyses projects (if MS agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurojust</td>
<td>Access to database</td>
<td>Data exchange; Participation in Eurojust cases (if MS agree)</td>
<td>Data exchange; Participation in Eurojust cases (if MS agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Name Record</td>
<td>Carriers provide PNR, Authority-to-authority cooperation (not DK*)</td>
<td>No specific cooperation so far</td>
<td>EU carriers provide PNR, Authority-to-authority cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prüm</td>
<td>Interconnection of databases</td>
<td>Interconnection of databases (NOR &amp; ISL)</td>
<td>No interconnection of databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECRIS</td>
<td>Interconnection of databases; data exchange</td>
<td>No access</td>
<td>No access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS II</td>
<td>Full access*</td>
<td>Full access (as Schengen members)</td>
<td>No access, Schengen-related instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurodac</td>
<td>Full access</td>
<td>Full access (as &quot;Dublin&quot; members)</td>
<td>No access as not participating in &quot;Dublin&quot; system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extradition</td>
<td>European Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Agreement with NOR &amp; ISL on the application of certain provisions of the 2000 EU Convention on legal assistance as well as its 2001 Protocol</td>
<td>Extradition agreements with the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual legal assistance &amp; cooperation</td>
<td>Various instruments based on mutual recognition principle</td>
<td>Mutual legal assistance agreements (JPN, US)</td>
<td>International conventions (CoE, UN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Integrating the information on the relationship with NOR & ISL, as well as International conventions (CoE, UN)
Building blocks of the future relationship

Exchange of security relevant data

Support for operational cooperation

Judicial cooperation in criminal matters
Exchange of data

Europol
(e.g. US, Serbia, Canada, Ukraine, Norway)

Eurojust
(e.g. US, Montenegro, Norway)

PNR
(US, Australia, Canada)
# Europol: current cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cooperation</th>
<th>EU-MS (apart from Denmark)</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>3rd countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Board working groups</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Europol National Units</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Invited to the meetings</td>
<td>Invited to the meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange of data/ operational cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europol databases</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>No access* Data exchange</td>
<td>No access Data exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis projects</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Participation (if MS agree)</td>
<td>Participation (if MS agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Europol : exchange of data comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU-MS (apart from Denmark)</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Third countries (Schengen or non-Schengen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to databases</td>
<td>Data exchange; no access to databases (*)</td>
<td>Data exchange; no access to databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consequences of applying the third country model to the UK:**

- effective ways of **data exchanges** with Europol, MS and other partners (via SIENA),
- **liaison officers** to facilitate the data exchange
- **no access to Europol databases**
Eurojust: exchange of data comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Third countries (Schengen or non-Schengen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Eurojust database</td>
<td>Data exchange; no access to databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of applying the third country model to the UK:

- effective ways of data exchanges with partners,
- possibility to appoint contact points and liaison magistrates to facilitate data exchange
- no direct access to Eurojust Case Management System or case-files
Passenger Name Record: comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Third countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU PNR Directive: EU and third country carriers provide PNR, close authority-to-authority cooperation between MS.</td>
<td>EU carriers provide PNR to US, AUS, CAN, Authority-to-authority cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of applying the third country model to the UK:

- The UK requires EU air carriers to provide PNR
- **exchange of PNR and results of processing of PNR** between the UK and MS 27 Passenger Information Units (PIUs),
- **No access** for the UK to PNR on intra-EU flights
- Requirements set out in the **ECJ Opinion 1/15** to be met
  +
- EU PNR Directive will apply **erga omnes**
Support for operational cooperation

Europol
(e.g. US, Norway, Serbia, Canada, Ukraine...)

Eurojust
(e.g. US, Norway, Montenegro)
Europol: support for operational cooperation comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU-MS</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>3rd countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in analysis projects (if they want)</td>
<td>Participation in analysis projects (where MS agree)</td>
<td>Participation in analysis projects (where MS agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences of applying the third country model to the UK:

- Ways to cooperate on "live" investigations,
- The UK can be associated to an operational analysis project if:
  - the purpose of the project is relevant to the UK or if the data processed in the project concerns it,
  - if agreed by all participating Member States
- Observer in the Heads of Europol National Units' meetings
- may participate in the EU Policy Cycle supported by Europol
- Liaison officers
**Eurojust: support for operational cooperation comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Third countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Eurojust cases (if they want)</td>
<td>Participation in Eurojust cases (if MS agree) Possible secondment of liaison prosecutors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consequences of applying the third country model to the UK:**

+ **Cooperation** in real time and multilaterally on judicial cases
+ **Liaison magistrates** in UK/Eurojust
+ **Exchange** of operational data **via liaison magistrates** in UK/Eurojust
+ **Coordination of judicial cooperation** (extradition, mutual legal assistance)
+ **Use of Eurojust's On-Call Coordination**
Judicial Cooperation in criminal matters

Need for the EU-27 to ensure:

- ways of extradition
- mutual legal assistance
# Judicial cooperation in criminal matters: comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Schengen third country</th>
<th>Non-Schengen third country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extradition</td>
<td>European Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Agreement on the surrender procedure with NO &amp; IS (not yet in force)</td>
<td>Extradition agreement with US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual legal assistance &amp; cooperation</td>
<td>Various tools based on mutual recognition principle, e.g., Investigation Order, financial penalties, freezing &amp; confiscation, etc.</td>
<td>Agreement with NO &amp; IS on the application of certain provisions of the 2000 EU Convention on mutual legal assistance and its 2001 Protocol</td>
<td>Mutual legal assistance agreements (JPN, US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- International framework (CoE, UN, etc.)
- International framework (CoE, UN, etc.)
Extradition

- Fall-back: CoE Convention 1957 on extradition and additional Protocols:
  - N°1-1975,
  - N°2-1978,
  - N°3-2010,
  - N°4-2012.

- Could other cooperation models with third countries be a basis for the future relations?
## Models for extradition cooperation with third countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>EU- Norway/Iceland (Schengen members; free movement) not yet in force</th>
<th>CoE Convention</th>
<th>EU-US agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the surrender between judicial authorities (mutual recognition principle):</td>
<td>• international cooperation through diplomatic channels</td>
<td>• international cooperation through diplomatic channels,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• exception of double criminality (for certain offences)</td>
<td>• double criminality,</td>
<td>• largely relies on existing and future bilateral agreements with particular MSs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• deadlines for execution,</td>
<td>• no extradition of own nationals,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• limited grounds for refusal;</td>
<td>• no time-limits for extradition (ca 1 year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BUT:</strong> possibilities for Parties to unilaterally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• renounce their obligation to surrender their own nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• restrict the obligation to surrender for political offences (in both cases subject to reciprocity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA)

- **Aim:** to collect and exchange evidence in cross-border criminal proceedings; other forms of assistance

- **Fall-backs:** CoE Conventions, e.g. 1959 on mutual legal assistance and additional Protocols:
  - N°1- 1978
  - N°2-2001

- **Other models of cooperation with third countries on mutual legal assistance:**
  - EU - Norway/Iceland agreements
  - EU-US and EU-Japan agreements
### Models for MLA cooperation with third countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>EU- Norway/Iceland (=Schengen members; free movement)</th>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>EU-US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MLA regime based on application of 2000 EU MLA Convention to NOR/ISL, i.e. association with Schengen acquis</td>
<td>• &quot;Classic&quot; international cooperation (diplomatic channels, letters rogatory based on principle of request) improvements since 2nd protocol (similar to 2000 MLA Convention, incl. JITs)</td>
<td>• General framework based on internal cooperation through diplomatic channels, largely relies on existing and future bilateral agreements with particular MSs EU-US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Necessary safeguards for the future cooperation

• **Fundamental rights** as set out in the European Convention on Human Rights

• **Essentially equivalent data protection standards**

• **Effective enforcement & dispute settlement**
Preparedness

Preparedness to end UK’s EU membership

- The EU and Member States need to raise awareness of need to anticipate and adjust
- Issues related to the EU databases

Additional preparedness to risk of no deal

- The EU and Member States need to raise awareness of need to anticipate and adjust
Transition:
Application of the acquis,
Opt- ins to measures amending/replacing/building upon the acquis
No opt ins to new measures
No participation in institutions and decision making

Future
Framework allowing for:
Exchange of security relevant data, i.e. Europol, Eurojust, PNR
Operational cooperation, i.e. Europol, Eurojust
Judicial Cooperation on Criminal matters

Preparedness
MS & stakeholders awareness
+ if no deal, contingency measures to safeguard EU interest