



European Joint Master Programme

Module VII – Master Thesis

The coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level

Submitted by

Hugo Cruz

Submission Date

June 16th 2019



European Joint Master Programme

Module VII – Master Thesis

The coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level

Submitted by

Hugo Cruz

Submission Date

June 16th 2019

Statement of authorship

In accordance with the CEPOL “European Joint Master Programme” assignment rules, I declare that the text hereby presented is of my entire authorship and that all the text used and belonging to others is properly referenced.

Hugo João da Silva Cruz

Police Major

Acknowledgments

This Master's dissertation, as a final stage of a demanding, but immensely fruitful European Joint Master Programme, was only possible due to combination of efforts from several persons and institutions that allowed us to walk the long road in order to reach our goal.

It is with great sympathy and acknowledgment that I would like to express my gratitude to:

CEPOL, for selecting me as a participant and my fellow colleagues in Budapest for providing all the conditions for me to attend the several modules and being able to conduct my research, with continuous incentives and important contributes;

The several Framework Partners, Coordinators, Trainers and supporting staff involved in the implementation of the seven modules in Hungary, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Romania, the Netherlands and Estonia, for the high level of knowledge and expertise provided and the welcoming learning environment;

The Portuguese Public Security Police (PSP) and especially the Higher Institute of Police Sciences and Internal Security (ISCPSI), for allowing me to submit my candidacy to attend the EJMP and also giving me all the necessary support during the journey;

My dear friends and colleagues who attended this edition of the EJMP during the last two years, and with whom I shared and learned so much;

Detlef, Aija, Mario, Miguel and Gerhard for the enormous contribution given during the interviews;

My girlfriend and companion during so many nights of research, readings and writings for all her support, patience, incentives and caring;

Finally, to my mentors and friends, Sergio Felgueiras and Lúcia Pais, for the all the support, availability, suggestions and constructive criticism that allowed me to achieve this goal.

Abstract

This master dissertation reflects about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. Focusing firstly on the implementation of training by Justice and Home Affairs Agencies and other European and international institutions and secondly on the coordination tools available, there is an analysis of these factors' evolution since 2014 based on Regulations, reports and bibliography, complemented with the analysis, thoughts and future perspectives of individuals representing the key actors on the subject.

By perceiving how the training is implemented and trying to respond to the main question whether there is an effective and efficient coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, conclusions were drawn and recommendations are given in order to comprehend the current status and contribute to a better coordination in the future.

Key Words: Coordination, European dimension, Law Enforcement, Training

Table of contents

· Statement of authorship	2
· Acknowledgments	3
· Abstract	4
· Acronyms and abbreviations	7
· 1 - Introduction	9
· 2 - Method	12
· 2.1 - Participants	12
· 2.2 - <i>Corpus</i>	12
· 2.3 - Instruments	13
· 2.4 - Procedure	13
· 3 - The training for law enforcement officials by the JHA Agencies	14
· 4 – The role of CEPOL	19
· 5 - The training for law enforcement officials by other Institutions	21
· 6 - The coordination of training on a European level	26
· 7 - The Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix	39
· 8 - Future perspectives	51
· 9 - Conclusions and recommendations	55
· References	59

Index of tables

· Table 1: Training activities implemented per stakeholder	48
· Table 2: Number of participants per stakeholder	49
· Table 3: Number of participants per type of activity	50

Index of annexes

· Annex 1: Results from the questionnaire applied to the CNUs	66
· Annex 2: Scripts of the interviews	79
· Interview #1 – Detlef Schroeder (CEPOL)	80
· Interview #2 – Aija Kalnaja (FRONTEX)	82
· Interview #3 – Miguel Madaleno (ESDC)	84
· Interview #4 – Mário Gouveia (CKC Leader)	86
· Interview #5 – Gerhard Haberler (Austrian CNU)	89

Acronyms and abbreviations

- CAAR Consolidated Annual Activity Report
- CC Common Curriculum
- CEPOL European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training
- CFSP Common Foreign and Security Policy
- CITYCOP Citizen Interaction Technologies Yield Community Policing
- CKC CEPOL Knowledge Centres
- CNU CEPOL National Units
- CSDP Common Security and Defence Policy
- DG-HOME Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs
- DG-JUST Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers
- EASO European Asylum Support Office
- EC3 European Cybercrime Centre
- ECTEG European Cybercrime Training and Education Group
- ED Executive Director
- EEAS European External Action Service
- EIGE European Institute for Gender Equality
- EJMP European Joint Master Programme
- EJTN European Judicial Training Network
- EMCDDA European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction
- EMPACT European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats
- ENFSI European Network of Forensic Science Institutes
- ENTRi Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management
- ESDC European Security and Defence College
- EU European Union
- EU-LISA Agency for the operational managements of Large-scale IT Systems in the area of Freedom, Security and Justice

- EUPST European Union Police Services Training
- EURODAC European Asylum Dactyloscopy Database
- EUROJUST European Union's Judicial Cooperation Unit
- EUROPOL European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation
- EU-SOCTA Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment
- EU-STNA EU Strategic Training Needs Assessment
- FP Framework Partners
- FRA Fundamental Rights Agency
- FRONTEX European Border and Coast Guard Agency
- FSI Internal Security Fund
- JHA Justice and Home Affairs
- LEA Law Enforcement Agency
- LETS European Law Enforcement Training Scheme
- Matrix Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix
- MB Management Board
- MMA Mentoring, Monitoring and Advising
- MS Member States
- OAP Operational Action Plan
- OTNA Operational Training Needs Analysis
- SIRENE Supplementary Information Request at the National Entries
- SIS Schengen Information System
- SIS II Schengen Information System II
- SOCTA Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment
- SPD Single Programming Document
- THB Trafficking of Human Beings
- UNICRI United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute
- UNODC United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- VIS Visa Information System

1 - Introduction

The criminal reality on a European level has been evolving and changing exponentially, especially during the last decades. New forms of criminality arose while the digital transformation brought new forms of crimes that are not confined nor related to physical borders, social circles, ethnic groups or governmental ideologies. All these changes obliged the several Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA) across the European Union (EU), both on a national and international level, to cooperate and coordinate efforts, not only on an operational level, but also in terms of training for the two million law enforcement officials performing their duties in the EU Member States.

When a police officer was recruited in 1970', there was a high probability that during several years, maybe decades, there would be no need for further training, or if there was, that training was most probably implemented within the country or region where that police officer was performing duties. In the 21st century, that is no longer the reality. Law enforcement officials not only need to attend additional lifelong training in their Member States (MS) but also, they need to be engaged in international training activities in order to create common basis for the necessary operational cooperation.

The training opportunities for law enforcement officials from the Member States have been increasing every year. The EU, either through its Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) Agencies or through funding of other Institutions and Projects, has been investing the tax-payers money on human resources and the creation of capabilities in order to identify the common training needs and provide the necessary training.

There are many academic studies and research about the importance of training, the best ways to deliver training and how the training is the first step for further cooperation, but we did not find any extensive studies or research about how this training should be coordinated, in order to avoid duplications and overlap of efforts, curricula, human resources, and thus avoiding a

negligent spending of the available funding. That was the reason why we decided to initiate the journey of writing this thesis.

Our study proposes to investigate how the coordination of training for law enforcement officials is established and conducted in Europe and understand whether this coordination is effective and efficient.

Concerning the scope, we will not analyse the training delivered by Member States, even if these have an international perspective, accepting participants from other Member States, but only on those activities implemented by the JHS Agencies, European institutions and EU funded projects.

In order to achieve this goal, we will analyse studies that have been conducted in this matter, in order to give us some theoretical support, but also the mandates, Regulations or strategic documents of all the actors involved, combined with a qualitative analysis of the opinions of key players responsible for the design, implementation, evaluation and coordination of training activities, hoping to understand how they perceive the implementations of training, its coordination and how to improve this coordination in the future.

Due to the reduced bibliography found on the subject matter, we opted to include the opinions of the interviewees along the development of the thesis, instead of having a separate chapter dedicated to the qualitative analysis of the interviews, as we believe this is the best way to illustrate the reality and complement the information gathered in the context of the bibliographic research.

The structure of the thesis follows a logical sequence in order to give the reader a sequential, albeit logical overview the whole problematic and subsequent relevant topics.

We will start by analysing the training for law enforcement officials delivered by the JHA Agencies of the EU, with a special highlight to the European Union for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), as since 2016, it is the EU Agency tasked to “support, develop, implement and coordinate training for law enforcement officials” (CEPOL Regulation, 2015, art. 3 - 1).

Besides from the JHA Agencies, there are other European institutions, organisations and EU funded projects delivering training for law enforcement officials with a European dimension, so we will also analyse their role and capabilities on delivering training and how they coordinate the training with CEPOL and the other stakeholders.

We will then try to understand how the implementation of training is being coordinated, through the analysis of the existent coordination mechanisms, combining the research with the opinions of key actors involved on both implementation and coordination of training. A special emphasis will be given to the Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix (Matrix), as this tool is referred as one of the most important concerning the coordination of training.

Before we advance with our conclusions and recommendations, we will also analyse the perception of the key actors interviewed concerning their vision for the future and how to improve the existing coordination mechanisms.

The present dissertation aims not only to be an accurate, innovative and relevant research, but also to be used as a tool for further improvement, hoping that it reaches the right target groups, eventually by publishing the findings.

2 – Method

This master thesis was developed using the qualitative method, following two paths. The first one aimed to establish the theoretical framework on the subject of work, as well as the support of the research question, through an analysis of the state of the art, legislation, normative documentation and several other documental sources. The second path of development of the work was conducted by interviews with relevant actors within the European framework of institutions responsible for delivering training for law enforcement officials.

2.1 - Participants

In order to have a complete view of the current status of the training of law enforcement officials on a European level, focusing the research on the aspects related with the coordination of such training, several interviews were conducted to have the necessary information to complement the documental research.

To achieve these goals, we interviewed: the Executive Director of CEPOL, Mr. Detlef Schroeder (Interviewee #1); the Head of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (FRONTEX) Capacity Building Division, Mrs. Aija Kalnaja (Interviewee #2); a Training Officer from the European Security and Defence College (ESDC), Mr. Miguel Madaleno (Interviewee #3); a former representative from a CEPOL Framework Partner who was the first leader of the CEPOL Knowledge Centre (CKC) on Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) Missions, Mr. Mário Leal Gouveia (Interviewee #4); and, a representative from a CEPOL Framework Partner, who is also the Head of the CEPOL National Unit (CNU) in Austria, Mr. Gerhard Haberler (Interviewee #5).

2.2 - Corpus

The *corpus*, according to Bardin (1977, p. 122), consists of "all the documents taken into account to be submitted to analytical procedures". Thus, the *corpus* of this work consists of three different types of materials: the documentary, constituted by bibliographic research such

as related researches, publications and articles; the legislation, constituted by normative documentation and other relevant documents, such as official reports; and, the material derived from the five interviews carried out, which were transcribed *verbatim*.

2.3 - Instruments

The instrument of interview was used as an instrument of data collection, using personalised scripts built for this purpose. The questions are open-ended and semi-directive, allowing to reduce the constraints usually associated with the imposition of predetermined or closed answers, as well as to facilitate the delimitation of the subjects and dimensions that can be used by the respondents to describe their thoughts and experiences (Kvale, 1996), while leaving them free to respond. At bottom, there is a set of topics about which respondents are invited to speak, although interviewees are shaping the interview rather than the other (Atkinson, 1981).

The instrument used to analyse responses to interviews is thematic content analysis, which consists of a "set of communication analysis techniques that seek, through systematic and objective procedures for describing message content, indicators (quantitative or otherwise) that allow the inference of knowledge concerning the conditions of production / reception (inferred variables) of these messages" (Bardin, 1977, p.42).

The information obtained by the interviews was used to illustrate ideas and confirm or infirm our thoughts.

2.4 - Procedure

Through documentary analysis, all the normative documentation, legislation and other relevant documents already mentioned were studied. With this procedure we intend to establish relationships in the time band that allow us to perceive the evolution of the problem.

After stabilizing the script of the interview based on the literature review, the research problem and the analysis of the documentary *corpus*, and obtaining the necessary authorization, the interviews were carried out. It should be noted that three of the respondents requested the set

of questions to answer in writing, which constitutes an anomaly in the data collection process, since they had different conditions from the other participants to provide information.

The procedures for content analysis of the transcribed interviews met the criteria of reliability and validity required (Bardin, 1977; Ghiglione & Matalon, 1993; Pais, 2004).

3 - The training for law enforcement officials by Justice and Home Affairs Agencies

The Justice and Home Affairs Agencies network has an important role to play in Europe. Their work helps ensure that the EU is well equipped to deal with security, justice, fundamental rights and gender equality. The Agencies work on a wide range of important areas, including migration and border management, drug trafficking and combating organised crime, human trafficking and gender equality. Since these areas have a lot in common, a network was established to make use of the synergies and share information and includes nine Agencies: CEPOL; the European Asylum Support Office (EASO); the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE); the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA); the Agency for the Operational Management of Large-scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (eu-LISA); the European Union's Judicial Cooperation Unit (EUROJUST); the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (EUROPOL); the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA); and, FRONTEX (EUROPOL, 2019).

All these Agencies are stakeholders on the Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix (Matrix), developed and coordinated by CEPOL. Besides the nine Agencies mentioned above, the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) is also integrated in the Matrix, as it is an important player in Europe concerning the implementation of training activities for law enforcement officials.

It is important to understand the role of some of these Agencies concerning their engagement in the training for law enforcement officials, therefore we went through the respective Regulations in order to better comprehend this engagement.

As CEPOL has a major role in terms of implementation and coordination of training, according to its mandate, we will firstly analyse the other Agencies and the ESDC and then analyse the CEPOL role on a separate chapter.

According to its Regulation, the Support Office of EASO shall establish and develop training available to members of all national administrations and courts and tribunals, and national services responsible for asylum matters in the Member States. Participation in training is without prejudice to national systems and procedures (EASO, art. 6). Also, the Support Office shall develop training in close cooperation with Member States' asylum authorities and, where relevant, take advantage of expertise of academic institutions and other relevant organisations. The training offered by the Support Office may be general, specific or thematic and may include 'train-the-trainers' methodology. Specific or thematic training activities in knowledge and skills regarding asylum matters shall include and shall not be limited to international human rights and the asylum acquis of the Union, including specific legal and case-law issues (EASO, art. 6).

Concerning eu-LISA, this Agency performs tasks related to training on the technical use of the Second Generation Schengen Information System (SIS II), the Visa Information System (VIS) and the European Dactyloscopy - fingerprint database for asylum seekers (Eurodac) as well as other systems entrusted to it in the future (eu-LISA, preamble - 16). Also, in relation to SIS II, the Agency performs tasks related to training on the technical use of SIS II, in particular for the Supplementary Information Request at the National Entries (SIRENE) staff, and training of experts on the technical aspects of SIS II in the framework of Schengen evaluation (eu-LISA, art. 3).

In the EUROJUST Regulation there is not much mentioned about training and the cooperation with CEPOL and other Agencies concerning training. The only reference can be found in article

51 where it is mentioned that Eurojust shall establish and maintain cooperative relations with the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) (EUROJUST, art. 51).

EUROPOL's Regulation states that this Agency shall provide specialised training and assist Member States in organising training, including with the provision of financial support, within the scope of its objectives and in accordance with the staffing and budgetary resources at its disposal in coordination CEPOL (EUROPOL, art. 4).

The Regulation, besides from the CEPOL one, that provides more references to training is FRONTEX's. At the preamble (point 16) it is mentioned that Member States should ensure that any authorities which are likely to receive applications for international protection such as the police, border guards, immigration authorities and personnel of detention facilities have the relevant information and ensure that such authorities' personnel receive the necessary level of training which is appropriate to their tasks and responsibilities and instructions to inform applicants as to where and how applications for international protection may be lodged (FRONTEX, preamble – 16). FRONTEX should also develop specific training tools, including specific training in the protection of children and provide training at Union level for national instructors of border guards offering additional training courses and seminars related to integrated border management tasks, including for officers of the competent national bodies. This should include training on relevant Union and international law and on fundamental rights. The Agency should be authorised to organise training activities in cooperation with Member States and third countries on their territory (FRONTEX, preamble – 40).

It is further mentioned that FRONTEX shall assist Member States on training of national border guards, other relevant staff and experts on return, including the establishment of common training standards (FRONTEX, art. 8), and shall monitor and assess the availability of the technical equipment, systems, capabilities, resources, infrastructure, adequately skilled and trained staff of Member States necessary for border control (FRONTEX, art. 13).

Different from the other Agencies' Regulations is the fact that FRONTEX Regulation has a specific article dedicated to Training (art. 36), where, amongst other things, it is stated that the

Agency shall, in cooperation with the appropriate training entities of the Member States, and, where appropriate, EASO and FRA, develop specific training tools, including specific training in the protection of children and other persons in a vulnerable situation by providing border guards and other relevant staff who are members of the European Border and Coast Guard teams with advanced training relevant to their tasks and powers. Experts from the staff of the Agency shall also conduct regular exercises with those border guards in accordance with the advanced training and exercise schedule referred to in the annual work programme of the Agency (FRONTEX, art. 36.1). Additionally, it shall offer training courses and seminars on subjects related to the control of the external borders and return of third-country nationals for officers of the competent national services of Member States and where appropriate of third countries (FRONTEX, art. 36.6) and organise training activities in cooperation with Member States and third countries on their territory (FRONTEX, art. 36.7).

Concerning the cooperation with Union institutions, bodies, offices, Agencies, and international organisations, it is mentioned that FRONTEX may, with the agreement of the Member States concerned, invite observers of Union institutions, bodies, offices, Agencies or international organisations to participate in its activities, in particular joint operations and pilot projects, risk analysis and training, to the extent that their presence is in accordance with the objectives of those activities, may contribute to the improvement of cooperation and the exchange of best practices, and does not affect the overall safety and security of those activities. The participation of those observers in risk analysis and training may take place only with the agreement of the Member States concerned (FRONTEX, art. 52).

Concerning the ESDC, the contribution of Madaleno gave valuable insight in order to better comprehend the role of ESDC in the implementation of training but also its' engagement with CEPOL and other JHA Agencies.

According to Article 2 of the Council Decision 2016/2382 of 21 December 2016 establishing a European Security and Defence College (ESDC), the "ESDC shall provide training and education, among other specific tasks and responsibilities set forth in the Council Decision, in

the field of the Union's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in the wider context of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) at European level in order to develop and promote a common understanding of CSDP and CFSP among civilian and military personnel, and to identify and disseminate best practice in relation to various CSDP and CFSP issues through its training and education activities". The ESDC is an organization, with its own legal capacity, embedded in the European External Action Service (EEAS) and is the core provider of CSDP training and education in Europe.

Additionally, the ESDC Steering Committee draws responsible for the overall coordination and direction of the ESDC training activities, with the support of the ESDC Executive Academic Board which ensures the quality and coherence of the ESDC training activities. ESDC liaises with relevant organisations and supports several partnerships and projects within the CFSP and CSDP such as FRONTEX, CEPOL and EUROPOL, amongst others (ESDC, 2016).

According to Madaleno, *"the ESDC has an inclusive training policy, support and procedure, coordinating/either cooperating with the various stakeholders who provide training in the CSDP area, in what can be characterized by a training architecture on CSDP, supporting the efforts exerted by all these entities, in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity and complementarity, promoting the necessary synergies, avoiding overlapping. In this regard, pursuant to Article 5.1(a) of the Council Decision (CFSP) 2016/2382 of 21 December 2016, the ESDC is to establish close links with the Union institutions and relevant Union Agencies, in particular with CEPOL. Therefore and additionally, on the 11th of July 2017 ESDC and CEPOL signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) setting a working arrangement between the two institutions, as it is in the common interest of ESDC and CEPOL to contribute to law enforcement cooperation in the field of CSDP, through learning and through strengthening training activities for law enforcement officials"* (Interviewee #3).

The Fundamental Rights Agency delivered training in the specific area of Human Rights, but mostly supported other Agencies on implementing courses in this area (FRA, 2019).

Concerning the remaining Agencies, namely the EMCDDA and EIGE, we could not find a specific mention to training, at this level, on the respective Regulations thus we will not make a reference to them in this chapter. However, it is important to understand that they also implement training and often provide expertise for the implementation of training by other Agencies, especially CEPOL and that they are stakeholders of the Matrix.

4 – The role of CEPOL

The European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training is, without any doubt, the JHA Agency with the biggest role in terms of implementation and coordination of training. The (former) European Police College (CEPOL), was established by Council Decision 2005/681/JHA as an entity of the Union with the aim of training senior police officers of the Member States and facilitating cooperation between national police forces by organising and coordinating training activities with a European policing dimension (CEPOL, 2005). One of the major changes with the new Regulation was the enlargement of the target group of training products from senior police officers to making such training systematically accessible to law enforcement officials of all ranks (CEPOL, 2015, preamble – 3).

The four general principles, according to the new Regulation are: to support Member States in providing training in order to improve basic knowledge of the Union dimension of law enforcement; to support Member States, upon their request, in the development of bilateral and regional cooperation through law enforcement training; to develop, implement and coordinate training in specific thematic areas; and to develop, implement and coordinate training in relation to Union missions and law enforcement capacity-building activities in third countries.

It seems appropriate to highlight that two of these principles mention the importance of the coordination of training, reflecting the importance of the present study.

The mentioned set of general principles should represent the European Law Enforcement Training Scheme (LETS), which aims to ensure that Union level training for law enforcement

officials is of a high quality, coherent and consistent. In fact, the importance of the LETS was well studied and documented by a previous student on the CEPOL European Joint Master Programme (EJMP), who had very interesting and useful findings concerning the implementation of the LETS by CEPOL, namely when he defends that “there should exist common projects towards a standardization of methods, procedures and instruments (...) in order to facilitate policing together towards the same types of criminality on a similar manner and also the capacity to coordinate police actions in a centralized way and establish working groups to better analyse the procedures and information gathered during those common actions and to rely on centralized structures (institutions, Agencies, at central level, like EUROPOL and CEPOL) in order to allow for better coordination, standardization of streamlined and practised procedures, as well as the establishment of common policies and projects that could be processed and accepted by all legal systems” (Meireles, 2017, p. 11).

Also, he mentions that “LETS could be a cornerstone and have a huge impact on EU police cooperation, thus providing training programmes, coordinated by a centralized agency (CEPOL)” (Meireles, 2017, p. 13).

We will further develop the study concerning the LETS and its implementation in the chapter dedicated to the coordination and also try to understand why, according to the CEPOL Executive Director, the EU-LETS is already dead, although the European Commission still refers to it at times.

Concerning the implementation of training by CEPOL and in order to understand if there are areas where CEPOL is delivering training which are also covered by other Agencies/Institutions, we analysed the 2018 Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR).

According to the overview of number of activities (CAAR, 2018, p. 10) it is possible to understand that the majority of the courses implemented by CEPOL were related to Serious and Organised Crime, meaning, the areas covered by the EU Policy Cycle (excluding cybercrime related activities), which are:

- Drug trafficking;

- Facilitation of illegal immigration;
- Organised property crime;
- Trafficking in Human Beings;
- Excise and MTIC fraud;
- Illicit firearms trafficking;
- Environmental crime;
- Criminal finances and money laundering; and,
- Document fraud.

Concerning these areas, which are aligned with the European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats (EMPACT) priorities, CEPOL implemented 57 training activities. This is an important information that we will explore later, on the chapter dedicated to the coordination. Besides from these areas, CEPOL training also covers training activities in the following areas (with the respective number of activities implemented):

- Information exchange, policing of mass events and fundamental rights: 53 activities;
- Cybercrime and cybersecurity: 41 activities;
- Counterterrorism: 17 activities;
- Training development; 17 activities;
- CSDP missions training: 12 activities;
- Migrant smuggling: 9 activities;
- Leadership development: 4 activities.

5 - The Training for law enforcement officials in Europe by other Institutions

Besides from the training provided by the JHA Agencies, there are other institutions also delivering training for law enforcement officials in Europe. Some of these training activities are in areas also covered by CEPOL and other EU Agencies. According to our research, from 2014 to 2018 the following trainings were delivered:

- Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management (ENTRI): Around 20 training activities were implemented in the areas of Pre-deployment for EU Missions, Mentoring, Monitoring and Advising (MMA), Human Rights, Organised Crime, Corruption and Train the Trainers.

ENTRI is an initiative mostly funded by the European Commission (90%). The programme began in 2011 and was set to run until May 2019. The total budget of the programme since its inception is 8 million Euros. The implementing partners are from different Member States of the European Union and Switzerland. ENTRI was created by the European Union's Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace and was guided by the European Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), which is co-located with the EEAS. To that end, the ENTRI consortium of training institutions has developed a variety of tools to support crisis managers, such as training courses and packages, handbooks, a certification mechanism to ensure a minimum standard of course content across institutions, and peer mechanisms to help organisations learn from each other (ENTRI, 2019);

- European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI): Several training activities were implemented in the areas of forensics evidence, interpretation of gunshot residues, firearms, document analysis, drugs, explosives, fingerprints, DNA. Also, some joint courses were organised with CEPOL, EUROPOL and the EJTN. Besides from that, 17 Expert Groups were created in the areas of drugs, document analysis, explosives, firearms, forensics and the area of Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear (CBRN).

ENFSI is recognized as the pre-eminent voice in forensic science throughout Europe and worldwide through its promotion of the quality in the delivery and development of forensic science at all stages, from crime scene to the court room.

This vision is achieved through a number of strategic goals: Strengthening the scientific basis for the delivery of forensic science by stimulating and co-ordinating research and

development activities; promoting the evaluation of forensic information to strengthen the effectiveness of scientific results as evidence; providing a forum for the exchange of good practice in the daily delivery of forensic science; facilitating the mutual recognition of forensic results throughout Europe through active involvement in the process of harmonisation and the setting of standards for forensic science in Europe; promoting quality assurance and the achievement of accreditation across the whole forensic process; and, stimulating an education and training program which is fit for purpose for all stakeholders in the forensic process (ENFSI, 2012);

- European Cybercrime Training and Education Group (ECTEG): several training activities were implemented, especially in the area of cyber-crime and in cooperation with EUROPOL – European Cybercrime Centre (EC3).

Funded by the European Commission and working in close cooperation with Europol-EC3 and CEPOL, both members of its advisory group, the activities aim, amongst others, to:

- Support international activities to harmonise cybercrime training across international borders;
- Share knowledge, expertise and find training solutions;
- Promote standardisation of methods and procedures for training programmes and cooperation with other international organisations;
- Collaborate with academic partners to establish recognised academic qualification in the field of cybercrime and work with universities that have already created such awards making them available across international borders;
- Provide training and education material and reference trainers to international partners, supporting their efforts to train law enforcement on cybercrime issues globally (ECTEG, 2019);

- Council of Europe: implementation of training is not one of the main tasks of the Council. Nevertheless, several training sessions were implemented in the areas of Train the Trainers and Human Rights (Council, 2019);
- RAN POL: The Police and Law Enforcement Working Group (RAN POL), from the European Commission has organised, between 2014 and 2018, training on crime prevention, radicalisation, community policing and also in the areas of tax, customs, mostly by e-learning (COM, 2019);
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC): On a European level and using mostly e-learning methods, the UNODC has implemented training in the areas of narcotics, Train the Trainers and firearms.

UNODCs online e-learning courses deliver trainings to a community of over 50,000 Member State officials on international security threats such as transnational organized crime, terrorism, illicit drugs, trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, wildlife and forest crime, cybercrime as well as provide training on border control, intelligence analysis, gender issues, anticorruption and human rights.

These courses, developed by leading international experts, enable law enforcement officers and other professionals to expand their knowledge and stay up to date with the international community's fight against illicit drugs, crime and terrorism experts in line with United Nations standards and norms and other relevant international instruments.

The UNODC e-learning programme has been in operation since 2010, building on what was initially computer-based training delivered as stand-alone. Today, the programme delivers training 24/7 across the world through online and offline training to Member States in line with the United Nations standards, norms and other relevant international instruments and strengthens the capacity of governments to better meet human security and health needs and challenges through e-learning.

The UNODC Training Catalogue includes, amongst others, the following topics:

- Airport Interdiction Techniques and Risk Assessment;
- Seaport Interdiction Techniques and Risk Assessment;
- Investigating Drug Organised Crime;
- Clandestine Laboratories and Precursor Control;
- Money Laundering and Financial Crimes;
- Intelligence Analysis;
- Human Trafficking;
- Smuggling of Migrants;
- Human Rights;
- Cybercrime;
- Anti-Corruption;
- Drug Identification and Testing;
- Gender Issues;
- Investigating Sexual Exploitation of Children;
- Investigating Sexual Exploitation of Children for Specialist Investigators;
- International Narcotics Control Board;
- Firearms Trafficking;
- Organized Crime;
- Counter-Terrorism (UNODC, 2019).

It is important to mention that most of these areas are also covered by CEPOL and other JHA Agencies when it comes to organising training activities;

- United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI): besides from ordinary training sessions, UNICRI also provides graduate, post-graduate and professional level training, for law enforcement professionals and judiciary, in the areas of fundamental rights, crime prevention, drugs, human trafficking, domestic violence, counterfeit goods and migration.

UNICRI's programmes aim to promote national self-reliance and the development of institutional capabilities. To this end, UNICRI provides a one-stop facility offering

high-level expertise in crime prevention and criminal justice problems. Technical co-operation is enhanced by the use of action-oriented research to assist in the formulation of improved policies and concrete intervention programmes. Institutional and on-the-job training of specialized personnel form an integral part of UNICRI activities.

UNICRI works in specialized niches and selected fields of crime prevention, justice, security governance, risks and benefits of advances in technologies, counter-terrorism and social cohesion and the training programmes focus on different areas with the aim of creating and testing new and holistic approaches in preventing crime and promoting justice and development (UNICRI, 2019);

- Citizen Interaction Technologies Yield Community Policing (CITYCOP): Using EU funding, several courses, workshops and conferences are organised in the areas of human rights, community policing, crime prevention and migration (CITYCOP, 2019).

None of these institutions is part of the Matrix. However, they all have been delivering training, in some cases accredited, in areas that are also covered by the JHA Agencies and the ESDC. Some of these institutions often support CEPOL and other JHA Agencies concerning the implementation of training, like ENTRi, ENFSI and FRA, but they also organise and deliver training for law enforcement officials in Europe on their own, either by residential courses, conferences and workshops or via e-learning tools.

6 - The Coordination of training on a European level

CEPOL is responsible for the coordination of training activities for the law enforcement authorities of Member States, without prejudice to national initiatives undertaken by Member States in the field of training for law enforcement officials, where such training activities can add value for Member States and the Union (CEPOL, 2015, preamble – 5).

On a wider level, it is also the role of CEPOL to coordinate with the key Union actors such as the Commission, EUROPOL, FRONTEX, EASO, FRA as well as international organisations (36/2017 MB, p.24).

For that, several coordination mechanisms were established and are mentioned on the Single Programming Document (SPD) for the period 2018-2020 and include the JHA Training Matrix, the coordination meetings, the annual training needs analysis report outlining the tactical level training requirements and the EU-STNA report listing strategic training needs of the European Union and potential training providers” (36/2017 MB, p. 29).

CEPOL’s role is also important in order to avoid duplication or overlap and to ensure better coordination of training activities for competent law enforcement officials (CEPOL, preamble – 8) and bring together a network of Member State training institutes for law enforcement officials (CEPOL, 2015, preamble – 9).

According to the Regulation, one of the main tasks of CEPOL is to support, develop, implement and coordinate training activities and learning products (CEPOL, 2015, art. 2).

From the 2018 Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR), it is possible to have a general overview concerning the role of CEPOL in the coordination of training. Here, it is mentioned that training coordination efforts among JHA Agencies continued to be supported through joint activities organised by CEPOL in close cooperation with partner Agencies, such as the joint agreement between FRONTEX and CEPOL which resulted in the implementation of 49 exchanges under the area of border and coast guarding funded by FRONTEX and carried out by CEPOL in 2018.

Also, this report mentions that CEPOL continued to contribute to the formulation of strategic training response in a multilateral, European context. CEPOL was working with the Commission and partner JHA Agencies to finalize the «Combating Cybercrime - Training Governance Model» providing the framework for an EU training coordination mechanism that could address the acute operational and strategic needs of the cyber law enforcement community and develop high quality training in the domain. The Training Needs Analysis in

line with the Training Competency Framework in the area of cyber-attacks against information systems was initiated in late 2018 to contribute to the training portfolio planning for 2020 (CAAR, 2018).

Taking into consideration all the possible coordination mechanisms and the role of CEPOL in the coordination of training for law enforcement officials in Europe, the Executive Director of CEPOL stated that *“it’s CEPOL task, since 2016, according to the new legal mandate, to coordinate training, but this does not change the landscape that we have a variety of players in the European Union providing the training. I would like to highlight the fact that everybody is praising coordination. But in reality, nobody wants to be coordinated. That means that despite the fact we have the coordination role in our mandate, I don’t see great interest from our partners side to be coordinated by us. We tried it out by the JHA Matrix, by the EU-STNA analytics, but I don’t see by now that our partners, the other training providers on the market do have a strong interest, in one way or the other, to be coordinated. On a modest level, we still continue to try this via the JHA coordination mechanism, but on a larger scale, all the training activities run by the Member States on a bilateral, trilateral or regional level, are not coordinated at all”* (Interviewee #1).

Also, concerning the coordination he said that *“right now, we try to coordinate amongst the JHA Agencies. At least we talk to each other to know what is going on and what could be implemented in terms of training. This brings some value by now. Unfortunately, the Matrix works as a retroactive tool by now and I don’t see the other partners with the willingness to move on by now. What we try is that all Agencies involved exchange their planning documents, so we receive, at least from all other Agencies, their planning documents and together with our planning document, we share the information with all the other Agencies and so there is kind of a coordination mechanism in place. Moreover, we try to understand what every partner is delivering in terms of training to avoid duplications in terms of work and competition for similar activities in the market”* (Interviewee #1).

The SPD 2018/2020 has a dedicated chapter for the coordination. In this document we can see that CEPOL's capacity to effectively operate in the wider European Union landscape, populated by a multiplicity of partners, is key to maximise the contribution of European level law enforcement training to the security of EU citizens. It is therefore paramount that "CEPOL continues to work closely with the European Commission and at the same time continues to contribute to the work of the relevant Working Parties and Committees at the level of the Council of the European Union. Fruitful exchanges with the European Parliament should also be sought to ensure the needs of the European law enforcement community are effectively communicated to the superior EU institutional instances" (SPD 2018-2020).

In particular, CEPOL shall further seek effective forms of cooperation with the immediate family of the JHA Agencies, "with a view to achieve a more concerted effort to avoid overlaps, duplication of efforts and to contribute to the effective, coordinated delivery of European law enforcement training in line with the spirit of the LETS. This will be done primarily (but not exclusively) by the enhanced use of the JHA Training Matrix, an online repository of all trainings delivered by the JHA Agencies and the European Security and Defence College (ESDC)" (36/2017 MB, pp. 36-37).

Clearly, the Matrix is seen as one of the most important tools for the coordination role of CEPOL, so we will dedicate a specific chapter to further analyse this tool.

Also, a major importance is given to the LETS. As Meireles (2017) stated in his 2017 EJMP dissertation, "without any doubt that CEPOL appears as the most relevant EU agency for the coordination and improvement of LEA's training across Europe. CEPOL should, together with other stakeholders, JHA Agencies, but also the Commission, the EEAS, the ESDC, and at national level, the training institutions or centres of excellence and other partners, assume this role and be recognised by all as the hub for LETS coordination" (pp. 41-42). Another important finding was that the "coordination of LETS implementation, at a supranational level is compulsory and CEPOL plays a relevant role in this regard. Its past experience in delivering training, with the network partners, have reached excellent results that have now to be boosted,

accompanying what is envisioned in the new CEPOL Regulation. The identification of centres of excellence, for specific police cooperation areas of expertise, could help CEPOL to better harmonize the training delivery, by the four identified strands of the LETS, and grant the necessary quality and certification” (Meireles, 2017, p. 44).

We understand LETS as having been a corner stone on what comes to the role of CEPOL in terms of training coordination, therefore we paid particular attention when the CEPOL Executive Director stated that he was *“sorry to say that the EU-LETS is already dead, because the Member States did not show a particular interest in this one as they disagreed on some extent. European Commission still refers to it at times, but it’s still the fact that besides EU Agencies and structures, the EU is investing a lot of money in activities aiming to capacity building. When you see the amount of money invested in the Horizon 2020 or similar funding projects which often lead to training seminars, I don’t see that this is coordinated by now, but when you ask me about our mandate, I am very happy with it generally, but this requires up to five, maybe ten years, until this coordination will be realised and also requires the necessary «muscles» and the acceptance from all players involved. When you see, for instance the different DG’s in Brussels, who hand out a large volume of funds to Member States for running, for instance, capacity building projects, they don’t have an interest or knowledge about this coordination”* (Interviewee #1).

Continuing with the considerations about the role of CEPOL regarding the coordination of training, it is important to understand how other actors involved in the implementation of training for law enforcement officials in Europe look at CEPOL and its role of coordination of training.

Madaleno, from the ESDC, stated that *“CEPOL does not coordinate the training given by the ESDC, but on the contrary, some of the training delivered by CEPOL, particularly in the area of CSDP, should be properly aligned and coordinated with the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) standards, guidelines and recommendations, in compliance with both Regulations, MoU, EU policies and structures, with due regard to the principle of subsidiarity*

and complementarity, promoting the necessary synergies, avoiding overlapping” and that “it is unsuitable to claim that CEPOL coordinates the training of the ESDC, because the scope and overall of the CFSP and CSDP is much wider and complex than JHA matters, as well it falls under Members States decision, EEAS auspices and HR/VP overall responsibility. Moreover, it is not the main responsibility of CEPOL. Besides of CEPOL main objectives reflected at Article 3 of the Regulation 2015/2219 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) and replacing and repealing Council Decision 2005/681/JHA, CEPOL specifically within the pursuant of its task 4 of Article 4(b) shall support Union missions and capacity building in third countries by developing and providing training to prepare law enforcement officials for participation in Union missions, including to enable them to acquire relevant language skills, in coordination with the European Security and Defence College and existing initiatives in the Member States” (Interviewee #3).

However, Madaleno also states that *“CEPOL support is fundamentally and indispensably necessary. Law enforcement officials from Member States are a significant component of Civilian CSDP Missions and Operations and a key target audience. Furthermore, most of EU CSDP missions are Civilian Missions (not military). In this regard, CEPOL role is crucial, particularly at the operational level, supporting the EU Integrated Approach and effort in providing quality training, at Member States level (locally), for law enforcement officials, enhancing their particular knowledge, skills and competences to be deployed to several EU missions. Training for CSDP missions and operation is a combined effort of several stakeholders. In my opinion, ESDC welcomes very much the successful establishment of the pilot CEPOL Knowledge Centre (CKC) for CSDP Missions, and its important essential role in building and offering relevant training solutions in CSDP area. In this regard, training activities should be developed and delivered in the spirit of complementarity (with ESDC and other stakeholders) with high quality as the leading principle” (Interviewee #3).*

Mario Gouveia, former CKC CSDP leader and Portuguese Head of the CNU considers that *“CEPOL significantly contributes both for the implementation and coordination of this kind of*

training. On the implementation perspective through multiple training actions using several methodologies always bearing in mind the filling of gaps identified on the training delivered in the MS according the most recent trends for identified criminal activities, the priorities identified on EU level also according the opinion issued by MS through CEPOL driven processes of OTNA and STNA; on the coordination of training my last statement on OTNA and STNA takes a critical role along a strong willingness from the Agency side on the interaction with the other actors and stakeholders relevant in this field IOT to avoid overlapping, waste of resources and trying to meet the MS training needs in an useful and coordinated manner. The CEPOL approach to the training coordination is a best practice to be followed by other actors less open to the generation of synergies on this domain of law enforcement international training” (Interviewee #4).

Interesting perspective was also given by the FRONTEX representative during the interview concerning the STNA. Kalnaja stated that on the “99% of the priorities were not border related. When the final report was being published, it was necessary to strongly advocate to focus on borders, which lays within CEPOL interest. Politically and practically, the topic of migration is a major subject and not being part of the STNA, should raise flags on how prioritisation is really happening and question the panel of people being used. It’s therefore crucial to consider the full range of Law enforcement sectors without any biases to fully understand the challenges laying ahead of us, regardless of the specific interest of a group. For that reason, in order for CEPOL to exercise that coordination effectively, it is fundamental to have a fully-fledged comprehensive approach of various sectors of Law Enforcement and to embrace its diversity.

However, it is important to note that in general, coordination is not an issue. Quite the opposite: we are looking forward to enhance it and are willing to develop the possible existing synergies, including sharing of information. We don’t want to start creating anything new and we are more than happy to handover the products that we have” (Interviewee #2).

When directly asked whether there is an effective and efficient coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, the answer from FRONTEX was clearly negative:

“I would like to see a pragmatic coordination emerging. That can happen if Agencies will be able to identify the traction points. For example, Firearms: currently we don’t have training on Firearms, but in the future, probably we will. Then we know that CEPOL deals with Firearms as it is an EMPACT priority. CEPOL deals as well with all EMPACT priorities related to training. When FRONTEX will have the needs to develop a training on Firearms in the future, then we will invite experts to develop the curricula, enhancing the coordination.

We have an example of good practice of coordination with the European Defence Agency on Search and Rescue. Since military training and border guards training is different, we need to ensure that in situation where we work together it will be possible to create a common curriculum on Search and Rescue that applies for both military and coast guard.

Coordination for the sake of coordination cannot be a goal, and in my opinion none of the agencies we are referring to have the required resources to deal with it” (Interviewee #2).

Also negative was the answer from the former Portuguese Head of the CNU: “No. The multiplicity of actors performing on this domain triggers overlapping and a clear waste of resources and sometimes contradictory messages for the «training customers». Clearly this situation calls for coordination on the political-strategical level (I mean Brussels level) or the delegation of the powers and resources to do it to an Agency IOT to perform this role and I consider that CEPOL is the one on better position to do it.” (Interviewee #4).

And, again a similar answer to the same question, whether there is an effective and efficient coordination, was given by Haberler, Head of the Austrian CNU: “Definitely not, in particular in the area of Police or LE training in the meanwhile there are a lot of international and EU training providers as well as national training providers offering participants from other countries to join their national trainers. I suppose the list will fill up one A4 page and personally even working in this field I wouldn’t be able to list all of them. By saying that we don’t now the individual service and products each of these institutions provides. When it comes to an efficient and effective coordination of such trainings these probably lies in the capacity and willingness of each individual training institute to set up a network or channels in order to receive all the

necessary information and offers which are on the «market». To be honest sometimes it looks like that the «right» hand doesn't know what the «left» hand is currently doing or planning in this area” (Interviewee #5).

A recent development at CEPOL was the establishment of the CEPOL Knowledge Centres (CKC). At the beginning of 2018, two pilot CKC projects were initiated in the areas of Counter-Terrorism and CSDP Missions. The idea of creating “Centres of Excellence” arose in 2013 and the idea has been matured since then. These new models of developing and implementing training are also seen as a way to better coordinate the training from the CEPOL side.

Being personally involved with the CEPOL CKCs, by assuming the coordination of both CKCs since they were established on December 2017 and until June 2018 and from all the meetings attended and direct contact with both CKC leaders and Framework Partners involved, it is fair to say that there was a great amount of coordination between all the parties involved and a strong willingness from CEPOL side to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of both projects.

When asked about the CKC, the Executive Director of CEPOL stated that *“concerning the CKCs, I have seen the process and progress of the established CKC, I have seen some strengths but also some weaknesses in the processes and now we are trying to address this in order to shift the model in a way that we can keep the strengths and eliminate the weaknesses and for that we need to centralise the administration and quality management but keeping the expertise from the MS in the core and then have even more CKC on other topics. The idea is to have the experts from the MS engaged in the design of the activities and portfolios and CEPOL, would be the one responsible to implement and deliver the training. Take the example of the CSDP, why not in the future to have some kind of certification of the activities in this field and then the EU machinery would have this as a requirement to take certain functions in a mission. The problem could be that there are so many players delivering training on CSDP areas that is difficult to coordinate. The EEAS could however take the initiative and set the certification as a requirement for personnel to be deployed on a mission”* (Interviewee #1).

It was also important for us to have the opinion of one of the CKC leaders and when asked about the impact of the CKC in the coordination role of CEPOL, Gouveia stated that *“as former leader of a CKC I can insure that within the CKC I’ve been leading the majority of the problems, in terms of coordination, were tackled. Major concerns have been avoiding fractures on training planning and implementation giving coherence to all the process and providing a smart continuum, coordinating it, avoiding overlapping and enhancing the best use of the available resources providing useful and relevant training meeting the MS law enforcement Agencies training needs”* (Interviewee #4).

Also, the coordination was tackled *“on the formal way through the CKC steering boards but also, through informal meetings and constant contacts almost on a daily basis with the partners, other stakeholders involved such as the European Commission, the EEAS, ENTRI, EUPST and the Internal Security Fund (FSI)”* (Interviewee #4).

The ESDC has also positive remarks about the new model of the CKC. Madaleno believes that *“CEPOL and the current CEPOL Knowledge Centre (CKC) for CSDP Missions should liaise and meet more regularly with the ESDC representatives, seeking to develop more productive opportunities and cooperation synergies in the development of course curricula, training material and courses programmes, exchanging best practices, expertise and lessons learned in the field of CSDP and CFSP, especially on new emerging threats. Perhaps, implement more joint activities on new topics, including other relevant EU Agencies, exploring the links and nexus between JHA and CSDP instruments, as well on the way ahead with the new global challenges, risks and threats for EU and Common Security and Defence Policy, Missions and Operations”* (Interviewee #3).

It is our belief that, in order to achieve an effective and efficient coordination of training, there has to exist some harmonisation tools that can help to achieve that objective. CEPOL offers several products that we understand to be harmonisation tools like for instance the Common Curriculum.

The Common Curricula are a learning product that is developed and implemented by CEPOL, intended for law enforcement training on specific subjects with a European Union dimension. However, already in 2015, “the Governing Board shared the apprehension of the evaluator (in the context of the Five-Year Evaluation Report of the European Police College – Recommendations by the Governing Board) regarding the use and effectiveness of Common Curricula (CC) developed by CEPOL and advised CEPOL to revise the concept of Common Curricula” (5 Year Report, p. 5).

During the survey conducted for the purpose of the report, the National Contact Points¹ (NCPs) were also asked about the extent to which different CEPOL learning and training activities were relevant. Amongst the different training and learning activities proposed by CEPOL, “courses and seminars were considered the most relevant activities and “common curricula” the least relevant. This might be due to the fact that practical obstacles to the implementation of such curricula in the national context are regularly encountered” (5 Year Report, p. 19).

According to the CEPOL website, the purpose of CEPOL's Common Curricula is to provide recommendations about police training on specific subjects with a European dimension. Member States can then use the recommendations within their national police training programmes according to their individual needs. The Common Curricula also provides the basic ideas and elements for CEPOL's courses and seminars. Currently there are Common Curricula available in the areas of Counter Terrorism, Europol, Police Ethics and Prevention of Corruption, Domestic Violence, Money Laundering, Trafficking in Human Beings, Civilian Crisis Management and Drug Trafficking (CEPOL, 2019).

From our personal opinion, it is somehow difficult to adopt the CC on national trainings, mostly because the several training programmes are already defined and the assigned teachers and lecturers are neither aware of this tool nor willing to make adjustment on their curricula to adopt, even partially, the findings of the CEPOL Common Curricula.

¹ Former designation of the current CEPOL National Units (CNU)

From a national perspective, the implementation of the CC was possible, or at least easier, when CEPOL trainings were implemented and the course organiser could ask the invited lecturers to include these findings on their presentations.

Consulted during the interview, the CEPOL Executive Director expressed that *“when it comes to Common Curricula, they are now implemented within CEPOL, but they are simply dead. We spend a lot of time in developing them with the end to help the Member States to harmonise the training on a national level, but we learned from our own surveys that most Member States simply do not apply them. We have seen that other third countries have an interest to use them, because they are kind of an EU standard to be applied, but in Member States, so far, this approach was very limited”* (Interviewee #1).

In order to explain why the Common Curriculum were not successful in CEPOL, the Executive Director gave the example of FRONTEX, giving some reasons why the implementation of the Common Curriculum is different in this other Agency. *“We have to understand that from the operational point of view, this is completely different than, for instance, FRONTEX. In FRONTEX, you can develop one common curricula, because you have one harmonised target group: Border Guards and Cost Guards. CEPOL has to deal with all kind of policing, from traffic police to high level investigators and everything in between. And then we have all other law enforcement groups, so having a curriculum to be accepted from all the different structures in Member States and for this to be in place is difficult. For instance, I do not think that all the different services in Portugal have one harmonised approach when it comes to training, so how should we harmonise it in Europe? The Common Curricula work now more as a tool for Member States where they can have some extra information and can orientate themselves. I don't see that this approach has led to any kind of standardisation and also, I do not believe that standardisation is what we are looking for. In terms of harmonisation, this could be a useful tool, but I see for the future some more useful tools. When we talk about admissibility of evidence, cross-border investigations or any kind of evidence collected by law enforcement that has to be accepted in a court, these are examples where there has to be an harmonisation, especially when evidences are collected in one country and are to be used in another country,*

because then any defence lawyer can question the qualifications of a law enforcement officer from other country” (Interviewee #1).

One example of CEPOL’s coordination of the implementation of training, although not implicitly mentioned on the documents used for this research, is related with the trainings delivered under the EMPACT priorities, which we mentioned on a previous chapter.

According to the EMPACT Terms of Reference (2017), EMPACT is an *ad hoc* management environment to develop activities in order to achieve pre-set goals. It is a structured multidisciplinary co-operation platform of the relevant Member States, EU institutions and Agencies, as well as third countries, international organisations and other (public and private) partners to address prioritised threats of organised and serious international crime (EMPACT, 2017, p. 6) where a training and awareness package about the EU Policy Cycle framework is developed and delivered by CEPOL.

Training activities aim at increasing knowledge of the EU Policy Cycle mechanism and the role and responsibilities of relevant actors and contributing to specific Operational Action Plans (OAP) with relevant training actions, with residential and online training events, exchange programme and similar (EMPACT, 2017, p. 9).

The importance of coordination is highlighted when it is stated that all relevant EU institutions, bodies and Agencies (e.g. EUROPOL, EUROJUST, FRONTEX, CEPOL, OLAF, EMCDDA, eu-LISA and EUIPO) should fully play their respective roles aiming at a genuine inter-agency approach with all relevant actors (EMPACT, 2017, p. 26).

To better understand the role of CEPOL in the coordination of training activities related with the EMPACT priorities, we will make use of our personal experience, as CEPOL Training Officer since 2017 and also as CEPOL portfolio manager for the Firearms EMPACT priority.

For each EMPACT priority, CEPOL has a designated portfolio manager, who has the role to liaise with the respective EMPACT participants on that specific priority. Also, each CEPOL member is an Action Leader, responsible for the coordination and implementation of training

related with the given priority. This means that there has to be an effective and efficient communication and coordination with all the other EMPACT representatives, in order to design the training, find the right expertise and in most cases to joint efforts in the preparation of the curriculum and pool of experts to be engaged in the training activity.

7 - The Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix

The Matrix has been referenced in the CEPOL Consolidated Annual Activity Reports (CAAR) since 2014, when CEPOL, in close cooperation with JHA Agencies, the EJTN and the ESDC, started to develop a training matrix which would provide the state of play of training activities delivered by those bodies. This was in view of better coordination and possible synergies in line with the Law Enforcement Training Scheme (CAAR, 2014).

By 2015, on an inter-institutional level, CEPOL contributed to the drafting of its new legal basis by advising the co-legislators upon request to participate to Council working groups, and work closely with the group of JHA Agencies to ensure even closer coordination in the development and delivery of training, inter alia by finalising an online database which gives a full picture of all training provided by EU JHA Agencies and bodies (CAAR, 2015).

The 2016 CAAR states that CEPOL achieved a significant step towards better coordination of training activities for law enforcement officials carried out by EU Agencies, by developing the online Justice and Home Affairs Agencies' Training Matrix, which has been finalised and is currently being used. All the JHA Agencies, as well as the ESDC and EJTN, were invited to contribute to the Training Matrix.

“The Training Matrix functions as a mapping tool for the existing and planned training activities at the EU level. It enhances the understanding of partner Agencies' actions and helps in the identification of the training needs and gaps. In the future, this tool should facilitate a more efficient planning, implementation and evaluation of training activities, both at policy and

operational level. An upgrade to the Matrix, allowing for bulk upload of entries has been set to be finalized in March 2017” (CAAR, 2016).

By 2017, the CAAR mentioned that the Training Matrix was again “functioning as a mapping tool for existing and planned training activities at EU level. It enhanced the understanding of partner Agencies’ actions and helped in the identification of the training needs and gaps” (CAAR, 2017).

As we can see, there was no significant evolution in the concept and scope of the Matrix, since its creation until 2017.

We will now analyse the Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix Reports from 2014 to 2017 and try to understand the evolution and impact of the Matrix during this period.

According to the 2014 JHA Matrix report, the Matrix, initiated in this year within the context of the JHA Agencies’ contact group would function as a basis for structured exchange of information and coordinated planning in the field of training activities provided by Migration and Home Affairs Agencies (CEPOL, EASO, EMCDDA, eu-LISA, Europol, FRONTEX) as well as the ESDC.

The analysis of the 2014 Matrix report provided some key insights on the training activities reported and delivered by the Agencies. While there was already a wide cooperation among the JHA Agencies and most of the training needs were addressed, it was reported that there was also room for enhanced cooperation between agencies, especially in terms of joint activities or activities conducted in partnership with one or more Agencies, as well as for a more structured needs analysis. It was recommended to improve the Matrix as a tool that could be used for planning purposes and not only to provide a picture of who does what, and to extend its use to better respond to policy requirements.

As it will be seen further ahead, this objective could not be achieved.

As the main purpose of the Matrix is to enhance awareness and coordination of EU training measures by the EU Law Enforcement Agencies, CEPOL initiated with the JHA partner

Agencies the establishment of the Matrix in January 2014, as a first step towards the implementation of a European Law Enforcement Training Scheme. In addition to the JHA Agencies, the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) was also asked to provide their input, in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the JHA related training.

“The Training Matrix was uploaded on the CEPOL website in August 2014, with a purpose of easing its update process. It was conceived as a tool to facilitate more efficient planning, implementation and evaluation of training activities both at policy and operational level” (Matrix report, 2014).

Still according to this report, there were three main recommendations regarding the Matrix:

1. Strategic Training Needs Analysis (STNA) and annual analysis (as envisaged in the principles underpinning the LETS) should be conducted to ensure a more efficient use of resources, and reduce overlaps or duplication;
2. Agree on the scope of future development of the JHA Training Matrix, such as coming to a more accurate and shared definition of target audiences and thematic training areas, so to facilitate better planning;
3. Use the JHA Training Matrix as a point of reference for annual programming as a training planning, reporting and management tool to exploit possibilities for joint actions where possible, avoid duplication, and design new training activities. It was recommended for this process to be conducted with a 2-year horizon;

As we will see ahead and according to our research, these recommendations were only partially or in some cases not even met at all.

In the 2015 Matrix report, which also mentioned the CEPOL Five-year (2011-2015) Evaluation Report Implementation Action Plan, in order to ensure greater synergies and coherence among the EU training suppliers, it is stated that the Matrix should be utilised as a coordinated planning tool.

In March 2016, the Contact group of EU Agencies on migrant smuggling set up by the Commission stated that the focus and the efforts should be invested in the mapping of the existing training on countering migrant smuggling at the EU level, via the Matrix.

As a recommendation, the use the Matrix should serve as a point of reference for annual programming as a training planning, reporting and management tool to exploit possibilities for joint actions where possible, avoid duplication, and design new training activities (Matrix report, 2015).

In the 2016 Matrix report, again the reference to the importance of inter-agency cooperation is underlined by the fact that already nearly a hundred training activities involved two or more Justice and Home Affairs Agencies.

It remained a question of major importance how the Matrix would be transformed into a planning, rather than a reporting tool and how awareness about it and its use could be promoted within the Agencies. Similarly to the previous year, it was still recommended to improve the Matrix as a tool that could be used for planning, reporting, and management tool purposes and not only to provide a picture of who does what, and to extend its use to better respond to policy requirements.

Furthermore, in the context of the development of the first Strategic Training Needs Analysis (STNA), a task given to CEPOL by its new legal mandate, adequate consideration was given to align the Matrix to the priorities that would result from the first STNA cycle that would commence in the near future (Matrix report, 2016).

In the 2017 Matrix report, the importance of inter-agency cooperation was underlined by the fact that already 20 % of all training activities (159), had involved two or more JHA Agencies.

Throughout 2018, CEPOL started the considerations of a planning aid to be introduced in the Matrix and aligned with the outcome of the EU STNA.

As a recommendation, it was stated that if this was not happening on a regular and systematic basis, the use of the Matrix had far less added value, even retrospectively, as a reporting tool,

as the subsequent years would not be comparable. This would require strong commitment of all the Agencies, as the Matrix is a joint product of all Agencies managing and using it. As a recommendation, the report emphasises that CEPOL should further promote and support the use of the Training Matrix and the timely recording of training activities in the database by JHA Agencies by continuously improving the user friendliness of the tool. CEPOL should also encourage DG HOME to promote the added value of the Matrix in its regular JHA coordination meetings (Matrix report, 2017).

Here we can see a turning point on the concept of the Matrix, that goes in line with the statement from the CEPOL Executive Director during the interview when he said that *“unfortunately, the Matrix works as a retroactive tool by now and I don’t see the other partners with the willingness to move on by now”* (Interviewee #1).

Considering the «slow» evolution of the Matrix since 2014, we asked the CEPOL Executive Director about the current status and he replied that *“the only real effect is that CEPOL offers to the stakeholders in Brussels, a complete inventory of what is offered by the JHA Agencies in terms of training. To convert this from what we have right now into a real tool to coordinate, we need a completely different workflow and a completely different process. It means that in parallel from the planning process of each Agency, we need to have a coordination process where along the line of two years of planning, training can be aligned and consolidated. I personally brought this forward in several Heads of Agencies meetings, but there is no appetite from other Agencies, because in practical terms we also duplicate their planning cycle. Each Agency has their cycle to identify the topics and allocate resources related to the planning. Building a common platform to identify who is implementing what, with how many resources and other important information is still not much appreciated. But on the other side and considering our target groups, we cannot operate in a way that we are always covering the same topics and in relation to content, I am not sure that we always harmonise what we are doing. In some topics, like Schengen, THB, we should always present a European position and answer”* (Interviewee #1).

Concerning the structure of the Matrix, at the present moment, the fields available for uploading information are:

1. Agency (implementing the action);
2. Type of activity:
 - a. Course;
 - b. Online course;
 - c. E-learning module;
 - d. Conference;
 - e. Webinar;
 - f. Workshop;
 - g. Exchange;
 - h. Development meeting;
 - i. Conference + workshop;
 - j. Training tool;
 - k. Information session;
3. Title;
4. Number of days;
5. Target group;
6. Start date;
7. End date;
8. Evaluation (according to Kirkpatrick model);
9. Certification/diploma;
10. EQF/SQF;
11. Supporting stakeholders;
12. Contact (organiser);
13. Creation date.

This fields are to be filled by a designated person on each of the partners involved and the content uploaded is the responsibility of the respective partner.

Analysing the content available on the Matrix directed to the subject of this thesis, these are the main findings:

- a. CEPOL is the Agency that uploads the information earlier each year. Usually in September, the information for the following year, concerning all the training activities to be implemented, is already available;
- b. In some cases, the «creation date», which is the date that the information is uploaded, is posterior to the dates of the implementation of the activities, meaning that this information is useful for statistical purposes, but loses all the effect in terms of possible coordination for the future;
- c. There is no information available on the field 8 – evaluation (Kirkpatrick model), making it more difficult to understand the aim of the training activity;
- d. Between 2015 and 2017, only FRONTEX uploaded information related to the field 10 – EQF/SQF level;
- e. Very rarely there is information available concerning the field 9 – Certification/diploma, so it is not possible to understand whether it is given a certificate of attendance, if the training activity is certified or even accredited.

It is important to understand who can access the Matrix, who effectively access the Matrix and with what purpose and why its purpose has not been achieved since it was created.

The Executive Director of CEPOL mentioned that “*technically, all CNU, all partner Agencies, the European Commission and other stakeholders have access to the Matrix and repeatedly, during the CNU meetings we present it to them. It was even upgraded into a web-based service with an interface that is user friendly for everyone, where information is easier to access, but it much depends on the interest that the partners have to visit it*” (Interviewee #1).

We conducted a questionnaire to the CNU to understand whether they have access to the Matrix and if somehow the information provided and available is useful in terms of understanding and getting to know all the training possibilities delivered by the JHA Agencies and if that information is useful for them on a national level.

Unfortunately, there was a reduced number of responses, despite the efforts and reminders sent. However, the responses that were given by the six (out of 26) Member States that answered the questionnaire, may give an idea on how the Matrix is perceived. Concerning the other aspects that we intended to examine by means of the questionnaire, in order to avoid reaching conclusions that might not be representatively accurate we will not use the data obtained, due to the low response rate (23%).

We received answers from Estonia, the Netherlands, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain.² Austria also provided some answers through the interview conducted with Mr. Haberler.

From these, four countries responded that the CNU does not have access and they are not aware of the content available on the Matrix. These countries were Estonia, the Netherlands, Austria and Spain. Italy responded that the CNU is aware of the Matrix and the content, however they do not have access. Only Portugal and Greece replied positively on having access and being aware of the content available in the Matrix.

Although it is not possible to extrapolate and take conclusions from this sample, clearly the message sent from the CEPOL management during the CNU meetings is either not perceivable or there is no interest from the CNU's side to have access to the Matrix. Our personal opinion is that the CNU's do not understand the added value of the Matrix in terms of coordination and we will reflect about this on the chapter dedicated to the Conclusions and Recommendations.

Asked about the ESDC contribution to the Matrix, *“the ESDC also promotes and inserts its training catalogue and activities in the JHA Training Matrix”* and that *“the JHA is a basis for structured exchange of information and coordinated planning in the field of training activities provided by Justice and Home Affairs Agencies (CEPOL, EASO, EMCDDA, eu-LISA, Europol, FRONTEX) as well as the European Security and Defence College (ESDC) and EJTN. Mainly, it allows us to have a global and very practical image of what the various Agencies in JHA are doing, in which topics or clusters. It allows us to gauge training dynamics in some relevant*

² Responses from these Member States constitute an annex to the dissertation.

areas, topics and EU policies, particularly those relevant to the ESDC, exploring for feasible links, synergies and relevance for CSDP activity. It enables a more structured and informed analysis, assessing how JHA Agencies and other stakeholders are delivering training and crosscheck with the training needs in a more practical or friendly way” (Interviewee #3).

In our opinion, it is clear that the ESDC is both contributing to the Matrix with relevant information and also using it for retrieving important and useful information that can help the ESDC to build their training portfolio.

Concerning the FRONTEX position on the Matrix, Kalnaja gave a very direct and clear answer: *“I would like to see a pragmatic coordination emerging. That can happen if Agencies will be able to identify the traction points. For example, Firearms: currently we don’t have training on Firearms, but in the future, probably we will. Then we know that CEPOL deals with Firearms as it is an EMPACT priority. CEPOL deals as well with all EMPACT priorities related to training. When FRONTEX will have the needs to develop a training on Firearms in the future, then we will invite experts to develop the curricula, enhancing the coordination.*

We have an example of good practice of coordination with the European Defence Agency on Search and Rescue. Since military training and border guards training is different, we need to ensure that in situation where we work together it will be possible to create a common curriculum on Search and Rescue that applies for both military and coast guard.

Coordination for the sake of coordination cannot be a goal, and in my opinion none of the agencies we are referring to have the required resources to deal with it” (Interviewee #2).

We will now analyse the data available in the Matrix. The following table (table 1) shows the number of training activities implemented by the stakeholders reported on the Matrix from 2014 to 2018.

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
CEPOL	135	173	203	248	251	TOTAL
FRONTEX	65	65	145	422	338	1010
ESDC	41	1	57	48	0	1035
EASO	27	22	23	28	33	147
EUROPOL	20	30	7	12	28	133
EMCDDA	11	7	9	9	13	97
EU-LISA	7	22	28	43	29	49
EJTN	0	0	0	0	298	129
						298
TOTAL	306	320	472	810	990	

Table 1: Training activities implemented per stakeholder

It is clear that the number of activities implemented since 2014 has been increasing every year and the expectation is that it will continue to grow, mostly because of the also increasing number of online activities, as we will show further ahead.

Also, it is very clear that CEPOL and FRONTEX are the two Agencies with the biggest impact on the implementation of training, which is completely normal and in line with the respective Regulations.

On the first sight, however, it might seem odd how FRONTEX has implemented more training activities in 2017 and 2108, when compared to CEPOL.

Of course, this increase on the number of activities implemented has a direct impact also on the number of participants. The following table (table 2), shows the number of participants on the above-mentioned training activities.

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
CEPOL	6838	12281	17728	23206	28084	88137
FRONTEX	1667	1503	5263	10429	8471	27333
ESDC	0	30	2336	1898	0	4264
EASO	241	215	312	464	744	1976
EUROPOL	437	1014	250	278	455	2434
EMCDDA	316	216	176	167	442	1317
EU-LISA	219	593	899	717	444	2872
EJTN	0	0	0	0	5763	5763
TOTAL	9718	15852	26964	37159	44403	

Table 2: Number of participants per stakeholder

Once again, CEPOL and FRONTEX are the Agencies that trained the highest number of participants. Nevertheless, the number of participants on trainings provided by the EJTN is also relevant, especially when considering that this Agency started contributing to the Matrix only in 2018.

When comparing this table with the previous, we find that although the number of trainings delivered by FRONTEX was higher than the ones delivered by CEPOL in 2017 and 2018, the number of participants does not have a direct relation and CEPOL clearly trains a higher number of officials. This observation led us into analysing the data available on the Matrix to get a better understanding of this.

The following table (table 3) shows the number of participants per type of activity. On the first column we can see the number of participants on Courses, Seminars, Conferences and Workshops (CSCW), on the second column, the number of participants on e-learning activities (online modules and online courses) and on the third column, the number of participants on Webinars.

	2014			2015			2016		
	CSCW	e-Learning	Webinars	CSCW	e-Learning	Webinars	CSCW	e-Learning	Webinars
CEPOL	2022	0	4816	2952	2178	6723	3046	3401	10889
FRONTEX	1630	27	0	1155	16	0	2608	1859	125
ESDC	0	0	0	30	0	0	2336	0	0
EASO	224	7	0	49	166	0	0	312	0
EUROPOL	412	0	0	1044	0	0	250	0	0
EMCDDA	69	0	0	216	0	0	176	0	0
EU-LISA	197	0	22	335	0	255	327	0	572
EJTN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	4554	34	4838	5781	2360	6978	8743	5572	11586

	2017			2018			TOTAL
	CSCW	e-Learning	Webinars	CSCW	e-Learning	Webinars	
CEPOL	3371	5489	13748	3313	8571	15976	36027
FRONTEX	8769	640	889	8104	0	367	7420
ESDC	1898	0	0	0	0	0	2366
EASO	0	464	0	0	744	0	758
EUROPOL	278	0	0	455	0	0	1706
EMCDDA	167	0	0	442	0	0	461
EU-LISA	415	0	272	335	0	109	1708
EJTN	0	0	0	2868	292	0	0
TOTAL	14898	6593	14909	15517	9607	16452	

Table 3: Number of participants per type of activity

From this table, we can better understand that the high number of participants on CEPOL activities, comes mostly from the attendance on Webinars. In fact, the number of participants on residential activities is much higher on FRONTEX in 2017 and 2018, when compared to CEPOL.

The justification from FRONTEX is that “*pre-deployment training for people that work in these environments which is roughly 3.000 people a year. In FRONTEX we have a dozen of profiles, such as dog handlers, document analysis specialists, debriefers, screening experts, etc, so we provide them with necessary skills to fulfil their tasks. So, the choice between residential activity and online activity is about how to successfully build necessary capabilities. We use the online*

training to raise awareness and the residential which is designed for practitioners as well as advanced practitioners” (Interviewee #2).

Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the increase of the overall number of participants on e-learning and web-based activities, like the webinars, which shows the adaptation of all the Agencies to the new technologies, the bigger capacity to reach a higher and higher number of participants but also the interest of the law enforcement officials in Europe to participate more and more in training activities delivered not only by CEPOL, but also by other JHA Agencies.

8 - Future perspectives

We believe that, in the future, in line also with the Internal Audit Service recommendation, “the Matrix should facilitate a more efficient planning, implementation and evaluation of training activities, both at policy and operational level” (CAAR, 2017).

We equally share Garner’s perspective when he mentions that “the movement toward distance education or e-learning for training and educational purposes has often met with equivocal enthusiasm in policing. Many universities are rethinking their approach to distance education. Some of the current related buzzwords regarding training and education involve terms such as distance learning, distance education, e-learning, computer-augmented education, and technology enhanced training. The premise has great appeal in that information can be made available to individuals all across the country (and the world), allowing for greater access and greater educational opportunities” (Garner, 2004, p. 37).

We agree that the quality standards should be a flagship and accreditation and certification of training is not only welcome but very much needed as it can harmonise training and facilitate cooperation by levelling the standards. We took as good example the idea of Konze and Nogala about the need of introduction and intensification of cooperation between higher education institutions, including joint degrees, and the removal of obstacles to mobility, as these remain two of the main weaknesses in police higher education. “While two EU Agencies, CEPOL and

Frontex, in the meanwhile took their own initiative in this regard by launching their European Master Programmes in 2015, there is still a lot to do. More and more police students enrolled in Bologna-accredited programmes realise that they theoretically could attend similar programmes in other European member states or countries. They may start looking for the most prestigious or interesting ones in Europe. The ability of CEPOL to deliver or help delivering courses granting credits within the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System will be an essential subject to be undertaken by CEPOL” (Konze & Nogala, 2018, p.176).

FRONTEX has been given an added importance to quality and there has been a different approach concerning training methodologies. According to Kalnaja, *“the approach to training in CEPOL and in FRONTEX is converging but yet focusing on different aims, using different methods. Recently, FRONTEX has been developing efficient face-to-face training. That is in the DNA of training, although environment has been changing very quickly which urged FRONTEX to be reactive and to implement many of e-learning trainings. Among these we can distinguish one using virtual reality, which includes simulation exercises of dangerous environments in a safe manner.*

For example, we have now a virtual reality simulation tool for search and rescue, which is the best solution, cost wise and safety wise to deal with virtual situations that could be perilous to run in a real environment” (Interviewee #2).

Apparently, FRONTEX took the advice of Getty concerning the use of new technologies and the fact that “these major advances in science and technology are of limited use if they are not implemented properly, and a significant element of implementation is training” (Getty, 2016, p. 598).

Concerning the future, Kalnaja also has a clear idea, stating that *“coordination has to make sense. STNA does not meet FRONTEX’s needs, the Matrix does not meet the needs of the coordination in the first place and I think that for the sake of good coordination, we have to sit together in order to make sure what is that we want to coordinate.*

Finally, I think we really need to enhance this constructive dialogue between our two institutions in order to materialize the coordination and to foster our cooperation” (Interviewee #2).

Another interesting point of view, concerning the future of coordination, is referred by Gouveia. In his opinion, *“as far as coordination on an international level is concerned, we should improve in a first step the cooperation and coordination within the CEPOL network before we think to extend this level. In my opinion even we still work together there might be still ways or possibilities to do it more efficient and effective” (Interviewee #4).*

For Haberler, concerning the future, *“first of all there should be a willingness from all training providers to cooperate with each other. Next there have to be clear transparent and agreed regulation and guidelines for the set-up, implementation and use of such training matrix. If this instrument depends of the "good will" nobody will put effort in this product which CEPOL (as the owner) has in its mandate. Following the example "if something is not mine, the priority and effort is not very high". Following the motto my organisation should be in the spot-light in case the product become success - it sounds a little bit narrow minded but this is my experience when looking deeper under the surface. Of course, the fact on personal resources is also always an issue. If the institution became an additional work (mandate) in a next step the question for additional (human or financial) resources appears” (Interviewee #5).*

According to CEPOL’s Executive Director, *“for the future, we have internal discussions on this and the idea is that CEPOL does not need to cover all topics, but rather cover those topics where we can make a difference. By now we are trying to do everything, but that is not what we want for the future. To give an example, would you prefer to go to a restaurant that has 100 options on the menu? Most probably not, because you would feel that they could not cook everything properly. Also, in CEPOL, instead of trying to cover all the topics, we should focus on covering 20/30 topics on which we believe we could really make a difference.*

As an improvement, CEPOL should not continue to deliver training on the awareness level. That can be covered by technical tools and there is no need for participants to be sitting in a

classroom. Also, it is not logical that we spend the tax payers money to raise awareness when there are other available tools where law enforcement officials can get information from” (Interviewee #1).

Our personal reflections about the future of coordination will be presented in the next chapter, under the form of recommendations.

9 – Conclusions and recommendations

Nowadays, on a European level, there are several opportunities for law enforcement training. Besides from the national training institutions, there are European Agencies, Institutions and Projects funded by the European Union that deliver training for law enforcement officials in a wide variety of crime related topics. Consequently, there is a duplication and overlap of training for law enforcement officials in the same topics.

Training is not only essential for enhancing the performance of law enforcement officials but is also a first, and important step, towards the cooperation on an operational level. Also, the need for coordination is an actual, important and urgent matter that needs to be discussed and improved.

CEPOL is the main Agency responsible not only for the implementation of training for law enforcement officers, but also for its coordination and for this coordination to exist there has to be mechanisms and tools. From our research, we understood that there is a partially effective coordination of training, mainly through the Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix and through coordination meetings. These mechanisms exist, however, we understood that this formal coordination is not efficient and that there is room for improvements.

As we have seen, the largest number of training activities implemented by CEPOL in 2018 were related with the EMPACT priorities, meaning that, although CEPOL does not have *per se* the role of coordinating the EMPACT, in all these activities there was a coordination from the CEPOL side, translated by the engagement of staff members in the several EMPACT groups. We can consider this as an “informal” coordination mechanism which has proven to be efficient.

There has been an increase of the number of training activities and participants. In our understanding, this results to the need to better coordinate all the training provided, in order to avoid overlaps, maintain similar quality standards in training and guarantee that all the training needs are covered.

Another mechanism recently created allowed CEPOL to better coordinate the training in the areas of Counterterrorism and CSDP Missions: the CEPOL Knowledge Centres. These pilot projects, established in 2018, allowed partners from several Member States to establish consortiums not only for the implementation of training but also for the definition of contents and design of appropriate curricula within the related topics, with good results and positive feedback from not only the engaged stakeholders, but the law enforcement community in general.

As some of the interviewees, we support that the CKCs should be established beyond the pilot phase, that ends in December 2019 and that CKCs in other thematic areas should also be established and be a strong component of the future strategy of CEPOL.

Following the latest years trends, we believe that both the demand for and offer of training will keep increasing. Given that the current coordination mechanisms are not efficient and if they are not redesigned or improved, it will not be possible to talk about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level.

Also, we perceived that there was a major increase in online training products such as online courses, online modules and webinars as well as in the use of new technologies such as virtual simulation exercises. These are methodologies already being adopted by most of the training service providers, and it can be expected that in the future, more and more courses will be implemented with the use of new technologies. We highlight the examples of CEPOL regarding the attendance of participants in online products and the virtual simulation exercises performed by FRONTEX as best practices that were implemented and that should be further improved and followed by other stakeholders.

Concerning our recommendation for the improvement of coordination, we agree with Gouveia that firstly, there has to be a change on a political and strategic level. Coordination requires resources and according to our research, neither CEPOL nor the other stakeholders have the necessary resources (financial and human) to have an effective and efficient coordination of training, although there is a willingness for that. In this regard, it came to our knowledge that

CEPOL is planning to have a Liaison Officer stationed at Brussels so there could be a closer cooperation with the other EU Agencies and respective General Directorates. This initiative was presented and approved during the last CEPOL Management Board meeting, that took place on 21st and 22nd of May in Bucharest. In our opinion, if this initiative will come to effect, CEPOL will have, not only a valuable asset that could also improve the coordination through closer and better cooperation, but also an asset who may influence decision makers in the direction of providing further resources.

It is our perspective that it is not sufficient to have in the CEPOL Regulation that this Agency has now the role of coordination. It would be important for the other JHA Agencies to have in their respective Regulations that they should cooperate with CEPOL in order to have a real coordination of the implementation of training, because apparently the several recommendations and reflexions, such as the ones in the CAARs and Matrix reports, are not enough to engage the stakeholders in a way leading to an efficient coordination.

Every partner engaged in the Matrix should have the necessary resources to update it and with all the necessary relevant information and also, the Matrix should be available for the consultation of the interested law enforcement agencies, even on a national level, then, the Matrix would pass from being a mere repository or consultation tool, to a tool that would allow an effective and efficient coordination.

Concerning the Matrix, other improvements could be important: the inclusion of other institutions delivering training for law enforcement officials on a European level, such as the ones mentioned on chapter 5 of the present dissertation and even national institutions that implement international training for law enforcement officers and comply with the necessary criteria; and, the re-definition of the fields available, in order to make the tool more user-friendly and containing more useful information for potential users, such as content of the training (curriculum), including the learning outcomes.

For this improvement to be even more efficient, there should be a harmonisation of the levels of training and an alignment regarding the implementation of such training. By this we mean

that for raising awareness activities, the training should be performed using online tools, such as webinars, online modules or online courses. But, when it comes to delivering training for practitioners, advanced practitioners or for a strategic and managerial level, the training should be residential and when possible combined with new technologies such as virtual simulations and virtual classrooms.

One final recommendation is related with the STNA exercise. Law enforcement covers a whole variety of fields beyond those prioritised on the Police Cycle, from community policing, public order, criminal investigation, intelligence, counterterrorism, international police cooperation, special intervention units, weapons and explosives, to border and coast control and so much more. In order to have a more efficient coordination in the future, the training needs for all the law enforcement officials need to be properly assessed, as this is a document that should reflect those needs and should be useful for the whole law enforcement universe.

While conducting our research, we faced a number of limitations. The first one was the reduced bibliography directly related with the subject of the thesis, as we could not find many other researches, publications or articles focusing on the coordination of training. On the positive side, we consider our research to be innovative and a basis for further research.

The second limitation is related with the interviews conducted. Two interviews were conducted face-to-face, which allowed us to further discuss some topics and conduct the conversation in order to gather all the information we needed. Concerning the remaining three interviews, although the questions were received by email, there were previous phone contacts with the interviewees and the replies received were in line with our expectations.

Thirdly, there was the limitation with the reduced number of answers to the questionnaire by the CEPOL National Units and we were not able to make a qualitative and quantitative analysis due to the reduced data available, in order to avoid reaching conclusions which would not be accurately representative of the whole target group.

References

Books and Articles

- Atkinson, P 1981, 'Research design in ethnography', In P. Atkinson (ed.), *Research methods in education and the social sciences*, Open University Press, London, pp. 41-81.
- Bardin, L 1977, *Análise de conteúdo*, Edições 70, Lisboa.
- Getty, R M 2016, Book review for Collaborative policing: police, academics, professionals, and communities working together for education, training, and program implementation, *Police Practice & Research*, vol. 17, no 6, pp 596-597.
- Garner, R 2004, The Training and Technology Train: Don't Forget the Passengers, available at: <https://www.iletsbeiforumjournal.com/images/Issues/FreeIssues/ILEEF%202004-4.3.pdf> [Accessed 12 Feb. 2019].
- Ghiglione, R & Matalon, B 1993, *O inquérito: Teoria e prática*, Celta, Oeiras.
- Kvale, S 1996, *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*, CA: Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Pais, L G 2004, *Uma história das ligações entre a psicologia e o direito em Portugal : Perícias psiquiátricas médico-legais e perícias sobre a personalidade como analisadores. (Tese de doutoramento, não publicada)*, Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade do Porto, Porto.

- Konze, A and Nogala, D 2018, 'Higher Police Education in Europe: Surveying Recent Developments' in C. Rogers and B. Frevel (ed.) *Higher Education and Police, An International View*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp.155-177.

Legislation

- Regulation (EU) No 439/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 establishing a European Asylum Support Office, OJ L 132, 29.5.2010, p. 11–28.
- Regulation (EU) 2018/1726 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 November 2018 on the European Union Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (eu-LISA), and amending Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006 and Council Decision 2007/533/JHA and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011, *OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 99–137*.
- Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 November 2018 on the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust), and replacing and repealing Council Decision 2002/187/JHA, OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 138-183.
- Regulation (EU) 2016/794 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) and replacing and repealing Council Decisions 2009/371/JHA, 2009/934/JHA, 2009/935/JHA, 2009/936/JHA and 2009/968/JHA, OJ L 135, 24.5.2016, p. 53–114.
- Regulation (EU) 2016/1624 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2016 on the European Border and Coast Guard and amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Regulation (EC) No 863/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 and Council Decision 2005/267/EC, OJ L 251, 16.9.2016, p. 1–76.

- Regulation (EU) 2015/2219 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) and replacing and repealing Council Decision 2005/681/JHA, OJ L 319, 4.12.2015, p. 1–20.
- Council Decision 2005/681/JHA of 20 September 2005 establishing the European Police College (CEPOL) and repealing Decision 2000/820/JHA, OJ L 256, 1.10.2005, p. 63–70.
- Council Decision (CFSP) 2016/2382 of 21 December 2016 establishing a European Security and Defence College (ESDC) and repealing Decision 2013/189/CFSP, OJ L 352, 23.12.2016, p. 60–73.

Websites

- CityCop, available at: <https://www.citycop.org/> [Accessed 3 April 2019].
- Council of Europe (CoE), available at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal> [Accessed 3 April 2019].
- ECTEG, European Cybercrime Training and Education Group. [online], available at: <https://www.ecteg.eu/> [Accessed 16 Jan. 2019].
- European Commission, Police and law enforcement Working Group (RAN POL), available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/about-ran/ran-pol_en [Accessed 3 April 2019].
- European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI), available at: <http://enfsi.eu/> [Accessed 3 April 2019].

- European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (EUROPOL), available at: <https://www.europol.europa.eu/> [Accessed 3 June 2019].
- ENFSI 2012, ENFSI Strategic Plan. [online] Enfsi.eu. available at: http://enfsi.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/enfsi_strategic_plan_2011-2014.pdf [Accessed 8 Mar. 2019].
- ENTRI 2019, ENTRI Website. [online] Entriforccm.eu. available at: <https://www.entriforccm.eu/about.html> [Accessed 4 Jan. 2019].
- EUPCST 2018, European Union Police and Civilian Services Training Programme. [online] available at: http://eplo.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/IcSP_Art.4_Annex_III_-_European-Union-Police-and-Civilian-Services-Training-Programme-EUPCST.pdf [Accessed 15 Mar. 2019].
- Justice and Home Affairs Training Matrix. [online] Available at <https://enet.cepol.europa.eu/jha-2017/> [restricted access].\
- OLAF 2003, The fight against fraud and transnational crime: OLAF and international cooperation. [online] available at: https://hip.lisboa.ucp.pt/edocs/cde/2005_2782.pdf [Accessed 15 Feb. 2019].
- UNICRI 2019, UNICRI Website. [online] Available at: <http://www.unicri.it/> [Accessed 12 May 2019].
- UNODC 2019, Course Catalogue. [online] Unodc.org. available at: <https://www.unodc.org/elearning/en/courses/course-catalogue.html> [Accessed 12 May 2019].

- Eur-lex.2019, Glossary of summaries - EUR-Lex. [online] available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/open_method_coordination.html [Accessed 2 Jun. 2019].

Other material

- Decision 06/2015/GB of the Governing Board of the European Police College, Analysis and Assessment of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report for the financial year 2014, available at: <https://www.cepol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/16-2015-GB.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2019].
- Decision 06/2016/GB of the Governing Board of the European Police College, Analysis and Assessment of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report for the financial year 2015, available at: <https://www.cepol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/06-2016-GB.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2019].
- Decision 08/2017/MB of the Management Board of the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), On establishing the analysis and assessment of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2016, available at: <https://www.cepol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/08-2017-MB.pdf> [Accessed 4 June 2019].
- Decision 10/2018/MB of the Management Board of the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), On establishing the analysis and assessment of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2017, available at: <https://www.cepol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/10-2018-MB%20-%20CAAR%202017.pdf> [Accessed 4 June 2019].
- European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), Five-Year Evaluation Report of the European Police College 2011-2015, available at:

<https://www.cepola.europa.eu/sites/default/files/five-year-evaluation-report-2011-2015.pdf>

[Accessed 4 January 2019].

- Decision 36/2017/MB of the Management Board of the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), On the CEPOL Single Programming Document 2018-2020, available at: <https://www.cepola.europa.eu/sites/default/files/36-2017-MB.pdf> [Accessed 14 March 2019].
- Council of the European Union, Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI), 2017, Terms of Reference for the EU Policy Cycle 2018-2021, available at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-10544-2017-REV-2/en/pdf> [Accessed 4 April 2019].
- Council of the European Union, Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI), 2017, Draft Council conclusions on setting the EU's priorities for the fight against organised and serious international crime between 2018 and 2021, available at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8654-2017-INIT/en/pdf> [Accessed 4 April 2019].
- European Police College, 2015, The JHA Training Matrix Report 2014, [CEPOL internal document, available upon request].
- European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), 2016, The JHA Training Matrix Report 2015, [CEPOL internal document, available upon request].
- European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), 2017, The JHA Training Matrix Report 2016, [CEPOL internal document, available upon request].

- European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), 2018, The JHA Training Matrix Report 2017, [CEPOL internal document, available upon request].

Annex 1: Results from the questionnaire applied to the CEPOL National Units

COVER LETTER

Dear Madam / Sir,

In the framework of the CEPOL European Joint Master Program (EJMP) 2017-2019, on **Policing in Europe**, **we are developing the Master thesis on the subject "The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe"**.

The overall goal of this thesis is to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing coordination mechanisms and the impact these have concerning the delivery of training for law enforcement officials in Europe.

For the purpose, we consider relevant to enquire the CEPOL National Units about some relevant topics for our research.

The survey will take 5 to 10 minutes to be completed and we kindly ask for your reply.

Grateful in advance for your availability,

Kindest regards,

Budapest, Hungary

April 2019

Hugo João da Silva Cruz

Portuguese EJMP student

E-mail: hugo.cruz@cepol.europa.eu / Mobile phone: +351 969456922

1. I – Identification

Country: Estonia

Date: 14.05.2019

II – Questions:

1. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*
 - a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*
Not aware about JHA matrix at all
 - b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*
We do not know
 - c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*
No
2. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*
 - a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*
No
 - b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in*

order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?

Yes

3. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

Could be better as example of using JHA matrix as **CEPOL development product** by the member states as an Estonian example

4. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

It is not flexible at present time, but it is very important at present circumstances in the society development process. The most important all supporting activities to organize training courses under CEPOL umbrella are in the stone age in our modern IT environment at present time and thus create lot of unnecessary workflow together with bureaucracy. From coordination point of view exist lot of duplications and on the same time competitions in the organisation of training activities between different EU Agencies and this is the taxpayer's money.

2. I – Identification

Country: GREECE

Date: 15/05/2019

II – Questions:

5. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*
- a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*
YES
 - b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*
Ministry of education, research and reigion
 - c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*
NO
6. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*
- a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*
YES regarding that the national LEA have access to the JHA Matrix
 - b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in*

order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?

I could imagine this but this process collides to the Council Decision 2219/2015 (Article 3) as CEPOL is the only agency in Europe to provide certified training to LEA authorities. Of course if the training is provided from non EU LEA (exp. FBI, USSS etc) then it would be an added value for us, if CEPOL could fund our national participation.

7. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

Since 2016 when the 2219.2015 was put into force CEPOL is coordinating training activities for the EU LEA and neighbouring countries LEA, professional. Of course there is still room for improvement as the OTNA and STNA are still very young as well as the CKC.

8. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

It is still very early in time, as a lot of other EU agencies need time to understand CEPOL's tasks. Moreover there are a series of agreements that have to be signed with other stakeholders in the EU (OLAF, Judicial institutes, FRONTEX for Coast Guard training, EFSCA, EFA – EΦA etc). Procedures have to be laid down for Grant agreement system and in addition CEPOL as well as the MS have to increase their human resources.

3. I – Identification

Country: Luxembourg

Date: 13.05.2019

II – Questions:

9. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*

a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*

Yes

b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*

Judiciary police

c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*

We don't have this information as it falls under the competence of the judiciary police.

10. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*

a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*

Yes

- b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?*

Yes

11. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

Coordination has improved in recent years. In order to provide more services and training to stakeholders, coordination should be extended to all European agencies active in the fields of law enforcement.

12. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

Clique ou toque aqui para inserir o texto.

4. I – Identification

Country: the Netherlands

Date: 17-05-2019

II – Questions:

13. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*

a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*

Unfortunately not.

b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*

If it's on the LMS, we as CNU. Otherwise the Ministry of Justice

c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*

Regarding CEPOL activities, yes.

14. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*

a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*

Yes.

b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in*

order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?

This is a MB decision, however my personal opinion , yes.

15. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

Very well

16. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

Working on it 😊

5. I – Identification

Country: Portugal

Date: 14/05/2019

II – Questions:

17. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*

a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*

YEs

b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*

CNU

Law Enforcement Authorities Point of Contacts

c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*

No because by principle each Law Enforcement authorities PoC should have access to this JHA matrix

18. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*

a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*

Definitely

- b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?*

Depends whether is or not a high requested training. There are specific thematic trainings that currently MS are seeking for training, no matter which EU Agency or MS provides. Nevertheless, duplications such be avoided. In this regard, this CNU supports the idea of CEPOL fund MS representative to attend trainings provided by EU Agencies or MS.

19. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

There is space for significant improvements. CEPOL is making efforts towards efficient training coordination. Nevertheless, CEPOL is one player among many others in a whole system. MS and other stakeholders have a very important role, but many times, due to many different factors, MS appoint different persons for different meetings without proper coordination or business continuity.

20. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

In our opinion, there is space for improvement the training coordination efficiency. Firstly, if not done yet, identifying all the players providing EU level training (Agencies, MS, Stakeholders) by areas of interest;

Secondly mapping the Points of Contacts and its workflow

Thirdly, define realistic timelines for contributions and feedback;

Last but not least, set the network and use it.

We also think that training coordination efficiency relies on organisations and people's will and their training needs. It will only be possible to improve the current state of art, when all the key players involved engage with the same energy, strength and mindset towards one direction only.

6. I – Identification

Country: SPAIN

Date: 28/05/2019

II – Questions:

21. *CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. This matrix compiles all the training activities implemented by CEPOL, FRONTEX, ESDC, EASO, EUROPOL, EMCDDA, EU-LISA and EJTN.*

a. *Are you aware of the JHA matrix?*

NO

b. *Who, in your country, has access to the JHA matrix?*

I DO NOT KNOW

c. *Is the information available in the JHA matrix, namely the list of activities to be organised in a given year, disseminated in your country?*

YES, THE CEPOL LIST OF ACTIVITIES IS DISSEMINATED

22. *Most Member States develop and implement international training activities for law enforcement officials covering areas of the EU Policy Cycle, and sometimes invite participants from other MS. Some of these trainings are implemented with high quality standards similar to other activities implemented by CEPOL or other Eu Agencies and institutions.*

a. *Would you find it useful for the JHA matrix to include training activities from MS that meet the criteria of quality and international relevance?*

YES, OF COURSE

b. *Imagine that a certain Agency (other than CEPOL) or a MS is organising a training activity in an area you have training needs. Do you believe that instead of organising a similar activity in*

order to avoid duplication of curriculum and engagement of trainers, CEPOL could fund the participation of MS in such activities?

YES, CEPOL COULD DO IT

23. *How do you perceive the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe performed by CEPOL?*

Still CEPOL is secondary in terms of European LE training, Member States use CEPOL as a tool, every time more useful, but it is not essential for LE training

24. *If you have any considerations or suggestions about the coordination of training for law enforcement officials on a European level, please explain.*

CEPOL training must be accredited and valued in the Member States. The CEPOL Master Programme must solve its administrative problems and develop as the MAIN Police Master in Europe, accessible both by official and private students

Annex 2: Scripts of the interviews

COVER LETTER

SEMISTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Dear Madam / Sir,

In the framework of the CEPOL European Joint Master Program (EJMP) 2017-2019, on **Policing in Europe**, **we are developing the Master thesis on the subject "The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe"**.

The overall goal of this thesis is to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing coordination mechanisms and the impact these have concerning the delivery of training for law enforcement officials in Europe.

For the sample, we consider relevant listening personalities with recognized expertise, knowledge and experience within the subject in study, being police, academics, and other personalities that will for sure fill some bibliographic gaps and thus enrich this work. Therefore, we request to Your Excellency to kindly collaborate for this study, making yourselves available to answer an interview.

We fully appreciate the expressed availability, contributing with your knowledge and experience to the strengthening of this thesis, stressing that this interview has merely academic goals.

Grateful in advance for your availability,

Kindest regards,

Budapest, Hungary

April 2019

Hugo João da Silva Cruz

Portuguese EJMP student

E-mail: hugo.cruz@psp.pt / Mobile phone: +351 969456922

GUIDE FOR THE INTERVIEW #1

Subject: “The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe”

Dear Madam / Sir,

We request the collaboration of Your Excellency for answering to the bellow questions by appealing to the capacity of synthesis and concision.

I – Identification

Full name: Detlef Schroeder	Current function: Executive Director
Institution: CEPOL	Country: Hungary
Date: 16/05/2019	Recorded interview

II – Questions:

- 1. Besides from the training delivered by Member States to Law Enforcement Officials, there are many EU Agencies, institutions and EU funded projects organising and delivering training with an international dimension. What has been the role of CEPOL, as the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training?*
- 2. Do you believe that the role of CEPOL concerning the coordination of training is in line with the EU-LETS?*
- 3. What do you believe is the biggest strength/contribute of CEPOL concerning the coordination of training in Europe?*

4. *Many Member States and other EU Agencies are now using the EU-STNA as a key document for the design and implementation of training activities. These trainings cover some or most of the needs identified in the EU-STNA but CEPOL is still implementing training activities on topics already covered by other actors. Do you believe that CEPOL needs to cover, in terms of implementing training, all the areas of the EU policy cycle or could there also be a coordination in this level where CEPOL would support the training delivered by other partners and then implement only the training in areas not already covered?*
5. *CEPOL developed the JHA training matrix in order to ensure a closer coordination in the development and delivery of training. What do you believe is the impact that the JHA matrix had in terms of training coordination?*
6. *The JHA matrix compiles information about the training delivered by several EU Agencies and other Institutions. This information might be very useful for any Law Enforcement official when searching for training opportunities. Who can have access to the information on the JHA matrix?*
7. *Imagine that a MS or a EU funded project is implementing a training activity which CEPOL is also planning to implement. Would it be possible for CEPOL to fund the participation of MS in such training instead of also implementing a similar activity, thus avoiding duplication of training and engagement of trainers?*
8. *Do you have any other considerations that you believe could be useful for the purpose of this master thesis concerning the coordination of training?*

GUIDE FOR THE INTERVIEW #2

Subject: “The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe”

Dear Madam / Sir,

We request the collaboration of Your Excellency for answering to the bellow questions by appealing to the capacity of synthesis and concision.

I – Identification

Full name: Aija Kalnaja	Current function: Head of Capacity Building Directorate
Institution: FRONTEX	Country: Poland
Date: 06/06/2019	Recorded interview

II – Questions:

- FRONTEX is one of the EU Agencies with the biggest increase of implementation of training activities for law enforcement officials and number of participants. In 2018, FRONTEX implemented 338 training activities, with 8.471 (8.104 in courses/seminars/workshops/conferences and 367 in webinars) participants. CEPOL has implemented 251 training activities with 28.084 participants (3.313 in courses/seminars/workshops/conferences and 15.976) in webinars. How do you explain this growth and the fact that FRONTEX has now more participants in residential activities than CEPOL?*

2. *CEPOL is the Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement official in Europe. How does CEPOL coordinate the training delivered by FRONTEX?*
3. *Specifically concerning the JHA matrix, who may have access and what is the added value for FRONTEX in using it?*
4. *So, in your opinion is there is an effective and efficient coordination of training in Europe?*
5. *What do you believe should be the future of Europe in terms of coordination of training for law enforcement officials?*

GUIDE FOR THE INTERVIEW #3

Subject: “The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe”

Dear Madam / Sir,

We request the collaboration of Your Excellency for answering to the bellow questions by appealing to the capacity of synthesis and concision.

I - Identification

Full name: João Miguel de Almeida Madaleno	Current function: ESDC Training Manager (Civilian Aspects - CSDP)
Institution: European Security and Defence College (ESDC), European External Action Service (EEAS)	Country: Portugal
Date: 28/05/2019	Response by email

II – Questions:

- 1. CEPOL is the EU Agency responsible for the coordination of training for law enforcement officials in Europe and the ESDC is one of the institutions delivering training on a European level. What, in your opinion, has been the role of CEPOL concerning the coordination of training delivered by the ESDC?*
- 2. One of the coordination tools developed by CEPOL is the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) training matrix. How does the ESDC contribute to the JHA matrix?
ESDC*
- 3. What is the added value of the JHA matrix to the ESDC?*

4. *Since 2014, the JHA matrix has been including the training delivered by the ESDC.*

The data available is the following:

- a. *2014: 41 training activities and no reference to the number of participants;*
- b. *2015: 22 training activities with 30 participants;*
- c. *2016: 57 training activities with 2336 participants;*
- d. *2017: 48 training activities with 1898 participants;*
- e. *2018: no reference to any training activities nor number of participants.*

i. Are these numbers accurate, or are they in accordance with the ESDC annual reports?

ii. Is there a reason for the ESDC not providing the numbers concerning 2018?

5. *The number of training activities delivered by the EU Agencies and other institutions, like the ESDC has been increasing exponentially in the past few years and the tendency is for further growth. Do you believe CEPOL is coordinating effectively and efficiently the training for law enforcement officials on a European level?*

6. *What do you believe the future should be in terms of coordination of training and how does CEPOL and the ESDC can contribute to an effective and efficient coordination of training?*

7. *Do you have any other considerations that you believe could be useful for the purpose of this master thesis concerning the coordination of training?*

GUIDE FOR THE INTERVIEW #4

Subject: “The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe”

Dear Madam / Sir,

We request the collaboration of Your Excellency for answering to the bellow questions by appealing to the capacity of synthesis and concision.

I – Identification

Full name: Mário Leal Gouveia		Current function:	
		Gendarmerie Colonel (Res)	
Institution: GNR		Country: Portugal	
Date: 27/5/2019	Response by email		

II – Questions:

- 1. Member States often develop and implement training for law enforcement officials with an international perspective, covering topics of the EU Policy Cycle and accepting participants from other MS. How does CEPOL contribute to the implementation and coordination of such training?*
- 2. In terms of coordination and harmonisation of training, CEPOL offers products such as the Common Curricula, e-Library and e-Journals, the EU-STNA report and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. Up to which extent do you use these products*

when implementing training, either in the CEPOL framework or as a National training agency?

3. *Do you believe that the aspirations of the EU-LETS were met by CEPOL concerning the coordination of training? Please justify.*
4. *As representative of a training institution, which is a CEPOL Framework Partner, as former head of the Portuguese CNU and also taking into consideration your knowledge about the implementation of training in other MS or by other EU Agencies and institutions, do you feel that there is an effective and efficient coordination of training for LE officials on a European level? Why?*
5. *The JHA matrix was developed to provide a state of play of training activities delivered by several EU Agencies, the EJTN and the ESDC and also as a tool for the coordination of training.*
 - a. *Do you have access to the JHA matrix?*
 - b. *Who do you believe should have access to the JHA matrix?*
 - c. *What kind of information you believe should be available in the JHA matrix?*
 - d. *How could the JHA matrix be improved in order to enhance to coordination of training?*

6. *Considering the coordination of training, what do you believe could be improved (if so) in the future and what developments are needed in order to ensure an effective and efficient coordination of training?*
7. *The CEPOL CKC were also mentioned in some strategic documents as a way to improve coordination. How do you believe that the CKC improved the coordination of training?*
8. *Within the CKC, there were also coordination meetings and implementation of training. Who were the partners/institutions involved?*
9. *What is the role of the CKC leader in terms of coordination?*
10. *Do you have any other considerations that you believe could be useful for the purpose of this master thesis concerning the coordination of training?*

GUIDE FOR THE INTERVIEW #5

Subject: “The Coordination of Training for Law Enforcement in Europe”

Dear Madam / Sir,

We request the collaboration of Your Excellency for answering to the bellow questions by appealing to the capacity of synthesis and concision.

I – Identification

Full name: Gerhard Haberler	Current function: Head of CNU and CEPOL FP
Institution: SIAK	Country: Austria
Date: 31/05/2019	Response by email

II – Questions:

- 1. Member States often develop and implement training for law enforcement officials with an international perspective, covering topics of the EU Policy Cycle and accepting participants from other MS. How does CEPOL contribute to the implementation and coordination of such training?*
- 2. In terms of coordination and harmonisation of training, CEPOL offers products such as the Common Curricula, e-Library and e-Journals, the EU-STNA report and the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) matrix. Up to which extent do you use these products when implementing training, either in the CEPOL framework or as a National training agency?*

3. *Do you believe that the aspirations of the EU-LETS were met by CEPOL concerning the coordination of training? Please justify.*
4. *As representative of a training institution, which is a CEPOL Framework Partner, as head of the Austrian CNU and also taking into consideration your knowledge about the implementation of training in other MS or by other EU Agencies and institutions, do you feel that there is an effective and efficient coordination of training for LE officials on a European level? Why?*
5. *The JHA matrix was developed to provide a state of play of training activities delivered by several EU Agencies, the EJTN and the ESDC and also as a tool for the coordination of training.*
 - a. *Do you have access to the JHA matrix?*
 - b. *Who do you believe should have access to the JHA matrix?*
 - c. *What kind of information you believe should be available in the JHA matrix?*
 - d. *How could the JHA matrix be improved in order to enhance to coordination of training?*
5. *Considering the coordination of training, what do you believe could be improved (if so) in the future and what developments are needed in order to ensure an effective and efficient coordination of training?*
6. *Do you have any other considerations that you believe could be useful for the purpose of this master thesis concerning the coordination of training?*