



Federal Ministry of
the Interior

POSTAL ADDRESS Federal Ministry of the Interior, 11014 Berlin

President of the German Bundestag
— Parliamentary Secretariat —
Reichstag Building
11011 Berlin

OFFICE ADDRESS Alt-Moabit 101 D, 10559 Berlin

POSTAL ADDRESS 11014 Berlin

TEL +49 (0)30 18 681-1 117

FAX +49 (0)30 18 681-1019

INTERNET www.bmi.bund.de

DATE 10 February 2014

RE **Minor interpellation tabled by the Members of the German Bundestag Andrej Hunko
et al. and the Left Party parliamentary group
Cooperative activities and projects conducted by European police forces in the
second six months of 2013**

Bundestag Printed Paper 18/274

Please find enclosed four copies of the answer drawn up in response to the above
minor interpellation, which I am forwarding on behalf of the German Federal
Government.

Note:

Parts of the answers to questions 6d, 6e, 6g, 6h and 6j, and questions 7d, 7e, 7g 7h
and 7j are categorised as **CLASSIFIED MATERIAL – CONFIDENTIAL** and are available
at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag.

Yours sincerely

pp.

Dr Günter Krings

POSTAL AND DELIVERY ADDRESS Alt-Moabit 101 D, 10559 Berlin

PUBLIC TRANSPORT S-Bahn Bellevue; U-Bahn Turmstraße
Bus Kleiner Tiergarten

Minor interpellation tabled by the Members of the German Bundestag Andrej Hunko *et al.* and the Left Party parliamentary group.

Cooperative activities and projects conducted by European Police forces in the second six months of 2013

Bundestag Printed Paper 18/274

Preliminary remarks by the Members who tabled the minor interpellation:

Forms of international cooperation between customs authorities, police forces and secret services frequently take place in working parties that are difficult for parliaments to scrutinise. In many cases, recourse is had to informal structures, even where the areas in which they are active have now come within the jurisdiction of EU agencies (Printed Paper 17/14474). As far as the Members who are tabling this minor interpellation are aware, the Council Law Enforcement Working Party alone has 18 subgroups under its aegis (Council Doc. 17559/11): EU contact points for tackling cross-border vehicle crime, Experts for major sports events, European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (ENPPF), Radio communications experts, European Network of Law Enforcement Technology Services (ENLETS), Liaison Officers' (LOs) Management Services, European Network on Fugitive Active Search Teams (ENFAST), European Firearms Experts (EFE), EnviCrimeNet, Network of police dog professionals in Europe (KYNOPOL), European medical and psychological experts' network for law enforcement (EMPEN), eMOBIDIG, EU-CULTNET, and the police networks AQUAPOL (shipping), TISPOL (transport), RAILS (rail transport), AIRPOL (airports) and ATLAS (special intervention units). 'Joint Police Operations' (JPOs), 'Joint Customs Operations' (JCOs) and 'Joint Customs Police Operations' (JCPOs) have been established within the EU for some years (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/6856). They are conducted with the participation or under the responsibility of the TISPOL, AQUAPOL, RAILPOL and AIRPOL networks.

The EU's law enforcement agency is being given further competences with regard to international cooperation. Operational agreements and other kinds of cooperation are negotiated with 'third states'. Its efforts are also directed against cross-border forms of left-wing protest (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/9756). The German Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA) engages in the 'exchange of information' about what is termed 'Euroanarchism' with authorities in France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Greece and Switzerland. Relevant intelligence is regularly discussed in the Council Working Party on Terrorism and stored in the 'Dolphin' Analysis Work File. Since 2007, the German

Federal Government has been working energetically to have information on left-wing demonstrators stored in a political database of 'violent travelling offenders' administered at the EU level and to establish the term 'violent travelling offenders' as a label for these individuals (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/7018). The BKA also contributes to the EU 'Expert Meeting Against Right Wing Extremism' (EMRE) project, in which Austria, Sweden and Switzerland are participating as well. Nevertheless, the international cooperation against right-wing extremism is weakly developed.

Furthermore, EMRE is investigating left-wing and antifascist responses to right-wing violence in a project on confrontations and conflicts between right-wing and left-wing groupings. It is known that the 'European Cooperation Group on Undercover Activities' (ECG) and the 'International Working Group on Undercover Policing' (IWG), which organise meetings between the supervisors of undercover officers, also deliberate on the infiltration of international left-wing groupings (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/9844). A 'Cross-Border Surveillance Working Group' (CSW) brings together mobile task forces from 12 EU Member States and the EU's law enforcement agency Europol to talk about cross-border observation techniques (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/5677). Members of police forces from several EU governments meet in the 'International Specialist Law Enforcement' (ISLE) project with a similar purpose. This project was launched in 2009 and is driving ahead the exchange and communication of information about the secret infiltration of rooms, vehicles and electronic devices (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/10713).

The Federal Criminal Police Office is still participating in the 'Police Working Group on Terrorism' (PWGT), which was established in 1979 to 'exchange information on terrorist attacks', but since 2000 has also been intended to help prevent 'violent political activities' (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/13440). The BKA set up the Remote Forensic Software User Group, which previously went by the name 'DigiTask User Group', to promote German Trojan software abroad (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/8958). Since 1992, the German Federal Government has been a member of the 'European Telecommunications Standards Institute' (ETSI), whose activities include the development of standards for telecommunications surveillance ('Lawful Interception') that have validity all over the world (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/11239).

Police forces and gendarmierie units from many EU Member States have met in the 'European Police Force Training' (EUPFT) exercises, during which dialogue takes place about different forms of operation (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/3316).

Parameters for the tactics used to manage large demonstrations that have also been practiced during these exercises had previously been drawn up in the multistage research project 'Coordinating National Research Programmes and Policies on Major

Events Security' (EU-SEC), but its results are not publicly available (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/7018). As a successor to the EUPFT, the European Commission had put similar training courses out to tender under the title 'European Union Police Services Training' (EUPST), provision that is now supposed to be administered by the civilian-military European External Action Service (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/7018). Apart from this, the EU has set up the 'Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management' (ENTRI) programme.

In its answers about the cooperative activities listed above, the German Federal Government frequently emphasises that they only feature the 'exchange of ideas'. It is claimed that such meetings merely involve discussions of the parameters for operational measures and not steps to arrange such measures. However, these forms of cooperation are likely to be of fundamental significance for subsequent cross-border, coercive measures. The German Federal Government has started refusing to provide answers that can be made publicly available to large parts of the questions put to it about the practices in which police networks engage. In contrast to this, the Members of the German Bundestag who are tabling this minor interpellation are of the opinion that the widest possible public debate needs to be conducted about the networks' activities.

1. What 'subgroups' of the Council Law Enforcement Working Party exist as far as the German Federal Government is aware at the moment, which countries are entrusted with leading them ('forerunners') or performing secretariat functions, and what changes occurred in this respect during the second six months of 2013?

Re 1.

As far as the German Federal Government is aware, the 18 expert groups and networks listed below currently meet under the aegis of the Council Law Enforcement Working Party.

No.	Expert group/network	Forerunners/secretariat functions
1	EU contact points for tackling cross-border vehicle crime (CARPOL)	Netherlands 'Co-drivers': Germany, Hungary, Sweden
2	Experts for major sports events	Belgium
3	European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (ENPPF)	Belgium
4	Radio Communications Experts Group (RCEG)	Current Council Presidency Two subgroups a) Inter System Interface (ISI) group: Belgium b) Forerunner group: Netherlands
5	European Network of Law Enforcement Technology Services (ENLETS)	France Core group: Greece, France, Cyprus, Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom
6	Liaison Officers' (LOs) Management Services	'Forerunners group': Belgium, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Austria, Finland, Sweden
7	European Network on Fugitive Active Search Teams (ENFAST)	Core group: Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Austria, Sweden, Spain, United Kingdom, Europol
8	European Firearms Experts (EFE)	Netherlands (secretariat)
9	Informal network for countering environmental crime (EnviCrimeNet)	Netherlands/Europol
10	Network of police dog professionals in Europe (KYNOPOL)	Hungary
11	European medical and psychological experts' network for law enforcement (EMPEN)	Hungary
12	European network of airport law enforcement services (AIRPOL)	Belgium
13	European network of special	Germany

	intervention units (ATLAS)	
14	Informal network of law enforcement authorities and expertise competent in the field of cultural goods (CULTNET)	Presidency coordinates activities and chairs meetings
15	European Traffic Police Network (TISPOL)	Executive Committee Current members can be viewed at: https://www.tispol.org/about/tispol-executive/tispol-executive-committee
16	European network for cross-border cooperation in the area of law enforcement in the waterborne transport domain (AQUAPOL)	Romania
17	European network of Railway Police Forces (RAILPOL)	Currently Netherlands
18	Electronic mobile identification interoperability group (eMOBIDIG)	United Kingdom

2. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of each of the subgroups, which currently number 18 to the knowledge of the Members who are tabling this minor interpellation, took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware (see preliminary remarks; please answer as in Printed Paper 17/14474)?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*

- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 2

During the second six months of 2013, authorities of the German Federal Government participated in meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the following Council Law Enforcement Working Party subgroups: ENLETS, CARPOL, ENPPF, EMPEN, ATLAS, Experts for major sports events, RAILPOL, ENFAST, EFE and EnviCrimeNet.

Authorities of the German Federal Government did not participate in meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the subgroups KYNOPOL, RCEG and Liaison Officers' Management Services or the police networks AIRPOL, CULTNET, TISPOL, AQUAPOL and eMOBIDIG during the second six months of 2013.

1: CARPOL

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of CARPOL took place on 20/21 November 2013 in Vilnius, Lithuania.
- b) The meeting was prepared by the CARPOL delegates from Lithuania (which held the chair of CARPOL) and the Netherlands (CARPOL 'driver').
- c) The agenda was distributed in advance.
- d) The following items featured on the agenda:
 - Results of Joint Police Operation (JPO) LITCAR
 - Results of the Spanish OP POPEYE
 - Lithuania's experience of retrieving stolen vehicles
 - CARPOL's Long Lasting Agenda
 - Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) — results from the evaluation of the questionnaires
 - Standardised marking of construction machinery
 - Introduction of the e-call in-vehicle emergency call system as of November 2015
 - Extraordinary vehicle identification cases

- e) Representatives of the Federal Criminal Police Office contributed a paper on the standardised marking of construction machinery and an explanation of problems associated with the use of e-call.
- f) Apart from staff of the Federal Criminal Police Office, delegates from Austria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Slovakia, the United Kingdom, Switzerland and Europol attended the meeting.
- g) With regard to this question, reference is made to the answer to question d).
- h) With regard to this question, reference is made to the answer to question e).
- i) JPOs targeted at car crime were regarded as worthwhile, but it was felt they should only last two to three days in future. The United Kingdom was to organise a workshop on PPPs during the first six months of 2014. Germany was to draw up a document on the need for the uniform marking of construction machines and introduce it into the deliberations of the European institutions via the LEWP. A working group led by the Netherlands was to find out the extent to which the e-call system could be used for police purposes at the international level.
- j) With regard to this question, reference is made to the answer to question d).

2: Experts for major sports events

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the Experts for major sports events subgroup took place on 4 October 2013 in Brussels.
- b) The Secretariat of the Council was responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting in cooperation with the country that held the Council Presidency (during this period Lithuania).
- c) The documents provided are identified by references in the agenda and are available to the public for download.
- d) The agenda set out in Council Doc. Enfopol CM 4293/13 is available to the public for download under the following link:
http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/EU/XXIV/EU/12/48/EU_124833/imfnam_e_10415517.pdf.

- e) The agenda was agreed by consensus in the run up to the meeting.
- f) The Permanent Representative of the Commander-in-Chief of the Public Order Support Forces of the Länder (IBP), a delegate from the Central Sports Intelligence Unit Germany (ZIS) and, for some of the time, a delegate from Germany's Permanent Representation to the EU in Brussels attended the meeting on behalf of Germany.
- g) The discussion of the agenda items covered the following subjects:
 - Agenda item 1: Deletion of agenda item 14
 - Agenda item 2: Presentation
 - Agenda item 3: Discussion led by the Council's Legal Service, it was necessary for the draft to be modified for formal reasons.
 - Agenda item 4: Note was taken of this item and there was a discussion about the inclusion of the results in Council Conclusions. There was a discussion of the national legal frameworks in the EU Member States and how they could be supplemented.
 - Agenda item 5: Presentation on a Memorandum of Understanding for international police cooperation at major football matches and tournaments such as the European Cup and World Cup. It was proposed that the Memorandum of Understanding be included in the 'Handbook with recommendations for international police cooperation and measures to prevent and control violence and disturbances in connection with football matches with an international dimension, in which at least one Member State is involved' as an appendix. One EU Member State lodged a scrutiny reservation, the Legal Service asked about impacts on other fields.
 - Agenda item 6: Presentation. It was agreed that no further discussion would take place in the subgroup or LEWP for the time being.
 - Agenda item 7 to agenda item 13: Presentations
 - Agenda item 14: Deleted
 - Agenda item 15: Paper
 - Agenda item 16: Discussion
- h) Delegates from German authorities made the following contributions:
 - Agenda item 3: Germany supported a revision of the document.

- Agenda item 5: Germany supported the proposal for a Memorandum of Understanding to be added to the ‘Handbook with recommendations for international police cooperation and measures to prevent and control violence and disturbances in connection with football matches with an international dimension, in which at least one Member State is involved’.
 - Agenda item 9: Germany took note of this item and supported the proposal that the greatest possible congruence be achieved between the measures taken by the Council of the European Union and those taken by the Council of Europe.
 - Agenda item 11: Germany took note of this item and supported the desire for a coordinated approach among the Member States.
 - Agenda item 13: Germany took note of this item and supported the retention of the rules applicable to date.
- i) The Member States agreed to revise the document referred to in agenda item 3 with the Council Legal Service. Agenda item 4 was to be examined further. Agenda item 5: The impacts on other areas were to be examined. Agenda item 6: It was decided that there should be no further deliberations in the subgroup or LEWP during the current Council Presidency. Agenda item 11: It was agreed that the subgroup would approach FIFA to discuss further action on the relevant issues.
- j) The meeting was not an informal exchange of ideas.

3: European Network for the Protection of Public Figures (ENPPF)

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the ENPPF took place on 11 October 2013 in Brussels, Belgium.
- b) The meeting was prepared by the Lithuanian ENPPF contact point (which held the chair) with support from the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union.
- c) The agenda and the document ‘Difficulties of protection units in relation to transport of firearms on commercial flights and the suggested way forward’ (Council Doc. 14023/13 LIMITE), which related to agenda item 3, were distributed in advance.
Furthermore, the ENPPF members were called upon to update their ‘National Factsheets’ (agenda item 2) so that the Factsheets could then be collated and added as an addendum to the ‘Handbook of the

European Network for the Protection of Public Figures' (Council Doc. 10478/13 RESTREINT UE). *Inter alia*, the National Factsheets include country-specific information on the bodies responsible for the protection of public figures and contact details for the national contact points.

Presentations by the participating states were distributed during and after the meeting.

d) The following items featured on the agenda:

- Adoption of the agenda
- Updated addendum to the 'Handbook of the European Network for the Protection of Public Figures'
- State of play as regards the armed escort of protectees in planes, the current EU legislation in this field and possible solutions (Presentation by the Presidency)
- Threat posed by individuals to protected persons, identification of such individuals, threat assessment and management (Presentation by the UK delegation)
- Lithuanian experience in the management of the risk of violent attacks posed by fixated persons (Presentation by the Presidency)
- Internet monitoring in order to retrieve information about the threats to protected persons, the concept of the threat, its sources and best practices in this field (Presentation by the Presidency)
- Anonymous threats on the Internet – German perspective (presentation by the DE delegation)
- Any other business

e) In the run up to the meeting, the chair asked the German ENPPF contact point (Federal Criminal Police Office) to give a presentation. The BKA agreed to this request. No other topics were suggested by the German delegation.

f) Delegates from 26 EU Member States, the European Commission, the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union and Europol attended the meeting. Two staff members of the Federal Criminal Police Office were sent to the meeting on behalf of Germany.

g to j) The subjects covered and the results of the meeting have been published in Council Doc. 15612/13 (Public Register of Council Documents).

4: European Network of Law Enforcement Technology Services (ENLETS)

- a) In the second six months of 2013, an ENLETS meeting took place in Vilnius, Lithuania on 24/25 October 2013.
- b) The meeting was prepared jointly by the Lithuanian Council Presidency with the core group of interested states that had formed at the meeting in February 2012 (Belgium, Greece, France, Cyprus, Netherlands, Poland, Finland and the United Kingdom).
- c) The presentations by the participating states were distributed in advance.
- d) The following items featured on the agenda:
 - Opening remarks
 - Presentation by Europol on the Europol Platform for Experts
 - Discussion of the further work to be done by ENLETS
 - Presentation by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) and Frontex
 - Presentation on precommercial procurement by the Enterprise Directorate-General
 - Presentation on various research projects
 - Information from the upcoming Greek Presidency on the next meeting
- e) Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agenda.
- f) Individuals from 19 Member States and staff from the European Commission and various EU agencies attended the meeting. One member of staff from the German Police University in Münster attended the meeting on behalf of Germany.
- g to j) Apart from the presentations, the participants deliberated on ENLETS's 'Work programme 2014-2020'. This document includes a plan of work for 2014-2015 and an action plan for the next few years, as well as a summary of the Network's short, mid and long term objectives. Alongside this, it contains remarks on the funding of ENLETS. Deliberations on the 'Work programme' are currently being conducted in the Council bodies. The German delegates did not give a paper and took part only generally in the discussion. The next meeting is due to be held in Greece under the Greek Council Presidency in the spring of 2014.

5: European Network of Fugitive Active Search Teams (ENFAST)

- a) A meeting of the ENFAST core group took place in Berlin from 15 to 17 October 2013.
- b) The meeting was prepared jointly by the Federal Criminal Police Office and the Belgian ENFAST contact point.
- c) An invitation and the agenda were distributed.
- d) The following items featured on the agenda:
 - Successful joint searches and statistics
 - State of play concerning the Europol European Most Wanted List
 - ENFAST's terms of reference
 - Germany's application for an ISEC grant from the Commission to fund future ENFAST conferences
 - State of play on the use of the Europol Platform for Experts (EPE) by the ENFAST contact points
 - Connection of the ENFAST contact points to the SIENA information channel
- e) The agenda was drawn up jointly by the Federal Criminal Police Office and the Belgian ENFAST contact point.
- f) Delegates from the central fugitive search agencies in Austria, Belgium, Germany (Federal Criminal Police Office), Hungary, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom attended the meeting.
- g) With regard to this question, reference is made to the answer to question d).
- h) Germany was the organiser of the ENFAST meeting and provided the chair. This meant the German positions on all the agenda items were set out and explained.
- i) Agreements and arrangements were concluded on the further development and establishment of the ENFAST fugitive search network. In this respect, the emphasis is placed on an intensification of cooperation aimed at ensuring the arrest of internationally wanted offenders.
- j) This was a formal meeting of the ENFAST network at which the official agenda items were discussed.

6: European Firearms Experts (EFE)

- a) The EFE meeting in the second six months of 2013 took place at Europol in The Hague on 15/16 October 2013.
- b) The meeting was prepared by the EFE Secretariat.

- c) The agenda, list of participants and background documents ('Multiannual Strategic Plan (MASP) related to the EU crime priority "firearms", 'UNODC Updated Concept Note Firearms study GPF') were distributed in advance.
- d) The agenda included reports from the working groups, case studies and general presentations.
- e) The German Federal Criminal Police Office did not influence the agenda.
- f) Apart from staff of the Federal Criminal Police Office, delegates from 21 EU Member States, Europol and the European Commission attended the meeting.
- g) The discussion of the agenda items was informed by the desire to combat firearms crime, and concerns about firearms and the EU citizens' security. The activities undertaken on these topics by the working groups that had been set up were presented and general technical information was passed on, e.g. using case studies.
- h) Germany's role is to participate in exchanges of information and contribute to the work done within the following working groups: Definitions, Internet and Assignment of commercial security staff (Piracy).
- i) During the meeting, the EFE reiterated its goals/understanding of its purpose.

The EFE has been an advisory body to the LEWP since 2010. Its work serves the implementation of the 'European Action Plan (EAP) to combat illegal trafficking in so called "heavy" firearms which could be used or are used in criminal activities'. The EFE regards itself as an expert body that is guided by the EAP and works continuously within the limits of its capacities to illuminate in greater detail issues that come to prominence in the course of day-to-day operational work and are of Europe-wide significance.

In addition to this, the next steps to be taken by the individual working groups were coordinated, e.g. having drafted a catalogue that defines firearms-specific and technical terms, the Definitions working group had completed its task, while the Piracy working group was to use a questionnaire to collate information on the national regulations concerning piracy. These activities at the European level are coordinated by the Council Law Enforcement Working Party (LEWP) as part of a long-term process.

- j) The purpose of these meetings is to identify the potential for the optimisation of measures to combat firearms crime within the EU.

7: Informal network for countering environmental crime (EnviCrimeNet)

- a) EnviCrimeNet held its Annual General Meeting in cooperation with Europol on 13 and 14 November 2013 in The Hague.
- b) The chair and the EnviCrimeNet steering group were responsible for this event in cooperation with Europol.
- c) The participants received an invitation and the agenda in advance. Presentations that accompanied the papers, a list of participants and a Europol threat assessment on environmental crime were distributed during the Annual General Meeting.
- d) The following points featured on the agenda:
- Opening remarks
 - Papers by and discussion with representatives of the European Commission (Environment Directorate-General and Home Affairs Directorate-General)
 - Tour de table on the progress made in combatting environmental crime in the Member States
 - Report on the activities of the EnviCrimeNet steering group
 - Discussion of substantive and organisational measures taken by EnviCrimeNet
 - Case studies of various environmental crime phenomena from the Netherlands, Germany, Finland and Europol
 - Discussion of the procedure for the preparation of the Europol Organised Crime Threat Assessment
 - Report from Eurojust on measures to combat environmental crime
- e) A delegate from the German Federal Criminal Police Office was involved in drafting the agenda as a member of the EnviCrimeNet steering group.
- f) Apart from staff of the Federal Criminal Police Office, delegates from central police agencies or technical authorities that are responsible for action to combat environmental crime, 15 EU Member States, Interpol, Aquapol, Railpol, the European Commission, Eurojust and the European Union Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law (IMPEL) attended the meeting.

- g) Legislative aspects of European environmental law and its implementation in the Member States were examined by the European Commission's Environment Directorate-General. There was a discussion of the relevance of these provisions to environmental crime and the intervention strategies that are required.

The delegate from the European Commission's Home Affairs Directorate-General reported on new legislative measures concerning action to combat money laundering and corruption. Both phenomena have links to serious forms of environmental crime as well.

The progress made in combatting environmental crime in the individual Member States was also discussed against the background of EU environmental criminal law, which was harmonised with Directive 2008/99/EC.

The discussion of substantive and organisational aspects of the EnviCrimeNet network's activities dealt primarily with its duties to report to the European Commission, the support provided by Europol, cooperation with other networks and institutions such as Eurojust, and the network's specialist contribution to the Europol Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment. The case studies presented were focussed, in particular, on phenomena with potential relevance for all the EU states. Activities that communicate the experience gained in specific, practical areas of policing and consolidate the understanding of what they demand will promote the investigation and combatting of environmental crime in all the Member States.

- h) The German Federal Criminal Police Office presented the results of a special evaluation of Germany-wide waste trafficking associated with the recultivation of post-mining land, excavations and landfill sites.
- i) The meeting was primarily used to discuss the progress made in combatting environmental crime in the Member States, the identification of phenomena with cross-border aspects and the promotion of international cooperation as provided for by the Council resolution on the creation of EnviCrimeNet of 9/10 June 2011. *Inter alia*, the meeting put in place arrangements to fulfil the network's duties to report to the Council of the European Union and the European Commission.

EnviCrimeNet is restricted to non-operational cooperation. There is no operational cooperation, such as the exchange of personal data, or the conduct and coordination of joint preventive or repressive operations.

- j) This meeting was not an informal exchange of ideas.

8: European medical and psychological experts' network for law enforcement (EMPEN)

- a) In the second six months of 2013, the annual EMPEN workshop took place from 3 to 5 September in Tampere, Finland.
- b) The EMPEN Secretariat in Budapest was responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the workshop together with the European Police College (CEPOL) and the Police College of Finland.
- c) The seminar plan and logistical information were distributed to the participants in advance.
- d) The workshop was entitled 'Prepared Mind — Successful Operations' and looked at traumatic events in police work, their prevention and possible approaches to post-traumatic care.
- e) Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agenda.
- f) A total of 30 doctors, psychologists and social scientists from interior ministries and senior police authorities in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Police Headquarters), Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom were present at Tampere.
- g) The individual speakers explained what is being done at the national level to prevent potentially traumatic experiences and described the national institutions that provide post-traumatic care for police officers who have been through such experiences, discussing similarities, differences and prospects for the future.
- h) A delegate from the German Federal Police Headquarters spoke about the psychosocial care system in the Federal Police.
- i-j) The reciprocal dialogue about national standards concerning job-specific medical, psychological and social provision for police officers is to be placed on a permanent basis and intensified.

9: ATLAS

a to j)

With regard to these questions, reference is made to the preliminary remarks to the German Federal Government's answer to the minor interpellation tabled by the Left

Party parliamentary group on 6 June 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/13785) and 26 October 2012 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/11237).

Certain capabilities are maintained among the European Union police special intervention units involved in the ATLAS network, making it possible to respond to concrete policing situations if a concrete event occurs. If these capabilities (e.g. technology, tactics) were publicly known, this could endanger the overall success of an operation, as well as the lives and physical integrity of both the police officers deployed and, for instance if German citizens were taken hostage abroad, the lives and physical integrity of hostages. This would represent a significant breach of an essential fundamental and human right.

It is vital that the capabilities that have been acquired continue to be maintained and constantly upgraded. Given that national resources are limited, exchanges of experience with special intervention units from other nations are absolutely essential. With regard to exchanges of experience with international partners, the specific capabilities of a particular unit can be decisive. Thanks to the approach to exchanges of experience that is practiced, internationally available resources are used profitably, among other things to enhance the capabilities of the Federal Police Special Forces (GSG 9). The experience of the individual police special intervention units is therefore incorporated into the tactics, methodologies and technologies of the other special intervention units that participate in the ATLAS network.

For its part, the publication of this concrete material would, taken in its entirety, reveal the current capabilities and working methods of the European special intervention units involved in ATLAS, thus making it impossible for them to perform their functions in future. The police special intervention units in the ATLAS network are tasked with working in complex, hazardous and threatening situations of the greatest difficulty, and freeing individuals from immediate dangers to their lives and physical integrity. They find themselves confronted with offenders who operate extremely professionally, with a high degree of criminal energy and the latest technology. In these extreme situations, special intervention units are supposed to guarantee the protection of both fundamental and human rights, and individuals' lives and physical integrity. In the opinion of the German Federal Government, the disclosure of even some of the information requested would be likely to significantly endanger the protection of these fundamental rights. The police special intervention units would therefore be unable to fulfil their mission in future.

In addition to this, the provision of information concerning specialised foreign security authorities would permanently shatter our international cooperation partners' confidence in the integrity of German police work in a particularly sensitive and specialised field, and rule out cooperation on future activities to combat international organised crime and terrorism. After weighing up the rights to investigate and obtain information enjoyed by Members of the German Bundestag against the protection of fundamental rights, the German Federal Government has come to the conclusion that, in view of the reasons that have been set out and the high-ranking nature of the legally protected rights that are at stake, the publication of the information relevant in this respect must be ruled out, even if there is no more than a minor risk of undesirable consequences.

10: RAILPOL

Railway Accidents Working Group

- a) A meeting of the Railway Accidents Working Group was held in Spain during the second six months of 2013.
- b) The German Federal Police were responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting in cooperation with Spain.
- c) The invitations and agenda were sent out in preparation for the event.
- d) The event was focussed on the 'UNODC Updated Concept Note Firearms'. In addition to this, recent railway accidents were evaluated.
- e) The event was prepared substantively by the German Federal Police.
- f) Staff from railway police authorities in Belgium, Italy, Latvia, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and Germany (Federal Police) attended the event.
- g) The discussion of the agenda items covered the following subjects:
 - Drafting of a preventive concept to address risk in rail for police officers on European railways
 - Evaluation of recent railway accidents
 - Establishment of joint investigation groups when railway accidents occur in cross-border traffic
- h) Delegates from German authorities presented the draft of a preventive concept to address risk in rail for police officers on European railways.
- i to j) Consultations took place on the preventive concept to address risk in rail for police officers on European railways.

Crime Working Group

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the Crime Working Group was held in Bucharest.
- b) The RAILPOL Secretariat was responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting in cooperation with the host state, Romania.
- c) Invitations and the agenda were sent out in preparation for the event.
- d) The meeting's main priorities were 'best practices' for action to combat the crime phenomena faced by railway police, the drafting of a handbook to provide guidance on searching international trains and the drafting of recommendations for action on the phenomenon of 'metal theft'.
- e) Authorities of the German Federal Government did not ask for any items to be placed on the agenda.
- f) Delegates from the RAILPOL member states attended the meeting. The Federal Police attended on behalf of Germany.
- g) Reference is made to the answer to question d).
- h) Delegates from German authorities made no noteworthy contributions.
- i to j) Agreement was reached on the drafting of a handbook to provide guidance on searching international trains, and consultations took place on recommendations for action to combat metal theft.

RAILPOL Strategic Conference

- a) A RAILPOL Strategic Conference took place in Interlaken, Switzerland in the second six months of 2013.
- b) The RAILPOL Secretariat was responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the conference.
- c) The agenda, the participant registration form and hotel booking documents were sent out by the RAILPOL Secretariat in preparation for the event.
- d) The agenda items for the event were:
 - 'State of affairs Security SBB' - Presentation by Switzerland
 - Illegal Migration / Human Trafficking – the role of human traffickers, results of Operation PERKUNAS
 - Actual situation terrorism – risks to rail transport in Europe
 - Results from the RAILPOL working groups
 - Further RAILPOL activities, e.g. 'Train the Trainer'
 - 'Heads of main stations'
 - Evaluation of various queries raised between the Member States

- e) The Federal Police asked for a presentation about the planned 'heads of main stations' meeting to be placed on the agenda.
- f) All the member railway police organisations/authorities, and delegates from the TSA (USA) and the Amtrak Police (USA), which are associate members, took part in the plenary session.
- g) The discussion of the subjects placed on the agenda served the exchange of information and the comparison of 'best practices' with the aims of enhancing public security and order in the European railway sector, and improving crime prevention.
- h) Reference is made to the answer to question e).
- i to j) The participants agreed to conduct the 'heads of main stations' meetings by the end of the first six months of 2014.

Counter Terrorism Working Group

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the Counter Terrorism Working Group took place in London, UK.
- b) As the forces that chair the Working Group, the British Transport Police and the Italian Railway Police were responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting.
- c) The agenda, the participant registration form and hotel booking documents were sent out by the RAILPOL Secretariat in preparation for the event.
- d) The agenda items for the event were:
 - The future of RAILPOL
 - Evaluation of the 2nd Rail Action Day
 - Drafting of security recommendations for railway police officers/railway personnel
 - Information from the UK Passport Office
- e) Authorities of the German Federal Government did not ask for any items to be added to the agenda.
- f) Delegates from Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Spain, Portugal and Switzerland attended the meeting.
- g) The discussion of the subjects on the agenda contributed to the exchange of information and the comparison of 'best practices' with the aims of enhancing public security and order in the European railway sector, and improving crime prevention.
- h) Reference is made to the answer to question e).

i to j) Reference is made to the answer to question g).

Public Order Working Group

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the Public Order Working Group took place in Rome, Italy.
- b) The Italian authorities were responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting.
- c) The agenda, the participant registration form and hotel booking documents were sent out by the RAILPOL Secretariat in preparation for the event.
- d) The discussion was focussed on 'command structures and organisational structures at mass events'.
- e) The theme for the event was suggested in advance by the German Federal Police.
- f) Delegates from Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Switzerland and Germany (Federal Police) attended the event.
- g) An exchange of experience was conducted on the main theme. Furthermore, outstanding events from the jurisdictions of the various participants were presented.
- h) Reference is made to the answer to question g).
- i to j) The participants talked about the next meeting of the Working Group, identified future subjects for discussion and scheduled the annual RAILEX exercise.

Strategic Analysis Working Group

- a) In the second six months of 2013, a meeting of the Strategic Analysis Working Group was held in Bratislava, Slovakia.
- b) The Belgian chair was responsible for the preparation, agenda and organisation of the meeting together with Slovakia.
- c) The invitation and hotel booking documents were sent out by the RAILPOL Secretariat in preparation for the event.
- d) The Working Group dealt with the evaluation of railway-specific areas of offending.
- e) Authorities of the German Federal Government did not influence the agenda.
- f) The Federal Police took part in the event on behalf of Germany. A complete list of participants is not currently available.
- g) National results on railway-specific areas of offending were presented and collated.

- h) Reference is made to the answer to question g).
- i to j) Reference is made to the answer to question g).

3. *What Joint Customs Operations (JCOs), Joint Police Operations (JPOs) or Joint Customs Police Operations (JCPOs) were conducted with authorities of EU Member States in the second six months of 2013, as far as the German Federal Government is aware (please state as in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/12427)?*

- a) *Who prepared these operations, and was responsible for their planning and organisation?*
- b) *To what extent were authorities of the German Federal Government involved in the planning and organisation of the operations?*
- c) *What roles did the European Council's Customs Cooperation Working Party (CCWP) and Law Enforcement Working Party (LEWP) assume in the preparation of the operations?*
- d) *Where did the operations take place?*
- e) *Which authorities of which countries (including Germany), or organisations or individuals from the European Union or other institutions took part in the operations?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations of the German Federation or (as far as the German Federal Government is aware) the Länder contributed what capacities to these operations?*
- g) *What subjects were covered by the discussions of the agenda items and other business (please give a rough outline)?*
- h) *How were the operations funded?*
- i) *What concrete results did the operations achieve?*
- j) *Where meetings were primarily informal 'exchanges of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as their central aspects?*
- k) *To what extent is it accurate that consideration is being given to the establishment of JCOs as 'permanent structures' in future?*

JCO WAREHOUSE

In the second six months of 2013, the operational phase of 'Joint Customs Operation' (JCO) WAREHOUSE took place at the EU level from 15 to 31 October as far as the German Federal Government is aware. The aim of JCO WAREHOUSE was to combat the smuggling of excise goods such as energy products, tobacco products and spirits into the European Union in cargo transported by road.

- a) The lead roles in the preparation, planning and organisation of this Joint Customs Operation were taken on by the Lithuanian Customs Service together with the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF).
- b) The briefing on JCO Warehouse, which was attended by the participating states, took place in Brussels on 17 September 2013. The German customs administration was represented by the Central Office of the German Customs Investigation Service (ZKA). The gathering discussed the operational plan and adopted its finalised version.
- c) The Customs Cooperation Working Party (CCWP) offers the EU Member States the ability to coordinate technically and organisationally the conduct of any measures that come into consideration.
- d) The operation took place in the 28 EU Member States. Third countries were not involved.
- e) The customs administrations of the EU Member States took part in the operation. The ZKA participated on behalf of Germany. The individual EU Member States involved the various authorities responsible for the administration of value added tax in line with the assignment of competences for these matters at the national level. The ZKA involved the Federal Central Tax Office in the JCO as a contact point to the tax administrations of the Länder. The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), and the Taxation and Customs Union Directorate-General (DG Taxud) took part in the JCO on behalf of the European Commission. EUROPOL provided analytical support.
- f) The ZKA sent one representative to the Physical Operational Coordination Unit (P-OCU) formed during the operational phase at OLAF and acted as the National Contact Point (NCP). Since the defined purpose of the operation (see the answer to question g) below) resulted in the operational focus being placed more on intelligence gathering/information enrichment and less on physical checks from the outset in Germany, the personnel resources deployed were modest. It may be assumed that a total of about 200 personnel hours were invested in the operation.
- g) At the briefing, the participants discussed the purpose and goals of the operation thoroughly. The intention was for it to centre around preventive and repressive measures to combat the smuggling of excise goods such as energy products, tobacco products and spirits into the European Union in cargo transported by road.

- h) Some parts of the operation were funded by OLAF: These included, e.g., travel expenses for the participants in the briefing and debriefing, as well as the representatives sent to the P-OCU. Other costs were met by the participating states out of their own budgets.
- i) There were nine cases in which JCO Warehouse led to the seizure of excise goods in the European Union. The intelligence about trading flows gained from the operation, and the *modi operandi* observed where tax and duty exemption regimes were being manipulated will be incorporated into future risk assessments.
- j) This question is not relevant to JCO Warehouse.
- k) A proposal to this effect was made by the then Irish Council Presidency in the CCWP expert group and put to the Member States for them to discuss and vote on. Together with other Member States, Germany argued against such a structure. Ultimately, significant doubts remained concerning the added value of the proposal, so the matter was not pursued any further.

JPO PERKUNAS

In the second six months of 2013, Joint Police Operation (JPO) PERKUNAS took place at the EU level from 31 September 2013 to 13 October 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware. The aim of JPO PERKUNAS was to obtain information on illegal migration within the Schengen area, including migration routes, *modi operandi*, nationalities, and the countries of origin and destination for illegal migration (for more information on this JPO, see: Council Doc. 16045/13).

- a) The Lithuanian European Council Presidency was responsible for the preparation, planning and organisation of JPO PERKUNAS.
- b) Authorities of the German Federal Government were not involved in the planning and organisation of JPO PERKUNAS (see the answer to question 3 a)).
- c) The German Federal Government has no information on this matter.
- d) As far as the German Federal Government is aware, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Germany were involved in the JPO.
- e) Reference is made to the answer to question 3 d). The German Federal Government does not have any further information on this matter.

- f) The Federal Police took part in JPO PERKUNAS as part of the general, day-to-day performance of its duties, so no concrete information can be given on the resources deployed.
- g) The German Federal Government has no information on this matter.
- h) Operation PERKUNAS was conducted in Germany with Federal Police personnel and equipment (see the answer to question 3 f)).
- i) According to the final report (Council Doc. 16045/13), a total of 10,459 unauthorised residents from 143 states were identified in the course of JPO PERKUNAS, 1,606 of them in Germany. In addition to this, 577 irregular migrants using false travel documents or involved in imposture cases were intercepted during the operation.
- j) This question is not relevant to JPO PERKUNAS.
- k) The German Federal Government has no information on this matter.

Question 4:

What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security' (COSI) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*

j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

In the second six months of 2013, three meetings of the Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI) were held at the offices of the Council of the European Union in Brussels on 17 September, 21 November and 17 December.

b)

The preparation of these meetings is incumbent upon the country that currently holds the Presidency.

c) and d)

The agenda was distributed in advance. Reference is made to Council Docs. 13485/1/13, 5216/1/13 and 17562/13.

e)

Germany had no influence on the agenda.

f)

The participants are usually staff from the ministries of the Member States. A delegate from the German Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI), the head of Directorate ÖS I – Police Affairs, and a delegate from the Länder (to date Lower Saxony) have attended the meetings regularly on behalf of Germany.

g) to i)

The German Bundestag has been informed about the subject matter of the discussions in various cable reports (nos.: 4168, 4169, 5571, 5572, 6280, 6309 and 6308).

5. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'International Specialist Law Enforcement' (ISLE) project took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*

b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*

c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*

d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*

- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

A meeting of the International Specialist Law Enforcement (ISLE) project took place at Europol in The Hague from 23 to 25 October 2013.

b)

The meeting was prepared by the German Federal Criminal Police Office together with Europol. The Federal Criminal Police Office was responsible for the agenda and jointly responsible for organising the meeting with Europol.

c)

The agenda was sent out in advance of the meeting.

d)

The agenda included organisational information about the meeting and the following items:

- Future development of international cooperation in the ISLE field
- Discussion about the possibilities of the Europol Platform for Experts (EPE)
- Workshops on the use of the Europol Platform for Experts (EPE)

e)

With regard to this matter, reference is made to the answer to question 5 b).

f)

Apart from delegates from the Federal Criminal Police Office, staff from mobile task forces in eleven other EU Member States and one (EU) associated state attended the gathering.

g)

The discussions were focussed on the future development of ISLE cooperation and the use of the Europol Platform for Experts (EPE).

h)

Representatives of the German Federal Criminal Police Office organised and chaired the event.

i) to j)

Apart from the use of the Europol Platform for Experts (EPE) referred to above, agreement was reached to expand international technical ISLE cooperation and encourage other agencies in EU Member States to join in this cooperation.

6. *What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'European Cooperation Group on Undercover Activities' (ECG) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?*

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

The 2nd Undercover in Internet workshop took place from 5 to 8 November 2013 in Opatija, Croatia.

b)

The invitations and the agenda were prepared and sent out by Germany (Customs Criminological Office, which chairs the ECG). The workshop was organised by Croatia.

c)

The invitation and the agenda were distributed in advance of the workshop.

d) and e)

For reasons of secrecy, it is not possible for the German Federal Government to respond to these questions in the part of the answer to the minor interpellation that may be consulted by the public. The German Federal Government's answers to these questions must be categorised as 'CLASSIFIED MATERIAL – CONFIDENTIAL'. This part of the answer may be consulted at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag. With regard to the reasons for this, reference is made to the answer to question 4 of the minor interpellation published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

f)

Delegates from the competent national authorities of the following states attended the meeting:

- Austria (Federal Criminal Police Office Vienna)
- Belgium (Federal Police)
- Croatia (Criminal Police Directorate)
- Denmark (Danish National Police)
- Estonia (Central Criminal Police)
- Finland (National Bureau of Investigation)
- France (Central Directorate of Criminal Investigation Department)
- Germany (Customs Criminological Office, Federal Criminal Police Office)
- Latvia (Criminal Police Department)
- Lithuania (Criminal Police Bureau)
- Netherlands (National Police Agency)
- Norway (Oslo Police Department)
- Serbia (Criminal Police Directorate)
- Slovenia (Police/General Police Directorate)
- Spain (Spanish National Police)
- Switzerland (Federal Criminal Police)
- Turkey (National Police)
- United Kingdom (Metropolitan Police)

g) to j)

For reasons of secrecy, it is not possible for the German Federal Government to respond to these questions in the part of the answer to the minor interpellation that may be consulted by the public. The German Federal Government's answers to these questions must be categorised as 'CLASSIFIED MATERIAL – CONFIDENTIAL'. This part of the answer may be consulted at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag. With regard to the reasons for this, reference is made to the answer to question 4 of the minor interpellation published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

7. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'International Working Group on Undercover Policing' (IWG) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

The 44th meeting of the International Working Group on Police Undercover Activities (IWG) was held in Saanenmöser, Switzerland from 22 to 25 October 2013.

b)

The invitation and the agenda were prepared and sent out by Switzerland. The meeting was also organised by Switzerland.

c)

The invitation and the agenda were distributed in advance.

d) and e)

For reasons of secrecy, it is not possible for the German Federal Government to respond to these questions in the part of the answer to the minor interpellation that may be consulted by the public. The German Federal Government's answers to these questions must be categorised as 'CLASSIFIED MATERIAL – CONFIDENTIAL'. This part of the answer may be consulted at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag. With regard to the reasons for this, reference is made to the answer to question 4 of the minor interpellation published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

f)

Delegates from the competent national authorities of the following states attended the meeting:

- Australia (Australian Federal Police)
- Austria (Federal Criminal Police Office Vienna)
- Belgium (Federal Police)
- Canada (Royal Canadian Mounted Police)
- Czech Republic (Czech National Police)
- Denmark (Danish Security and Intelligence Service)
- Finland (National Bureau of Investigation)
- France (Central Directorate of Criminal Investigation Department)
- Germany (Federal Criminal Police Office, Customs Criminological Office)
- Hungary (Hungarian National Police)
- Italy (Carabinieri)
- Lithuania (Lithuanian Criminal Police Bureau)
- Netherlands (National Police Agency)
- New Zealand (New Zealand Police)
- Norway (Oslo Police Department)
- Poland (Central Bureau of Investigation)
- Portugal (Judicial Police)
- Slovenia (Criminal Police Directorate)

- South Africa (South African Police Service)
- Spain (Spanish National Police)
- Sweden (National Bureau of Investigation)
- Switzerland (Federal Criminal Police)
- United Kingdom (Metropolitan Police, Serious and Organized Crime Agency)
- USA (Federal Bureau of Investigation)

g) to i)

For reasons of secrecy, it is not possible for the German Federal Government to respond to these questions in the part of the answer to the minor interpellation that may be consulted by the public. The German Federal Government's answers to these questions must be categorised as 'CLASSIFIED MATERIAL – CONFIDENTIAL'. This part of the answer may be consulted at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag. With regard to the reasons for this, reference is made to the answer to question 4 of the minor interpellation published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

8. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the IWG's 'International Business Secretariat' (IBS) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*

- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 8

No meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the IBS took place in the second six months of 2013.

9. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Cross-Border Surveillance Working Group' (CSW) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

A meeting of the Steering Committee Group took place in Paris, France from 8 to 9 October 2013, and a meeting of all the Member States at Europol in The Hague, Netherlands from 16 to 18 December 2013.

b)

The Steering Committee Group drew up the agendas for both meetings. The meeting in Paris was organised by the French police, the meeting in The Hague was organised by Europol.

c)

The agendas and organisational information were sent out to the participants in advance of both meetings.

d)

An EU project that would provide financial support for the CSW and the concluded process by which new Member States had joined the CSW were discussed at both meetings.

In addition to this, the agenda for the meeting in The Hague featured the following items:

- Presentation on the organisation of the police in the Netherlands and Belgium, and dialogue on the various Member States' experience of cross-border cooperation
- Current state of play with regard to the options offered by the interoperability of technical equipment
- Account of, and experience in, the use of automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) systems
- Discussion of differences between the training structures of the observation units in the various participating countries and account of the various legal foundations for the exercise of special rights during observation operations in the different Member States
- Account of the results of the exchange programme for police officers that had been conducted among the CSW Member States.

e)

The Federal Criminal Police Office made contributions to the drafting of the two agendas as a member of the Steering Committee Group. At the same time, the topics proposed by the participating states were taken into account when the agenda was being prepared by the Steering Committee Group.

f)

Delegates from Germany (Federal Criminal Police Office), the United Kingdom, France and Europol attended the meeting of the Steering Committee Group. Delegates from mobile task forces or comparable units in Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Denmark, Austria, Italy, Finland, Ireland,

Luxembourg, Sweden, Norway and Germany (Federal Criminal Police Office) met at the full meeting in The Hague. In addition to this, one delegate from Europol attended the event.

g)

The open-minded discussions dealt with the exchange of 'best practices' in relation to the agenda items mentioned above.

h)

The Federal Criminal Police Office contributed a paper on the conduct of the exchange programme.

i) to j)

No concrete agreements were concluded. The meetings served the exchange of experience between the various mobile task forces of the EU Member States and the optimisation of cooperation on cross-border observation operations that is associated with dialogue of this kind.

10. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Remote Forensic Software User Group' (or, following its possible disbandment, similar groups) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*

- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 10

As far as the German Federal Government is aware, no meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the Remote Forensic Software User Group took place in the second six months of 2013.

11. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings on 'Euroanarchism', animal rights activism, resistance to major projects or similar forms of protest (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/9756) took place and were attended by authorities of the German Federal Government in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*
- k) *What further 'exchanges of information' or 'ad-hoc discussions' did authorities of the German Federal Government conduct on 'Euroanarchism' with which authorities of which countries in the second six months of 2013 (please list as in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/9756)?*

Re 11

The German Federal Government has no information about meetings, conference calls or other gatherings on Euroanarchism, animal rights activism, No Border campaigns or similar forms of protest in the second six months of 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/9756).

12. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the EU 'Expert Meeting Against Right Wing Extremism' (EMRE) project took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 12

The German Federal Government has no information about meetings, conference calls or other gatherings held by the EU Expert Meeting Against Right Wing Extremism (EMRE) project in the second six months of 2013.

13. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings were held by 'Focal Point' DOLPHIN in connection with the Counterterrorism (CT) 'Analysis Work File' at Europol in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*
- k) *How many entries (absolute number) were transmitted to DOLPHIN by German authorities in the second six months of 2013?*
- l) *How many entries (absolute number) were retrieved from DOLPHIN by German authorities in the second six months of 2013?*

a)

An Operational Meeting on the funding of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) was held by Focal Point DOLPHIN at Europol in The Hague on 23 October 2013.

b)

The agenda was prepared and drafted by Europol.

c)

Information on PKK funding was provided by the Federal Criminal Police Office in the form of a paper on the situation.

d)

The agenda included consultations on and a comparison of the information about PKK funding available in the EU.

e)

The meeting was held at the initiative of the Federal Criminal Police Office and was therefore crucially influenced by the BKA.

f)

Apart from representatives of the Federal Criminal Police Office, delegates from police forces in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, and Europol attended the meeting.

(g)

The event contributed above all to the discussions, and reciprocal exchanges of experience, on the underlying situation and current developments with regard to the PKK's funding in the participating states.

h)

The Federal Criminal Police Office gave papers on 'basic information about the PKK' and the 'state of play' (situation report for Germany).

i)

Agreement was reached on the establishment of a Target Group within Focal Point DOLPHIN and the drafting of Terms of Reference (ToR) with the aim of gathering and evaluating intelligence about the PKK's funding.

j)

The meeting was not an informal 'exchange of ideas'. The German Federal Government makes reference to the answer to question 13 a).

k)

54 entries were transmitted to Focal Point DOLPHIN in the second six months of 2013.

l)

It is not possible for the German Federal Government to carry out a statistical evaluation of the entries.

14. How have the quantity and quality of data supplied by German authorities to Europol developed over the last two years?

- a) How many entries (objects and 'person' entities) did the 'Europol Information System' (EIS) contain in the first six months of 2013, how do these entries break down by areas of crime, who input which data, how many entries have been deleted by which Member States, and which Member States have conducted how many searches (if the data for the second six months of 2013 are still not available, please give the most recent possible figures)?*

b) *Which countries now use 'data loaders' for the Europol information systems?*

Re 14.

According to Europol's most recent statistical survey (30 September 2013), the German dataset has become smaller over the last two years with 36,047 inserted data entries. In September 2011, the German dataset consisted of 62,005 inserted data entries in the EIS.

a)

The dataset of objects and 'person' entities in the EIS includes a total of 232,961 (30 September 2013). The data input into the EIS are categorised in accordance with the different areas of Europol's mandate and can be broken down as follows: drug trafficking (28%), forgery of money (10%), robbery (18%), trafficking in human beings (11%), and fraud and swindling (7%). Germany is one of the EIS's main users. No information is available on the ways the system is used and the kinds of searches carried out by other EU Member States. The German Federal Government is not aware of detailed, up-to-date, concrete statistics on the deletion of data from the EIS. In the third quarter of 2013, Germany carried out a total of 10,968 searches in the EIS.

b)

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, apart from Germany, 13 other Member States (the Netherlands, Denmark, Spain, Belgium, Sweden, France, Italy, Portugal, Slovakia, Poland, the United Kingdom, Lithuania and Finland) are now using what are known as 'data loaders' to transmit information from their own national datasets to the EIS.

15. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Southeast European Law Enforcement Center' (SELEC) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*

- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 15.

a)

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, the 7th SELEC Council Meeting took place on 14 November 2013 at the SELEC headquarters in Bucharest, Romania.

b)

The meeting was prepared by SELEC.

c)

The preliminary agenda and various registration forms were forwarded by SELEC in preparation for the meeting.

d)

The preliminary agenda items forwarded with the invitation are listed below. The German Federal Government has no information about the finalised agenda items.

- Approval of the Minutes of the 6th Council Meeting
- Approval of the draft Agenda of the 7th Council Meeting
- Briefing on the SELEC activity
- Presentation and approval of the Annual Action Plan for 2014
- Issues related with the Observers and Operational Partners of SELEC
- Presentation and approval of the Operational Rules and Procedures of SELEC
- Presentation and approval of the Internship Rules of SELEC
- Tour de table regarding the ratification process of Protocol on Privileges and Immunities of SELEC
- Take over of Chairmanship
- Closing remarks

- Issues for the next Council meeting

e) to j)

Since it did not attend the event, the German Federal Government does not have any relevant information.

16. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Police Equal Performance' (PEP) platform for police forces from South Eastern Europe took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*
- k) What 'deficiencies in police work' have been identified and analysed so far in the PEP project?*
- l) To what extent have the areas of crime covered by the PEP project now been specified?*

Re 16

The German Federal Government has no information about any meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the Police Equal Performance (PEP) platform for police forces from South Eastern Europe in the second six months of 2013.

17. What 'EU Twinning projects' were arranged in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware, which countries are entrusted with leading them ('forerunners') or performing secretariat functions, and what changes occurred in this respect compared to the previous six months?

Re 17

Preliminary remarks:

As the German Federal Government understands question 17, it is asking about the number of EU policing and customs Twinning projects with German participation approved under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA).

Answer

No EU police and customs Twinning projects with German participation were approved under the IPA in the second six months of 2013. By contrast, Germany had received approval for the Twinning project 'KS 12 IB JH 01 - Strengthening criminal investigation capacities against organised crime and corruption in Kosovo' on 22 April 2013. This project will be conducted on behalf of the Member States by Germany (Brandenburg Ministry of the Interior) in the lead role with Hungary and Lithuania as junior partners.

18. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation' (BSRBCC) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*

- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 18.

The following meetings and seminars were held by the Baltic Sea Region Border Control Cooperation (BSRBCC) in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware:

- Seminar for aviation experts
- Seminar on annual threat assessment
- Baltic Border Committee Meeting
- Seminar on cooperation in training and education
- Seminar on vehicle related crime
- Seminar on aircraft coordinator
- Search and Rescue 'on scene coordinator' course
- Seminar on implementing 'Automatic Border Control Systems'
- Heads Conference

Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government of 7 January 2014 to question 24 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/254).

a)

Three of the events took place in Germany and one in Latvia. The other meetings were held in Finland.

b)

As the country that held the BSRBCC Presidency in 2013, Finland prepared and organised all the events that took place in Finland. The events in Germany and Latvia were prepared and organised by the German Federal Police.

c) and d)

Invitations and agendas were sent out in advance of the meetings. The agendas for each of the events listed were based on their subject matter. In particular, the discussions concentrated on recurring topics such as annual reports or the strategic focus of subsequent presidencies and which countries were to hold them.

Furthermore, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government of 7 January 2014 to question 24 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/254).

e)

The Federal Police drew up the agendas for the events held in Germany and Latvia, and consulted on them with the participants.

f)

Delegates from the authorities of the states around the Baltic Sea concerned with border policing functions attended each of the gatherings. Furthermore, representatives of the Netherlands and the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (FRONTEX) took part in individual events that were relevant to their concerns.

g)

The discussions of the agenda items were focussed on the BSRBCC's operational plans and the conceptual further development of its organisational structure. Moreover, ideas about cooperation in the field of continuing professional development and the progress made in introducing automated border management systems were discussed. Further to this, reference is made to the answer to questions 18 c) and d), and the answer of the German Federal Government of 7 January 2014 to question 24 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/254).

h)

The contributions made by the German delegates were intended to constructively support the 2013 Finnish BSRBCC Presidency's operational and conceptual plans, and further develop the BSRBCC's organisational structure in the European context. In addition to this, the German delegates also presented their own proposals, which were aimed at promoting cross-border cooperation on crimefighting, continuing professional development and technology.

i) and j)

Agreement was reached on recommendations for action in the various fields of cross-border cooperation, the scale and intensity of each country's national participation in operational measures, the approval of the action plan for the Estonian BSRBCC Presidency in 2014, which countries were to hold the subsequent BSRBCC Presidencies in 2015-2016 and the adoption of the BSRBCC Guidelines.

19. *What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of working parties on a 'Common Pre-Frontier Intelligence Picture' (CPIP) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?*

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 19.

The Common Pre-Frontier Intelligence Picture provided for in Article 11 of the EUROSUR Regulation is not of priority significance for the current implementation of the EUROSUR Regulation.

Further to this, reference is made to the answers of the German Federal Government of 7 January 2014 to questions 51, 52, 53 and 55 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/254) and the answer of the German Federal Government of 20 September 2011 to question 21 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/7018). The German Federal Government has no further information on this matter.

20. *With which 'third states' or institutions is the EU law enforcement agency Europol currently cooperating under strategic, operational or other cooperation agreements?*

- a) *To which 'third states' has Europol posted liaison officers?*
- b) *With which 'third states' or institutions were cooperation agreements concluded in the second six months of 2013?*
- c) *What concrete subjects are covered by the agreements concluded?*
- d) *Which agreements failed to gain the approval of the Europol Management Board or another body of the agency, and what were the reasons for this?*

Re 20.

An up-to-date list of third states and agencies with which Europol has concluded cooperation agreements can be viewed at the Internet site www.europol.europa.eu.

a)

Europol has posted liaison officers to Interpol in Lyon, France and to Washington DC, USA.

b)

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, an operational agreement was concluded between Europol and Albania on 9 December 2013, and another between Europol and Serbia on 16 January 2014, but both still require ratification by Albania and Serbia if they are to enter into force.

Furthermore, according to the information available to the German Federal Government, a strategic agreement between Europol and the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market has been signed and ratified, and entered into force on 4 November 2013.

c)

The agreements concluded can be viewed at www.europol.europa.eu or www.consilium.europa.eu.

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, the conclusion of an operational agreement allows the exchange of personal data between Europol and third states/agencies. Furthermore, it includes provisions on the establishment of a liaison office at Europol.

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, it is generally the case that the conclusion of a strategic agreement merely allows the exchange of technical and strategic information (e.g. new *modi operandi*, trends, situation reports, new investigation techniques, forensic and analytical methods) – but not the exchange of personal data.

d)

According to the information available to the German Federal Government, no cooperation agreements with third states and agencies were concluded in the second six months of 2013 for which the Europol Management Board or another body of the agency failed to give their approval.

21. As far as the German Federal Government is aware, how many people currently work in which areas of activity for the 'EU Intelligence Analysis Centre' (EU INTCEN) and the 'European Union Military Staff Intelligence Directorate' (EUMS INT)?

- a) Which federal authorities have posted how many staff members from which directorates-general to these units for this purpose, and how many have assumed equivalent functions within their own authorities?*
- b) What situation reports were drawn up by INTCEN and EUMS INT in the second six months of 2013, and how did authorities of the German Federal Government contribute to them?*

Re 21.

As far as the German Federal Government is aware, INTCEN has approx. 75 staff at present. As far as the German Federal Government is aware, the EUMS INT Directorate currently employs approx. 40 people; it is divided into three divisions, 'Intelligence Policy', 'Intelligence Support' and 'Information Production'. (Cf. the answer of the German Federal Government to question 3 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Members of the German Bundestag Andrej Hunko, Christine Buchholz *et al.* and the Left Party parliamentary group of 9 December 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/146)).

a)

Germany is currently represented with a total of four staff in the units in question (INTCEN: one staff member from the Federal Intelligence Service and one from the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution; EUMS INT: two staff from the Bundeswehr).

b)

No comprehensive statistical survey of the INTCEN and EUMS INT reports and briefings forwarded to Germany has been carried out by the German Federal Government. Further to this, reference is made to the answers of the German Federal Government to questions 2 and 22 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Members of the German Bundestag Andrej Hunko, Christine Buchholz *et al.* and the Left Party parliamentary group of 9 December 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/146).

22. What new bilateral or multilateral agreements in the field of justice and home affairs have which authorities of the German Federal Government negotiated or successfully concluded with the governments of which countries in the second six months of 2013, and what negotiations were concluded unsuccessfully, suspended or delayed (please state reasons)?

Re 22.

No negotiations on bilateral or multilateral agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries in the field of justice and home affairs were concluded or initiated in the second six months of 2013. No such negotiations were suspended or delayed either. Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government of 1 August 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474) to question 19 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132) and the answer of the German Federal Government of 21 February 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/12427) to question 13 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/12141).

23. What new bilateral or multilateral agreements in the field of justice and home affairs did which German Länder conclude with governments of which countries with the participation or under the responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief of the Public Order Support Forces of the Länder (IBPdL) in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware, and what negotiations were concluded unsuccessfully, suspended or postponed (please give reasons)?

Re 23.

As far as the German Federal Government is aware, no new bilateral or multilateral agreements were negotiated or concluded by the Länder with the participation or under the responsibility of the Commander-in-Chief of the Public Order Support Forces of the Länder (IBP) in the second six months of 2013.

24. What new bilateral or multilateral agreements in the field of justice and home affairs did which agencies of the European Union negotiate or successfully conclude with the governments of which countries in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware (please state reasons)?

Re 24.

With regard to Europol, reference is made to the answer to question 20. Furthermore, the Justice and Home Affairs Council of 5/6 December 2013 adopted a decision on the signing of the agreement between Canada and the European Union on the transfer and processing of Passenger Name Records (PNR), and asked the European Parliament to give its consent to a Council decision on the conclusion of the agreement. Otherwise, no new bilateral or multilateral agreements were negotiated or concluded by agencies of the European Union with other countries in the field of justice and home affairs in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware. Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government of 1 August 2013 (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474) to question 20 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132).

25. What 'Police and Customs Cooperation Centres' (PCCC) currently exist within the EU as far as the German Federal Government is aware, and what other centres are being established?

Re 25.

A Police and Customs Cooperation Centre (PCCC) is a support structure for the exchange of information that backs up the activities of the operational agencies charged with performing policing, border management and customs functions in a border area. In practice, however, this term is not used consistently throughout the EU.

The German Federal Government is aware of the facilities included in the following list within the EU, which are described as PCCCs, liaison points or contact points. Joint centres, i.e. facilities at which the Federal Republic of Germany is represented by staff of the Federal Police, Land police forces and German customs authorities are marked in bold. By contrast, the German Federal Government is not aware of any further, specific PCCCs that are being established within the EU.

1. Artand (Hungary - Romania)
2. Barwinek (Poland - Slovakia)
3. Basel (Switzerland - Germany - France), liaison office
4. Budzisko (Lithuania - Poland)
5. Canfranc (France - Spain)
6. Castro Marim (Portugal - Spain)
7. Caya (Portugal - Spain)

8. Chiasso (Switzerland - Italy)
9. Chotebuz (Czech Republic - Poland)
10. Cunovo (Hungary - Slovakia)
11. Damoty (Hungary - Slovakia)
12. Dolga Vas (Slovenia - Austria - Hungary)
13. Drasenhofen (Czech Republic - Austria)
14. Galati (Romania - Moldova - Ukraine)
15. Geneva (Switzerland - France)
16. Giurgiu (Romania - Bulgaria)
17. Goch (Germany - Netherlands), joint liaison point
18. Heerlen (Germany - Netherlands - Belgium), Euregional Police Information Cooperation Centre
19. Hendaye (France - Spain)
20. Hodonin/Holic (Czech Republic - Slovakia)
21. Jarovce/Kittsee (Slovakia - Austria)
22. Kalviu (Lithuania - Latvia)
23. Kehl (Germany - France)
24. Kiszombor/Cenad (Hungary - Romania)
25. Kudowa (Czech Republic - Austria)
26. Luxembourg (Germany - Luxembourg - Belgium - France)
27. Melles Pont du Roy (France - Spain)
28. Modane (France - Italy)
29. Mohacs (Hungary - Croatia)
30. Nickelsdorf (Austria - Hungary)
31. Padborg (Germany - Denmark)
32. Perthus (France - Spain)
33. Petrovice/Schwandorf (Germany - Czech Republic)
34. Porubne (Romania - Ukraine)
35. Promachonas (Greece - Bulgaria)
36. Quintanilha (Spain - Portugal)
37. Satoraljaujhely (Hungary - Slovakia)
38. Schaanwald (Austria - Liechtenstein - Switzerland)
39. Swiecko (Germany - Poland)
40. Thörl-Maglern (Austria - Italy - Slovenia)
41. Tournai (Belgium - France)

- 42. Trstena (Poland - Slovakia)
- 43. Tuy (Spain - Portugal)
- 44. Ventimiglia (France - Italy)
- 45. Vilar Formosa (Spain - Portugal)

26. *What efforts are European [Union] organisations making as far as the German Federal Government is aware to implement further measures such as the previous 'European Police Force Training' (EUPST) exercises, the 'European Union Police Services Training' (EUPST) project or the 'Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis Management' (ENTRI) programme?*

- a) *Where were or are exercises, conferences and seminars of this kind or other forms of training held?*
- b) *What content are the events in question intended to deliver?*
- c) *Who prepares these events, and is responsible for their planning and organisation?*
- d) *To what extent have authorities of the German Federal Government been involved in the planning and organisation of these operations?*
- e) *What role have European Council working parties assumed in the preparation of these events?*
- f) *Which authorities of which countries, organisations or individuals from the European Union or other institutions take part in or observe these events?*
- g) *Which authorities or other organisations of the German Federation or (as far as the German Federal Government is aware) the Länder contribute what capacities to these events or observe them?*
- h) *How were and are the measures funded?*

Re 26.

Reference is made to the answers of the German Federal Government of 21 February 2013 to questions 17 a) to 17 h) published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/12427.

27. *To what extent is it still intended that the 'Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security' (COSI) should deliberate to a greater extent on 'counterterrorism' in future, for which purpose it may regularly receive situation reports from the Intelligence Analysis Centre (INTCEN), and what is now the German Federal Government's attitude towards this issue?*

Re 27.

Reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government to question 31 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group on European Union secret services and the involvement of Federal authorities (Bundestag Printed Paper 18/146).

28. What 'representatives of EU partner services' were invited by the Federal Intelligence Service to an 'initial discussion' to work on the 'development of common standards for cooperation between foreign intelligence services of the EU Member States' (Printed Paper 18/159)?

- a) When and where were the meeting, further follow-up meetings, conference calls or other gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared these gatherings, and was responsible for their agendas and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed in advance, or on the day, of meetings, conference calls or other gatherings for this purpose?*
- d) What concrete items were placed on the agendas for these gatherings?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence the agendas for these gatherings?*
- f) What authorities, other institutions or individuals from which countries (including Germany) took part in these gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were covered by the discussions of the agenda items and other business (please give a rough outline)?*
- h) What contributions were made by delegates from German authorities, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results did these gatherings achieve?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 28.

In the summer of 2013, the German Federal Chancellor announced measures to improve the protection of citizens' privacy, including the agreement of common intelligence standards for the EU Member States' foreign intelligence services. The Federal Intelligence Service has been tasked with drawing up a proposal to achieve this and reaching agreement on it with Germany's European partners. The Federal Intelligence Service has commenced talks on this matter with its EU partner services. This is an

ongoing process that is being taken ahead in talks characterised by an atmosphere of trust.

The constitutionally guaranteed right of the German Bundestag to put questions to, and obtain information from, the German Federal Government is limited by interests deserving of protection that also enjoy constitutional rank, as well as the public good. This minor interpellation addresses aspects of the relationships between the Federal Intelligence Service and foreign intelligence services that touch upon the public good and are therefore not to be discussed in an answer intended for publication. If substantiated answers were given to these questions, details of the Federal Intelligence Service's international cooperative activities would be published that would be likely to cause irreparable damage to its current relationships with its partner services. The details of the talks, which are being conducted in a positive atmosphere founded on mutual trust, and the partner services that are taking part in them are therefore subject to confidentiality. In view of the significance of the issues to be negotiated on, both nationally and across the whole of the EU, nothing can be done that would affect their confidentiality. This may be the first time it proves possible to agree supranational standards for the intelligence services' future activities. The fundamental significance of the issue gives reason to minimise any risks that would endanger the talks' success. Any breach of the confidentiality that is a prerequisite for such success would endanger the continuation of the ongoing talks to a significant degree. At the same time, the international standing of the Federal Intelligence Service would be adversely affected too. The reliability of the Federal Intelligence Service as a negotiating partner, as well as in circumstances that go beyond this context would be called into question. There would be reason to fear negative consequent effects, in particular on other intelligence services' willingness to enter into cooperative activities with the Federal Intelligence Service. However, the exchange of information with other intelligence services is an irreplaceable source for the gathering of information by the intelligence services. Any decrease in the amount of information that comes from this sector would impair the Federal Intelligence Service's ability to analyse the security situation.

A security classification and the deposition of the information requested at the Document Security Office of the German Bundestag would not do sufficient justice to its explosive implications concerning the significance of international intelligence cooperation. The question about the services that have attended the gatherings in question touches on interests of other foreign public agencies that need to be protected.

If this information were to be disclosed, there would be a danger that inferences could be drawn about the positions and interests of other intelligence services. This too could

endanger the successful continuation of the talks. Furthermore, since the negotiations have still not been concluded, and consultation and discussion processes on this matter are continuing, the central core of executive responsibility places limits on the parliamentary entitlement to obtain information.

As will be apparent from the remarks made above, the interests in confidentiality touched upon by the information requested require such a degree of protection that, in particular, the public good outweighs the parliamentary right to information. To this extent, the right of Members of the German Bundestag to put questions must exceptionally cede to the interests of confidentiality.

29. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) took place in the second six months of 2013 and were attended by which authorities of the German Federal Government as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*
- k) To what extent did the German Federal Government contribute to the work done within the UNODC 'Working Group on Countering the Use of the Internet for Terrorist Purposes' or receive reports from the Working Group in*

the second six months of 2013, and what details can it give of such activities or reports?

- l) To what extent did the German Federal Government contribute to the work done within the 'UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch' or receive reports from this unit in the second six months of 2013, and what details can it give of such activities or reports?*
- m) To what extent did the German Federal Government contribute to the work done within the UNODC 'Counter Terrorism Implementation Task Force' (CTITF) or receive reports from the Task Force in the second six months of 2013, and what details can it give of such activities or reports?*
- n) To what extent did the German Federal Government contribute to the work done within the UNODC 'Open-ended intergovernmental expert group' or receive reports from the group in the second six months of 2013, and what details can it give of such activities or reports?*

Re 29.

a) to j)

Essentially, the German Federal Government maintains contact with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), which is headquartered at Vienna, in the connection with its commitments to UNODC projects and at specialist conferences. To this end, regular contacts are cultivated at the working level by the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Office of the United Nations and to other International Organisations in Vienna, and the Federal Foreign Office. The UNODC engages in dialogue with its member states, including the Federal Republic of Germany, at meetings of its working groups and events on the organisation's key concerns (preventing and combatting drugs trafficking and crime, combatting terrorism and corruption). The invitations to these events are usually issued by the UNODC, which also proposes the agendas. The meetings take place regularly in Vienna. No conference calls were held with the UNODC in the second six months of 2013. The UNODC reports directly to the Secretariat of the United Nations and regards itself as a leading global institution in the fight against illegal drugs and international crime. In 2013, Germany was the seventh-largest contributor to the UNODC. The focus of its project commitments is on financial grants to the UNODC to fund the drafting and implementation of binding international conventions in the fields of crime prevention and counterterrorism, as well as work to ensure compliance with, and the implementation of, international drugs conventions. In November 2013, a team from the division that administers project funds at the Federal Foreign Office

conducted talks in Vienna on the configuration of project cooperation with the UNODC. On this occasion, the German Federal Government's current commitments to UNODC projects were discussed and possible cooperative projects for 2014 looked at as well. The talks also dealt with the thematic and regional priorities for project cooperation. Further to this, reference is made to the answer to question 26 of the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474 of 1 August 2013. In addition to this, there have been working contacts with the UNODC in the course of the following events:

Conference on the 'Global Initiative on ensuring effective counter-terrorism investigations and prosecutions while respecting human rights and the rule of law'

a) and b)

On 2 and 3 October 2013, delegates from the Federal Criminal Police Office and the Public Prosecutor General of the German Federal Court of Justice attended a conference in Geneva prepared and organised by the UNODC and the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) on the 'Global Initiative on ensuring effective counterterrorism investigations and prosecutions while respecting human rights and the rule of law'. The UNODC and the CTED were also responsible for the agenda.

c)

An invitation and an agenda with supplementary information on the initiative were forwarded to participants in advance.

d)

The agenda featured the following items: 'Opening remarks', 'Presentation of the joint UNODC/CTED "Global Initiative on ensuring effective counter-terrorism investigations and prosecutions while respecting human rights and the rule of law"', 'The investigation and prosecution of preventive criminal offences', 'The investigation and prosecution of financing of terrorism through illicit activities, including kidnapping for ransom', 'The use of special investigative techniques', 'Enhancing coordination among investigators and prosecutors', 'Challenges in conducting cross-border investigations: requests for mutual legal assistance and extradition', 'Regional implementation of the joint initiative in the Maghreb', 'The way forward: strengthening capacities of investigators and prosecutors' and 'Concluding remarks'.

e)

Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agenda.

f)

Reference is made to the answer to questions a) and b).

g)

Papers were given on the background to, and goals of, the conference, which were drawn on to discuss the topics mentioned in the answers to question d).

h)

Contributions were made on the 'Structure of and Experience with the German Joint Counter-Terrorism Centre (GTAZ)'.

i) and j)

The focus of the conference lay on the exchange of information between the participants on the items placed on the agenda. No agreements or arrangements were concluded.

National Workshop on the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of terrorist related offences based on the Digest of terrorist cases

a) and b)

A delegate from the Public Prosecutor General of the German Federal Court of Justice attended a workshop 'on the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of terrorist related offences based on the Digest of terrorist cases' prepared and organised by the UNODC on Malta from 10 to 12 December 2013. The UNODC was also responsible for the agenda.

c)

An invitation and an agenda with supplementary information were forwarded to participants in advance.

d)

The agenda featured the following items: 'Opening ceremony and welcoming speech', 'Presentation of the participants', 'The International Legal Framework against Terrorism', 'Overview of the national legal framework concerning the fight against terrorism in Libya', 'Prosecution of preventive criminal offences', 'Criminalization of preparatory acts committed directly in preparation of terrorist acts', 'Conducting complex investigations', 'The prevention and repression of the financing of terrorism', 'National experience and challenges in the prosecution and investigation of terrorism', 'Collaboration between investigators and prosecutors in terrorist cases', 'Challenges in the Investigation of terrorist acts', 'The Detention of Terrorist Suspects and Human Rights', 'International Cooperation in Criminal Matters and the Universal Legal Framework against Terrorism', 'International Cooperation in Criminal Matters: challenges and best practices', 'Mutual legal assistance and Extradition' and 'Conclusions and closing remarks'.

e)

Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agenda.

f)

Reference is made to the answer to questions a) and b).

g)

The workshop contributed to the training and continuing professional development of Libyan judges, public prosecutors and police officers in the field of criminal counterterrorism work.

h)

A paper on the 'Prosecution of preventive criminal offences (incitement and recruitment)' was given by the delegate from the Public Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice.

i) and j)

The focus of the workshop lay on continuing professional development and in-service training. Further-reaching arrangements or agreements were not concluded.

Expert Consultation on New Psychoactive Substances

a)

The Expert Consultation on New Psychoactive Substances took place in Vienna from 3 to 5 September 2013.

b)

The UNODC prepared and organised the conference, and set the agenda.

c)

The invitation, an agenda and a background paper were forwarded to participants in advance.

d)

The agenda was structured around four key topics: drug control systems, possible approaches to drugs control, legal options and international responses.

e)

Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agenda.

f)

Delegates of health and law enforcement authorities, and experts from the following states attended the Consultation: Austria, Belgium, China, Canada, Columbia, Egypt, France, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Poland, Romania, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the USA. In addition to this, various international bodies and organisations were present.

Delegates from the Federal Ministry of Health, the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the Office of the United Nations and to other International Organisations in Vienna and the Federal Criminal Police Office attended the conference on behalf of Germany. Furthermore, Interpol, the WCO and the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) were represented by German experts.

g)

Papers were given on the background to, and goals of, the Consultation, which were drawn on to discuss the topics mentioned in the answer to question 29 d).

h)

The contributions made by the German delegation related essentially to the European Early Warning System for psychoactive substances.

i-j)

No concrete recommendations on further action or measures were adopted during the Consultation. The Member States recognised that new psychoactive substances have now become established on drugs markets practically everywhere in the world and have developed into a phenomenon that gives cause for alarm.

k)

The German Federal Government neither contributed to the work done within the Working Group nor received any reports from it in the second six months of 2013.

l)

The German Federal Government neither contributed to the work done within the UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch nor received reports from it in the second six months of 2013.

m)

The mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) that was established in 2005 by the Secretariat of the United Nations provides for the coordination of counterterrorism efforts within the United Nations system. The UNODC is just one of the 31 organisations whose activities are coordinated by the CTITF. The Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations in New York is in regular contact with the CTITF at the working level. Reports are not drawn up by the CTITF itself.

n)

The German Federal Government contributes to the work done within various UNODC 'open-ended intergovernmental expert groups', as they are known. It is not

possible for this question to be answered unless particular expert groups are specified.

30. *What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Police Working Group on Terrorism' (PWGT) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/13440)?*

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 30

a)

A PWGT conference took place in Vienna, Austria on 28 and 29 November 2013.

b)

The conference was prepared and run by the Austrian Federal Ministry of the Interior/Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and Counterterrorism.

c)

Up-to-date situation reports from the PWGT member states were forwarded to the participants.

d)

Apart from an overview of developments in politically motivated crime in the PWGT member states since the spring 2013 conference, papers were given on 'travel movements of potential terrorists to Syria' and 'investigations in Germany against the National Socialist Underground (NSU)'.

e)

The German Federal Government and its authorities did not influence the agenda.

f)

Delegates from the agencies responsible for combatting politically motivated crime in the PWGT member states attended the conference. Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government to question 3 of the minor interpellation on European cooperation in the Police Working Group on Terrorism (Bundestag Printed Paper 17/13440).

g)

Apart from the contents of the papers and any questions that may have been asked about them, it is not possible to state the subjects discussed under the individual agenda items.

h)

The Federal Criminal Police Office gave papers on the preliminary proceedings against members and supporters of the National Socialist Underground (NSU), and the progress made in the search for a successor system to the PWGT communications network.

i)

No concrete arrangements were made during the conference.

j)

The most important aspects of the meeting are reflected in the topics chosen for the agenda. Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government to question 30d).

31. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'European Expert Network on Terrorism Issues' took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

a) Where was each of these gatherings held?

b) Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?

- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

a)

The EENeT Annual Conference was held at Cambridge, UK, from 25 to 27 September 2013.

b)

The Annual Conference was prepared in consensus by the EENeT Administrative Office at the Federal Criminal Police Office, the members of the EENeT Steering Committee, the organisers from RAND Europe on the ground in Cambridge and representatives of the Federal Agency for Civic Education (BPB), which supported the event financially this year.

The agenda was based on the contributions from EENeT members that were submitted to the EENeT Administrative Office in advance of the conference in response to a call for papers. All the topics proposed were taken up and were grouped into separate workshops on the following four major topics: 'Radicalisation – Deradicalisation', 'Methodical Approaches', 'Phenomenological Changes in Terrorism', and 'Extremism and Counter-Terrorism'.

c)

The programme and brief abstracts/introductions to the individual topics of the papers were made available to the participants in advance of the conference.

d)

Reference is made to the answer to question 31 b).

e)

The Federal Agency for Civic Education had asked for 'deradicalisation' to be adopted as a topic for the event.

f)

Experts from security authorities, universities and other organisations concerned with research into extremism in Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, and delegates from the European Union, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe and RAND Europe attended the conference.

g)

The Annual Conference was held under what are known as 'Chatham House Rules', which are intended to encourage the kind of informal dialogue that was desired. This means substantive statements made during the discussions were not subsequently reported outside the event.

h)

The Federal Agency for Civic Education gave a paper on 'Radicalisation – Deradicalisation', and the Federal Criminal Police Office contributed a paper entitled 'Right-wing Music in Germany'.

i)

No concrete agreements were concluded at the 2013 Annual Conference; rather, the central concern was informal dialogue at an academic, analytical level on issues raised by recent advances in research into extremism and terrorism.

However, reference is made to the fact that in September 2013 the Federal Criminal Police Office responded to an 'EU Call for Proposals' on 'Radicalisation' on behalf of EENeT and applied for EU grants under the ISEC programme to hold EENeT conferences, an application it made in its role as project leader in consultation with the EENeT Steering Committee and EENeT's members. A decision on the approval of EU funds still remains to be taken.

j)

The most important aspects of the meeting are reflected in the topics placed on the agenda. Further to this, reference is made to the answer of the German Federal Government to question 31 b).

32. *What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'Global Counterterrorism Forum' (GCTF) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?*

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 32.

a) to d)

The GCTF is organised with a Coordinating Committee as its strategic executive organ and five working groups. In the second six months of 2013, the fourth Coordinating Committee meeting was held at New York on 26/27 September 2013. Various events were held by the working groups in the second six months of 2013 – plenary meetings, workshops, seminars and conferences. An overview of the working groups and their events, including information on timings and venues, summary reports and key documents can be found on the Internet at <http://www.thegctf.org/web/guest/working-groups>. Plenary meetings are usually organised by the chair of the working group in question, while other events are usually organised by the states that issue the invitations, always in cooperation with the GCTF's 'Administrative Unit'. The chairs of the working groups or the host states

usually set the agendas as well. Germany does not chair any of the working groups and has not been a host state to date.

At the meetings of the GCTF Coordinating Committee, the German Federal Government is usually represented by the Federal Foreign Office and the Federal Ministry of the Interior, which consult closely in advance with the departments concerned at the policy level. The departments send delegates to meetings and events held by the individual working groups, depending on the subject matter to be addressed.

Conference calls are not a customary working method within the GCTF, and the German Federal Government did not take part in any conference calls in the second six months of 2013.

e)

The agendas for the meetings of the Coordinating Committee are agreed among the members of the GCTF. No agenda is yet available for the next meeting of the Coordinating Committee, which is expected to take place in April 2014. Further to this, reference is made to the answers to questions 32 to 32 d).

f) and g)

Reference is made to the answers to questions 32 to 32 d).

h)

The GCTF serves as a forum for the exchange of experience, expertise, strategies and capacity building for counterterrorism measures implemented with respect for the rule of law and human rights, and offers a platform for the coordination of national projects in this field. The delegates from German authorities adhere to this line at the GCTF's meetings and other gatherings.

i)

The members of the GCTF do not take any binding decisions, but deliver non-binding recommendations or develop non-binding 'good practices', which are implemented on a voluntary basis. Further to this, reference is made to the answers to questions 32 a) to 32 d).

j)

Reference is made to the answer to question 32 h).

33. What meetings, conference calls or other gatherings of the 'TC LI Group' of the 'European Telecommunications Standards Institute' (ETSI) took place in the second six months of 2013 as far as the German Federal Government is aware?

- a) *Where was each of these gatherings held?*
- b) *Who prepared each of the gatherings and was responsible for its agenda and organisation?*
- c) *What documents were distributed for this purpose in advance, or on the day, of each of the meetings, conference calls or other gatherings?*
- d) *What concrete items featured on each agenda?*
- e) *To what extent did authorities of the German Federal Government influence each agenda?*
- f) *Which authorities or other organisations or individuals from which countries (including Germany) attended each of the gatherings?*
- g) *What subjects were discussed under each of the agenda items and any other business?*
- h) *What contributions were made by representatives of German authorities at each gathering, and what was their content?*
- i) *What concrete arrangements, agreements or other results were achieved by each gathering?*
- j) *Where meetings primarily involved the informal 'exchange of ideas', what does the German Federal Government see as the central aspects of each gathering?*

Re 33

Two 'Rapporteur's Meetings' and a regular plenary meeting of the TC LI Group took place in the second six months of 2013.

a)

During the period to which the question refers, ETSI TC LI met in Amsterdam (Rap-29), Edinburgh, UK (Plenary 34) and Hamburg (Rap-30).

b)

The meetings were organised and prepared substantively by members of TC LI. Further to this, reference is made to the answer to minor interpellation 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

c)

The lists of the documents distributed for each meeting are contained in Annexes 1 to 3. Irrespective of this, the German Federal Government wishes to emphasise that the parliamentary right to ask questions does not grant any entitlement to obtain documents, and these documents are only forwarded in this case for labour-saving reasons.

d)

The agendas for each of the meetings are contained in Annexes 4 to 6. With regard to Annex 4, it is to be noted that, although it sets out the subjects due to be covered under the agenda in question, this document is not itself an official ETSI paper.

e)

Authorities of the German Federal Government had no influence on the agendas.

f)

Participants from the following authorities, organisations or companies were registered for the meetings mentioned in the answer to question 33 a).

ETSI TC LI Rap-29, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 28-30 August 2013

Organisation	Country
Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV)	Germany
North Rhine Westphalia Land Criminal Police Office (LKA NRW)	Germany
Group 2000	Netherlands
KPN N.V.	Netherlands
Ministry of Economic Affairs	Netherlands
PIDS	Netherlands
Pine Lawful Interception	Netherlands
TNO	Netherlands
TELEFONICA S.A.	Spain
Ericsson	Sweden
SWISSCOM	Switzerland
BT Group Plc	United Kingdom
National Technical Assistance Centre	United Kingdom
VODAFONE Group Plc	United Kingdom
Operational Technology Division (OTD)	USA
Yaana Technologies LLC	USA

ETSI TC LI 34, Edinburgh, UK, 24-26 September 2013

Organisation	Country
Attorney-General's Department	Australia
Softel Systems Pty Ltd	Australia

Public Safety Canada	Canada
China Academy of Telecommunication Research (CATR)	China
Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Transport and Infrastructure (MMATI)	Croatia
Finnish Communications Regulatory Authority (FICORA)	Finland
Alcatel-Lucent	France
AQSACOM S.A.	France
ETSI	France
General Secretariat for Defence and National Security (SGDSN)	France
Minister for Economic Regeneration	France
Minister of the Interior	France
Orange SA	France
ATIS SYSTEMS GmbH	Germany
Bavarian Land Criminal Police Office	Germany
Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (BMWV)	Germany
Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV)	Germany
North Rhine Westphalia Land Criminal Police Office (LKA NRW)	Germany
P3 communications GmbH	Germany
Siemens AG	Germany
UTIMACO SAFEWARE AG	Germany
C-DOT	India
Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MCIT)	Indonesia
AREA Spa	Italy
Group 2000	Netherlands
KPN N.V.	Netherlands
Ministry of Economic Affairs	Netherlands
PIDS	Netherlands

Pine Lawful Interception	Netherlands
TELENOR ASA	Norway
Central Science Research Telecommunications Institute (ZNIIS)	Russia
TELEFONICA S.A.	Spain
Ericsson	Sweden
Federal Office of Communications (OFCOM)	Switzerland
SWISSCOM	Switzerland
BlackBerry UK Limited	United Kingdom
BT Group Plc	United Kingdom
Communications-Electronics Security Group (CESG)	United Kingdom
Home Office	United Kingdom
National Technical Assistance Centre	United Kingdom
SS8 Networks	United Kingdom
VODAFONE Group Plc	United Kingdom
Zeata Security Ltd	United Kingdom
Operational Technology Division (OTD)	USA
Yaana Technologies LLC	USA

ETSI TC LI Rap-30, Hamburg, Germany, 19-21 November 2013

Organisation	Country
Minister for Economic Regeneration	France
North Rhine-Westphalia Land Criminal Police Office (LKA NRW)	Germany
KPN N.V.	Netherlands
PIDS	Netherlands
TELEFONICA S.A.	Spain
Ericsson	Sweden
SWISSCOM	Switzerland
BT Group Plc	United Kingdom
Home Office	United Kingdom
National Technical Assistance Centre	United Kingdom

VODAFONE Group Plc	United Kingdom
Yaana Technologies LLC	USA

With regard to all these meetings, it is to be noted that, although the registered participants usually do travel to the TC LI meetings, it can happen that additional participants appear there who have not registered in advance or that registered participants fail to attend without cancelling their registration. However, the German Federal Government has no further information on this matter.

g)

Reference is made to the answer to the minor interpellation published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

h)

Delegates from German Federal authorities did not contribute any discussion papers during the period to which the question refers.

i) and j)

Reference is made to the answer to the minor interpellation tabled by the Left Party parliamentary group and published in Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14132 (answer: Bundestag Printed Paper 17/14474).

34. When, at what location and at what venue is the 2015 G8 summit expected to take place, as things stand at present?

- a) To what extent, and when and with whom have talks been held with mayors, minister-presidents or other political representatives prior to the selection of a venue?*
- b) What other locations or venues have previously been considered for selection and why were they ultimately ruled out?*
- c) To what extent has a police agency already been tasked with the preparation of the summit, and what functions are being assumed by this agency?*
- d) What forms of international cooperation have been initiated by German police forces and secret services for the forthcoming G8 summit with which partner authorities, and what meetings have already been held?*
- e) In what ways are foreign authorities, as well as institutions such as the UNODC or comparable organisations already being involved in the security architecture for the G8 at the present time?*

Re 34.a) to e)

On 23 January 2014, Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel announced her decision that the 2015 G8 summit would be held at Schloss Elmau. Schloss Elmau is located in the Bavarian Alps not far from Garmisch-Partenkirchen, about 100 kilometres south of Munich. The other G8 Member States are currently being consulted about the timing of the summit. The date for the summit will be announced as soon as it has been set.

A venue must satisfy numerous conditions such as, for example, capacity and security requirements if it is to come into consideration to host a meeting of the G8 heads of state and government. Several host venues were examined from various points of view when a location was being selected for the 2015 summit. Schloss Elmau is the one that best satisfies all these requirements.

As usual, security issues will be clarified in close consultation with the authorities competent in each case.