

CCBE Comments on the text from Member States (dated 2 March 2015) regarding the creation of a European Public Prosecutors Office

27/04/2015

INTRODUCTION

1. The CCBE is the representative organisation of more than 1 million European lawyers through its member bars and law societies from 32 full member countries, and 13 further associate and observer countries. The CCBE has been following the discussions on the creation of a European Public Prosecutors Office.

The CCBE welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposal of the Latvian Presidency set out in document "6318/1/15 revision 1" dated 2 March 2015. Our comments should be read in conjunction with previous detailed CCBE comments on this proposal of 7th February 2013, 29th November 2013 and most recently 18th November 2014.

As we have previously observed (29th of November 2013) the CCBE accepts that the task of creating a legislative framework for a European Public Prosecutor's Office poses a singular if not unique challenges. Equally the CCBE acknowledges its responsibility to engage constructively, albeit without compromising on core values affecting the integrity of the criminal process wherever it is conducted. The comments and reservations offered are proposed in that vein.

PRELIMINARY AND GENERAL

2. The Presidency document under consideration is not complete and has not addressed key concerns previously raised by the CCBE including an effective mechanism for Judicial Review

MEASURES TO RESTRAIN IMPROPER FORUM SHOPPING

3. Guarantees in relation to fundamental rights - including provisions in relation to the admissibility of evidence, access to a lawyer, legal aid (there should be proper legal aid in all cases which are investigated by the EPPO and there should be no EPPO as long as there are no common standards of legal aid in the Member States which will participate) standardisation of fundamental rights across the European Union, reinforcement of the principle of *ne bis in idem* and the provision of a remedy in respect of wrongful prosecution - these fundamental rights and procedural safeguards have been set out exhaustively in our earlier commentary and we refer expressively to them as they need to be included in the EPPO paper.

We remain firmly of the view that the measure to establish a European Public Prosecutor's Office cannot be properly evaluated until the provisions protecting the rights of suspected persons are also available for consideration.

The European Union is only too well aware of the unsatisfactory situation which persists as a result of the framework decision establishing the European Arrest Warrant model being introduced in advance of the procedural safeguards which were promised. Those safeguards have still not been fully introduced and the Arrest Warrant continues to pose significant practical problems for requested persons and their advisers by virtue of the lack of simultaneous safeguards being put in place.

Having regard to the above introductory observations, we comment as follows on the 2 March Presidency proposal:

In the first instance, we are happy to welcome the move to priority competence in place of the previously proposed automatic and exclusive competence being given to the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

We previously expressed concerns that the original proposal would swamp the office from the outset with an unrealistically heavy caseload resulting in damage being suffered not only by suspected persons but by national legal systems also. The current proposal appears to us to strike the correct balance identifying reasonable criteria for case selection and especially the provision which acknowledges that some cases can have such significance for the broader European Union that their prosecution by the European Public Prosecutor is warranted even if the sums at issue are not particularly high.

We reserve of course our position in respect of the internal rules of procedure which are not yet available to us.

SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES.

Article 5 - Basic principles of the activities

Article 5 (1)

We welcome the express and mandatory obligation on the European Public Prosecutor's Office to respect the rights enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. While some commentators may take the view that this is merely an expression of the state of the law, in any event we are of the opposite view and hold that it is vital that fundamental rights are expressly acknowledged, especially in a document conferring significant additional powers on a new European institution. We accordingly expect that this mandatory language will also be included when the sections on fundamental rights and procedural safeguards are published.

Article 5 (5)

We believe this article could be expanded upon to indicate that the European Public Prosecutor will have the obligation of seeking out and disclosing exculpatory evidence and to make that evidence available to the defence in any proceedings they see fit to bring either in a national court or by way of Judicial Review to the court in Luxembourg.

Article 6 - Independence and accountability

Due to the situation in a number of Member States (for example, France, Spain, Poland, Belgium, Luxembourg), where at the hearing, the prosecutor sits at the table of the judge and accompanies the judge in the deliberation room before the beginning of the hearing, during any possible suspension of the hearing, and at the end of the hearing, which creates in the eyes of the public in the court room, including the parties to the case and their lawyers, the very unpleasant appearance and belief that there exists a special relationship/influence between prosecutor and judge and that discussions may take place between them in the deliberation room outside of the view and the knowledge of the other parties and their lawyers, we believe this article could be expanded upon to indicate that:

Under penalty of inadmissibility of the proceedings:

- a) at the hearing the EPPO stands and speaks exclusively where the other parties and/or their lawyers do stand and plead;
- b) the EPPO may not be in the deliberation room or in the office of the judge without the presence of the other parties to the case and/or their lawyers.

Article 7 and Article 8 - Structure of the European Public Prosecutor's Office/the College

The College Model risks creating bureaucracy without any added value. The Permanent Chambers will have to review the case material and take all the relevant decisions during the proceedings. This may have the effect that proceedings last much longer than they would if they were only led at a national level. This is especially true in cases where the suspect is in pre-trial detention, as the College Model may cause an unnecessary period of pre-trial detention which may be in conflict with Art. 5 Par 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Article 9 – Permanent Chambers

We wish to reserve comment on this Article and indeed on the other Articles conferring powers until such time as we have the text of the Judicial Review mechanism available to us.

It is our central concern that the measure should not provide a platform for forum shopping where a decision as to the venue of trial could be influenced by factors such as differential laws of evidence or more restrictive rules on pre-trial detention or on sentencing generally. We believe that any decision as to the venue of trial must be subject to meaningful Judicial Review, and that the rules of evidence ought not to be more favourable in one jurisdiction over another, and that sanctions should be on a par.

We believe that the material available to the permanent chamber under the provisions of Article 9 (3) ought also to be available to the suspect and his advisers.

Article 12 - European Delegated Prosecutors (and Article 6.1 and Article 15.2 last sentence)

While the internal rules of procedure (when they become available to us) may address some of our concerns, we wish once more to highlight the potential for a conflict of interest between a Prosecutor acting on the one hand as a National Prosecutor and at the same time as a European delegated Prosecutor. There must be some measures proposed to remove the clear temptation to act inappropriately given the real potential for a conflict of interest. Whilst we appreciate the economic reason for having a part-time delegated Prosecutor we believe that the principled approach of having a strict dividing line between the two functions more than justifies the additional cost that might be borne.

Article 13 - Appointment and dismissal of the European Chief Prosecutor

Article 13 (2A)

We do not believe that serving members of the judiciary should be considered for appointment as European Public Prosecutor's. We have previously sought to emphasise the importance of distinguishing between the function of Prosecutors and the function of the judiciary. We believe that the rules of procedure must address this expressly. In keeping with that aim, members of the judiciary should remain disengaged from prosecution activities.

Article 13 (4)

We welcome the supervisory role to be given to the Court of Justice of the European Union and believe that an expanded section on the role of the court in relation to European Public Prosecutor issues will be required in the next draft of the Presidency proposal to include

issues such as Judicial Review, admissibility of evidence etc. We have previously pointed out our belief that a centralised system of obtaining rulings on procedural matters from the Court of Justice of the European Union will improve the standard of justice where European Public Prosecutor cases are concerned.

Article 22 - urgent measures

We express our concerns about the "confirmation" by the EPPO of "*the [investigation] measures taken by the national authorities, even if such measures have been undertaken and executed under rules other than those of this Regulation.*"

This provision could indeed work or be interpreted as an automatic "covering" of any possible inadmissible investigation measures taken by the national authorities, especially in "urgent" situation as concerned by this provision.

Article 23 (6) - Conducting the investigation

The protection of professional secrecy should equally apply to those who are advising suspected persons, and it might conveniently be recited at this juncture.

Article 26 - Investigation Measures

This Article lists several measures of investigation without any concrete preconditions or indications as to who (judge, prosecutor, police etc) shall be entitled to carry out such measures.

In addition, the provisions of Article 26 (a) which provides that *Member States shall ensure that the following investigative measures are also available under their laws to the European Public Prosecutor's Office - search any premises, land, means of transport, private home, clothes and any other personal property or computer system, and any conservatory measures necessary to preserve their integrity or to avoid the loss or contamination of evidence* - go well beyond the standard of the European Investigation Order.

Article 29 – Transactions

We had previously expressed our concern that the provision of an alternative to prosecution for those who could afford to pay a fine gave rise to the real risk of differential standards of administration of justice which could bring the entire system into disrepute. It would, for instance, appear that the perception would be created of a "rich man's justice" where persons who had the means to enter into a transaction would be spared imprisonment etc.

While remaining concerned at this potential, we are pleased to note that certain additional measures have been introduced to the current proposal which address those concerns.

The measures which we welcome are 29 (1d) which acknowledges that a transaction must be an exceptional measure in circumstances where a party has not previously offended. 29 (2) acknowledges the importance of legal advice. We have previously expressed the view that the prospect of a prosecution at the hands of the European Public Prosecutor would be so daunting that many citizens, wholly innocent of wrongdoing, may be compelled to enter into a transaction rather than face the potentially ruinous cost of defending the proceedings. We interpret paragraph 29 (2) as acknowledging that a citizen must be provided, at public expense, with legal representation to ensure that there is no inequality of arms and that any decision to enter into a transaction is arrived at freely and fairly and with the benefit of full legal advice.

We welcome Paragraph 29(3) as it appears to specifically envisage the prospect of a low transaction fine being applied where the means of the suspect are such that this is the only realistic avenue open.

We would like to add the necessity of a provision stating that if no transaction can be reached between parties - which is a possibility - the EPPO may not use in the later stages of the proceedings any information, communication or documents given during the previous discussion between parties to reach this transaction. If not, the risk exists that a strategy could arise consisting of the EPPO proposing a transaction with no real intention to make it possible, but only to bring the prosecuted person to take such steps that will be used against him/her in the later prosecution as an acknowledgment of guilt.

We reserve further comment on the transaction proposal until the full measure, including the protection of fundamental rights, and provisions in respect of procedural safeguards are available for study.

CONCLUSION

We hope our comments are of assistance, and we are happy to elaborate on any aspect should this be required.



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 2 March 2015
(OR. en)

**Interinstitutional File:
2013/0255 (APP)**

6318/1/15
REV 1

EPPO 18
EUROJUST 48
CATS 33
FIN 126
COPEN 54
GAF 4

NOTE

From: Presidency
To: Council

Subject: Proposal for a Regulation on the establishment of the European Public
Prosecutor's Office
- Orientation debate/State of Play

A. State of Play

The Latvian Presidency of the Council has continued the work of the previous Italian Presidency with a view to finalising the first five chapters of the Regulation. These chapters cover most of the issues of importance for the functioning of the Office, as they include rules on the status, structure and organisation of the Office, on the procedure for investigations, prosecutions and trial proceedings and on judicial review.

Seven meeting days in the competent Working Party (COPEN) and one discussion in CATS have been organised under the Latvian Presidency. The meetings have been held in a very constructive atmosphere and considerable advances have been made, notably as regards the details on the internal organisation of the Office and the important issue of how the cross-border work of the Office shall be organised. The Presidency will continue the work in the coming months with a view to finding agreement on a text that can be endorsed by the Council in June. To this note, the text in its current wording is attached in annex for information.

B. The issue of transactions

B.1 Background

The original proposal from the Commission includes the following provision on transactions (Article 29):

1. *Where the case is not dismissed and it would serve the purpose of proper administration of justice, the European Public Prosecutor's Office may, after the damage has been compensated, propose to the suspected person to pay a lump-sum fine which, once paid, entails the final dismissal of the case (transaction). If the suspected person agrees, he/she shall pay the lump sum fine to the Union.*
2. *The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall supervise the collection of the financial payment involved in the transaction.*
3. *Where the transaction is accepted and paid by the suspected person, the European Public Prosecutor shall finally dismiss the case and officially notify the competent national law enforcement and judicial authorities and shall inform the relevant Union institutions, bodies, agencies thereof.*
4. *The dismissal referred to in paragraph 3 shall not be subject to judicial review.*

The purpose of the proposed provision is mainly to provide for a fast and effective way to close certain cases without an indictment. As was stated in recital 32 in the proposal, the possibility of proposing a transaction to the suspect if this would be in the interest of the proper administration of justice should be foreseen when the case is not dismissed on the ground that it is minor, but prosecution is not justified either.

The issue has been discussed several times at expert level, as well as in CATS, during the Lithuanian, Hellenic and Italian Presidencies. No common understanding on the content and form of the provision has thereby been reached.

During negotiations, a considerable number of various views and arguments for and against the provision, or aspects of the provision, have been put forward. The Presidency would summarise these discussions as follows:

- A majority of delegations have in principle expressed support for the idea of a common European system for transactions.
- Some delegations are against the introduction of such a system at European level, mainly since it is not known in national law. Some of these delegations have suggested that a "plea bargaining" system should be considered instead of the transaction mechanism.
- Some delegations have suggested that the draft Regulation could, instead of the proposed European transaction system, include rules that give the EPPO the possibility to conclude transactions on the basis of national law.
- Many delegations have noted that a transaction should only be possible under certain conditions, for example when the criminal offence in question is of a minor nature, or when it is a first-time offender or when the offender has not previously been the subject of a transaction.
- A considerable number of delegations have argued that a system of transaction would need to be submitted to judicial control of some form; it has thereby been questioned whether a transaction concluded without any involvement of a judge would have the effect of *res judicata*.
- Whereas many delegations are of the opinion that there must be a possibility to appeal against a decision on transactions by the EPPO, some have suggested that a possibility to appeal against decisions of European Delegated Prosecutors or Permanent Chambers to the College may be sufficient in this sense.

B.2 Latest development

In order to take account of the main concerns of delegations, the Italian Presidency in December 2014 presented a new text¹ of Article 29, which expressed the state of play in the negotiations at that moment in time. On the basis of general developments on the file, the Latvian Presidency proposes to update this text with a number of elements, in particular to take account of requests for a clarification of the conditions under which a transaction can be proposed and for a strengthening of the procedural safeguards. With these changes, the text would read as follows (the additions/deletions in relation to the December 2014 text marked in the text):

"1. After obtaining the approval of the competent Permanent Chamber, ~~Where the case is not dismissed according to Article 28 and where the suspected persons' guilt is considered to be of a minor nature and it would serve the purpose of proper administration of justice, the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case or competent European Prosecutor may, after the damage has been compensated, propose to the suspected person to pay a lump-sum fine (hereafter: fine) which, once paid, entails the final dismissal of the case (transaction), if the following cumulative criteria are satisfied:~~

a) the damages caused to the Union's financial interests does not exceed [50 000/100 000 /250 000/500 000/xxx] euros;

b) it would serve the purpose of proper administration of justice;

c) the damage has been compensated;

d) the suspect has neither been the subject of a transaction under this Regulation nor been convicted of offences affecting the Union's financial interests before.

If the suspected person agrees, he/she shall pay the lump-sum fine to the Union within a period of maximum four months.

¹ Doc 16993/14 EPPO 28 EUROJUST 221 CATS 209 FIN 1006 COPEN 318 GAF 68

2. The suspected person shall receive legal advice on the advisability of accepting or refusing the proposal for the transaction as well as on its legal consequences, in accordance with national law. The European Delegated Prosecutor or the European Prosecutor handling the case may propose a transaction in cases which can not be considered serious, or where the damage caused to the Union's financial interests does not exceed [xxx Euros], and the suspected person has not been convicted of offences affecting the interests of the Union before.
3. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall ensure that the amount of the fine is proportionate to the damage caused and to the suspected person's financial means. The amount of the fine shall be calculated in accordance with the method of calculation defined by the rules referred to in Article 72 (e).
4. The transaction proposal shall set out the alleged facts, the identity of the suspected person, the alleged offence, the compensation made and the commitment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office to dismiss the case if the suspected person agrees with this proposal and pays the finelump sum to the Union budget, as well as the time-limit within which the suspected person has to pay the finelump sum, which shall not exceed 4 months. Where the suspected person agrees to such proposal, he/she shall pay within the set time-limit following receipt of the proposal of the European Public Prosecutor's Office. The European Public Prosecutor's Office can upon the request of the suspected person extend the period for the payment by another [15/30/45] days, where this is justified.
5. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall supervise the collection of the financial payment involved in the transaction. Where the ~~transaction~~fine is paid by the suspected person within the time-limit set out in paragraph 4, the European Delegated Prosecutor ~~or the European Prosecutor~~ handling the case shall finally dismiss the case and notify the competent national law enforcement and judicial authorities and shall inform the relevant Union institutions, bodies, agencies and injured parties thereof. The transaction shall be noted in the Case Management System of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

6. *If the proposed fine is not paid within the time set out in paragraph 4 the European Delegated Prosecutor ~~or the European Prosecutor~~ handling the case shall continue the prosecution of the case.*
7. *The European Public Prosecutor's Office or the competent national authorities may not prosecute the suspected ~~person~~ for the same facts which constituted the offence being the subject of the final dismissal through a transaction."*

C. Questions

With a view to finalising an agreed text of Article 29, the Presidency seeks the guidance of Ministers on the following questions:

1. **Do Ministers agree in principle with the model for transactions of the European Public Prosecutor's Office as proposed by the Presidency under section B.2 above?**
 2. **In particular, do Ministers agree with the specific conditions for transactions proposed in paragraph 1 in the Presidency text, or could alternative conditions be considered?**
 3. **Do Ministers consider that there is a need to provide in the draft Regulation for a particular role for national Courts as regards some or all of the transactions described above, for example in the form of an obligation to refer a transaction to a Court for validation?**
-

Draft

COUNCIL REGULATION

on the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

CHAPTER I
SUBJECT MATTER AND DEFINITIONS

Article 1
Subject matter

This Regulation establishes the European Public Prosecutor's Office and sets out rules concerning its functioning.

Article 2
Definitions²

For the purposes of this Regulation, the following definitions apply:

- a) 'person' means any natural or legal person;
- b) ~~'criminal offences affecting the financial interests of the Union' means the offences provided for by Directive 2014/xx/EU, as implemented by national law;~~

² The definitions will need to be adapted to be consistent with the definitions that will finally be included in the PIF-Directive. The provision in b) will be reformulated in order to be consistent with the final wording of Article 17. The issue of uniformity with EU law needs to be examined further.

- c) 'financial interests of the Union' means all revenues, expenditures and assets covered by, acquired through, or due to the Union budget and the budgets of institutions, bodies, offices and agencies established under the Treaties and budgets managed and monitored by them³;
- d) 'administrative personal data' means all personal data processed by the European Public Prosecutor's Office except for operational personal data;
- e) 'operational personal data' means all [case-related] personal data processed by the European Public Prosecutor's Office to meet the purposes laid down in Article [37];
- f) 'staff of the Central Office' means personnel which supports the College, the Permanent Chambers, the European Chief Prosecutor and the Members of the College in the day-to-day activities in the executions of the tasks of this Office under this Regulation.

CHAPTER II

Establishment, tasks and basic principles of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

Article 3

Establishment

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office is established as a body of the Union.
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall have legal personality.
3. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall cooperate with Eurojust and rely on its support in accordance with Article [57].

³ To be aligned with the final definition of the "financial interests of the Union" in the PIF Directive.

Article 4

Tasks

1. The task of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be to combat⁴ criminal offences affecting the financial interests of the Union, which are provided for in Directive 2014/xx/EU.
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be responsible for investigating, prosecuting and bringing to judgment the perpetrators of, and accomplices in the criminal offences referred to in paragraph 1. In that respect the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall undertake investigations, and carry out acts of prosecution and exercise the functions of prosecutor in the competent courts of the Member States in respect of the offences referred to in paragraph 1, until the case has been finally disposed of⁵.

Article 5

Basic principles of the activities

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall ensure that its activities respect the rights enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be bound by the principles of rule of law and proportionality in all its activities, and guided by the principle of legality.
3. The investigations and prosecutions on behalf of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be governed by this Regulation. National law shall apply to the extent that a matter is not regulated by this Regulation. Unless otherwise specified in this Regulation, the applicable national law shall be the law of the Member State whose European Delegated Prosecutor is responsible for the investigations and prosecutions in accordance with Article 12(1). Where a matter is governed by national law and this Regulation, the latter shall prevail.

⁴ A few Member State would replace this term, for example with "prosecute".

⁵ Some delegations has suggested that this provision should be modified in order to clarify what functions the Office will have after the Court proceedings, in particular as regards the execution of a judgment. A recital highlighting the necessity for each Member State to foresee the function of a prosecutor with the tasks described in this Regulation shall be elaborated.

4. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall have competence to investigate, prosecute and bring to judgment the perpetrators of, and accomplices in the criminal offences against the Union's financial interests as determined in Articles 17 and 18 and exercise this competence in accordance with Article 19 in this Regulation.
5. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall conduct its investigations in an impartial manner and seek all relevant evidence⁶, whether inculpatory or exculpatory.
6. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall open and conduct investigations without undue delay.
7. The competent national authorities shall actively assist and support the investigations and prosecutions of the European Public Prosecutor's Office at its request and shall refrain from any action, policy or procedure which may hamper or unduly delay their progress.

Article 6

Independence and accountability

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office and all its staff shall be independent. The European Chief Prosecutor, the Deputy European Chief Prosecutors, the European Prosecutors, the European Delegated Prosecutors as well as the staff of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall act in the interest of the Union as a whole, as defined by law, and neither seek nor take instructions from any person external to the office, any Member State or any institution, body, office or agency of the Union in the performance of their duties under this Regulation. The Member States and the Union institutions, bodies, offices or agencies shall respect the independence of the European Public Prosecutor's Office and shall not seek to influence it in the exercise of its tasks.

⁶ Some delegations wish that this and other provisions would clarify the role of investigative judges in cases handled by the EPPO.

2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be accountable to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Commission for its general activities, and shall issue annual reports in accordance with Article 6a.

Article 6a⁷

Reporting

1. Every year the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall draw up and issue an Annual Report in the official languages of the Union institutions on its general activities. It shall transmit the report to the European Parliament and to national parliaments, as well as to the Council and the Commission.
2. The European Chief Prosecutor shall appear once a year before the European Parliament and the Council to give account of the general activities of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, without prejudice to the Office's obligation of discretion and confidentiality as regards individual cases and personal data.
3. National Parliaments may invite the European Chief Prosecutor to participate in an exchange of views in relation to the general activities of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

⁷ A few delegations are of the opinion that paragraphs 2 and 3 of this provision need clarification. In particular, a few delegations have requested that the notion of "general activities" should be clarified. To that effect, a recital may be added in which it will be clarified that the report should as a minimum contain all relevant statistical data on the work of the Office.

CHAPTER III

STATUS, STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION OF EPPO

SECTION 1

STATUS AND STRUCTURE OF THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

Article 7

Structure of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be a Union body operating as one single Office with a decentralised structure.
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be organised at a central level and at a decentralised level.
3. The central level shall consist of a Central Office at the seat. The Central Office shall consist of a College, ~~its~~ Permanent Chambers, a European Chief Prosecutor, [his/her deputies] and the Members of the College.
4. The decentralised level shall consist of European Delegated Prosecutors located in the Member States.

Article 8

The College

1. The College of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall consist of the European Chief Prosecutor [and his/her Deputies] and one Member per Member State, who shall be referred to as European Prosecutors. The European Chief Prosecutor shall chair the meetings of the College and have responsibility for their preparation.

2. The College shall meet regularly, ~~in accordance with the internal Rules of Procedure. It and shall~~ be responsible for the general oversight (monitoring)⁸ of the activities of the Office in accordance with the internal Rules of Procedure. It shall ~~and for taking~~ decisions on strategic matters, and on general issues ~~of general application~~ arising from individual cases, in particular in view of ensuring coherence and consistency in the prosecution policy of the Office throughout the Union, as well on other matters as specified in this Regulation. The College shall not be responsible for taking operational decisions in individual cases.
3. On a proposal by the European Chief Prosecutor and in accordance with the internal Rules of Procedure, the College shall set up Permanent Chambers to direct ~~and monitor~~ the casework of the European Public Prosecutor's Office⁹.
4. The College shall adopt internal Rules of Procedure of the European Public Prosecutor's Office in accordance with Article 16, as well as the organigram and the establishment plan of the Central Office¹⁰.

⁸ In this document, the terms "monitoring", "~~directing and monitoring~~" and "supervision" are used to describe different control activities. These terms will need more detailed explanations/definitions in the text and/or recitals, in line with the following: ~~In general terms, the preliminary understanding of the [Hellenic] Presidency is that~~

✓ "Monitoring" refers to a general oversight of the activities of the Office, in which instructions are in principle only given on issues which will have a horizontal importance for the Office;

✓ "~~Directing and monitoring~~" refers both to the general oversight just described and to certain clear powers to direct individual investigations and prosecutions when such directions appear to be necessary.

✓ "Supervision" refers to a closer and rather continuous oversight of investigations and prosecutions, including full powers to at any time intervene and give instruction on investigations and prosecution matters.

⁹ ~~A number of delegations have requested that detailed criteria for the composition and set up of the Chambers shall be set out in the Regulation. Some have argued in favour of specialised chambers, whereas others appear to advocate a system where there is always one Chamber on duty. It has also been suggested that the European Prosecutors could be distributed between different Permanent Chambers with account taken to the size of the Member States and the expected number of cases~~

¹⁰ Whether the Internal Rules of Procedure will be adopted by the Council or the College will depend on the content of these rules. On the basis of the current state of negotiations, it is the assessment of the Presidency that the content of the Regulation will be such, that the internal Rules of Procedure can be adopted by the College. Some Member States have suggested that explanations of the terms organigram and establishment plan are needed.

5. Unless stated otherwise in this Regulation, the College shall take decisions by simple majority. The College shall vote at the request of any of its Members. Each Member of the College shall have one vote. The European Chief Prosecutor shall have a casting vote in the event of a tie vote on any matter to be decided by the College¹¹.

Article 9

The Permanent Chambers

1. The European Chief Prosecutor, the Deputies and all the other European Prosecutors shall be ~~Members~~^{part} of at least one Permanent Chamber. Each Permanent Chamber shall be chaired by the European Chief Prosecutor or one of the Deputies, or a Chairman appointed in accordance with the internal Rules of Procedure, and have 2 additional permanent Members. The number of Permanent Chambers shall be determined in function of the needs of the Office, and in accordance with the rules on setting up Permanent Chambers in the internal Rules of Procedure.
2. The Permanent Chambers shall direct ~~and monitor~~ the investigations and prosecutions conducted in the Member States in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4 in this Article¹². They shall also ensure the coordination of investigations and prosecutions in cross-border cases and the implementation of decisions taken by the College ~~on strategic or prosecution policy matters~~ in accordance with Article 8(2).

¹¹ The casting vote of the Chief Prosecutor as well as other voting arrangements foreseen have been criticized by some.

¹² The Commission, with the support of some Member States, advocates that the Permanent Chambers should be in charge of supervision in order to create a European system of supervision. The Commission also advocates a solution where one of the Members of a Permanent Chamber - regardless of his or her nationality - will be selected to be Rapporteur of the case in order to ensure the neutrality of the Rapporteur. One Member State would exclude that the Permanent Chamber shall have the right to intervene in individual cases.

3. The Permanent Chambers shall take the following decisions in accordance with the conditions and procedures set out by this Regulation¹³:
- a) to initiate an investigation in accordance with the rules in Article 21(1), where no investigations has been initiated by an European Delegated Prosecutor;
 - b) to refer to the College strategic matters or general issues of general application arising from individual cases;
 - c) to reallocate a case;
 - d) to determine the Member State in which the prosecution shall be brought;
 - e) to bring a prosecution to Court;
 - f) to dismiss a case, including through a transaction.

The decisions shall be taken in deliberation in the Chambers. All case material shall at request be accessible to the Permanent Chamber in view of the preparation of the decisions.

The internal Rules of Procedure may, as regards decisions that do not require any prior evaluation of evidence, authorise the Permanent Chambers to delegate its decision-making powers under points e) and f) in this provision to European Prosecutors or European Delegated Prosecutors. The internal Rules of Procedure may also authorise the Permanent Chambers to take decisions of a simple nature, to be defined in the internal Rules of Procedure, by means of a written procedure.

¹³ A number of delegations have questioned whether all (or any) important operational decisions always need to be taken by a Permanent Chamber and if such a system would ensure efficient and speedy proceedings. The introduction of a rule enabling European Prosecutors or European Delegated Prosecutors to take certain decisions and then refer the matter to a Permanent Chamber for confirmation has also been suggested. The Commission has argued that important decisions, with the exception of initiating an investigation, should be taken at Chamber level, in view of ensuring full independence of the decision-making. The list will be completed at a later stage of negotiations. A few delegations wish to include a provision indicating under which conditions a Member State may refuse instructions from the Central Office.

4. The competent Permanent Chamber may give instructions, through the competent European Prosecutor, in a specific case to the European Delegated Prosecutor to whom it has been allocated, whenever necessary for the efficient handling of the investigation and prosecution and in the interest of justice and a coherent functioning of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.
5. The Permanent Chamber shall take decisions by simple majority. The Chamber shall vote at the request of any of its Members. Each Member shall have one vote. The Chair shall have a casting vote in the event of a tie vote.
6. In addition to the permanent Members, the European Prosecutor ~~or European Prosecutors~~ who ~~is~~ are supervising a prosecution or an investigation¹⁴ in accordance with Article 11(1) shall participate in the decisions of the Permanent Chamber, without a right to vote as regards ~~regards~~. A Permanent Chamber may also, either at the request of a European Prosecutor or a European Delegated Prosecutor or at its own initiative, invite other European Prosecutors or European Delegated Prosecutors who are concerned by a case to attend their meetings without a right to vote.
7. The Chairs of the Permanent Chambers shall, in accordance with internal Rules of Procedure, keep the College informed of the decisions taken pursuant to this Article, in order to enable the College to fulfill its role in accordance with Article 8(2)~~accordance with the internal Rules of Procedure~~. The Permanent Chambers may also request guidance from the College in a particular case whenever this is required in order to ensure coherence and consistency in the prosecution policy of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

¹⁴ Some delegations have suggested that the participation in the decision-making should be limited to one of the supervising European Prosecutors, possibly to the one coordinating the investigations.

Article 10

The European Chief Prosecutor and the Deputies

1. The European Chief Prosecutor shall be the head of the European Public Prosecutor's Office. The European Chief Prosecutor shall organise the work of the Office, direct its activities, and take decisions in accordance with this Regulation and the internal Rules of Procedure.¹⁵
2. [Five] Deputies shall be appointed to assist the European Chief Prosecutor in the discharge of his/her duties and act as replacement when he/she is absent or is prevented from attending to his/her duties.
3. When the European Chief Prosecutor has been informed through the Case Management System or otherwise that a case has been initiated, or when a case has been evoked in accordance with Article 21a, he/she shall allocate the case to the Permanent Chambers which shall be in charge of the case in accordance with ~~Article [X]~~ and the automatised system of allocation of cases defined in the internal Rules of Procedure, ~~decide which Permanent Chamber shall be in charge of a case~~. The European Chief Prosecutor may disregard the automated distribution of cases where he/she deems it necessary for ensuring a balanced workload among the Permanent Chambers.
4. The European Chief Prosecutor shall represent the European Public Prosecutor's Office towards the Union institutions, the Member States and third parties. The European Chief Prosecutor may also delegate his/her tasks relating to representation to one of the Deputies or to a European Prosecutor.
5. ~~The European Chief Prosecutor and his/her Deputies shall be assisted by the staff of the Central Office in their duties under this Regulation.~~

¹⁵ The Rules of Procedure should include a provision on the equal distribution of the workload within the Office. A few delegations have suggested that this provision gives too extensive powers to the Chief Prosecutor.

Article 11

The European Prosecutors

1. The European Prosecutors shall, ~~on behalf of the Permanent Chamber in charge of the case~~ and in accordance with the instructions of the Permanent Chamber in charge of the case ~~its instructions~~, supervise investigations and prosecutions ~~allocated~~ signed to European Delegated Prosecutors, and may present proposals for decisions to be taken by the said Chamber¹⁶. The internal Rules of Procedure shall provide for a mechanism of mutual substitution between European Prosecutors in case the competent European Prosecutor is absent from his/her duties or for other reasons not available to carry out the functions of the European Prosecutors.

The European Prosecutors may give instructions in investigation or prosecution matters under their supervision whenever necessary for the efficient handling of the investigation and prosecution and in the interest of justice and a coherent functioning of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

They shall also function as liaisons and channels of information between the Permanent Chambers and the European Delegated Prosecutors in their respective Member States.

2. The European Prosecutors shall monitor the implementation¹⁷ of the tasks of the Office in their respective Member States in close consultation with the European Delegated Prosecutors, and shall ensure in accordance with this Regulation and the internal Rules of Procedure that all relevant information from the Central Office is provided to European Delegated Prosecutors and vice versa.

¹⁶ A number of delegations have suggested, as regards cases allocated ~~signed~~ to several European Prosecutors, that one of these European Prosecutors shall be selected to be coordinator/rapporteur of the case in question.

¹⁷ Some delegations have suggested that a specific definition of the notion "monitoring the implementation of the tasks" should be introduced in the text.

3. [The European Prosecutors may temporarily be authorised to discharge their duties on a part-time basis provided that this does not conflict with the interest of the European Public Prosecutor's Office. Such an authorisation may be granted, upon the written request of the national prosecution authorities, by the European Chief Prosecutor for a maximum period of up to 6 months. This period may upon request be extended by a new decision of the European Chief Prosecutor. The authorisation may be revoked at any time after consultation with the appropriate authorities].¹⁸

Article 12

The European Delegated Prosecutors

1. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall be competent to act on behalf of~~represent~~ the European Public Prosecutor's Office in their respective Member States and shall have the same powers as national prosecutors in respect of investigations, prosecutions and bringing cases to judgment.

The European Delegated Prosecutors shall be responsible for the investigations and prosecutions, which they have initiated or which have been allocated to them by a Permanent Chamber ~~through the competent European Prosecutor~~, and act under their direction~~instructions~~. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall also be responsible for bringing a case to judgment, in particular have the power to present trial pleas, participate in evidence taking and exercise the available remedies in accordance with national law.

2. There shall be two or more European Delegated Prosecutors in each Member State. The ~~Member States shall determine the division of competences~~ rules governing the distribution of tasks between their European Delegated Prosecutors shall be established in the internal rules of procedure.

¹⁸ A number of delegations wish to delete this provision, or to move it to Chapter IV. Various opinions as regards the need and appropriateness of various parts of this provision have been expressed.

3. The European Delegated Prosecutors may also exercise functions as national prosecutors, to the extent that this does not prevent them from fulfilling their obligations under this Regulation. They shall inform the competent European Prosecutor of such functions assignments. In the event that they are at any given moment unable to fulfil their tasks as European Delegated Prosecutors because of other commitments, the European Prosecutors may, after consultation with the competent national prosecution authorities, instruct the European Delegated Prosecutor concerned to give priority to their functions deriving from this Regulation and immediately inform the competent national prosecution authorities thereof.¹⁹ Should the European Delegated Prosecutor fail to follow the instructions, the European Prosecutor may propose to the Permanent Chamber to reallocate the case to another European Delegated Prosecutor or to himself/herself.

SECTION 2

APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL OF THE MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

Article 13²⁰

Appointment and dismissal of the European Chief Prosecutor ~~and of the Deputy European~~ Chief Prosecutors

1. The European Parliament and the Council shall appoint by common accord the European Chief Prosecutor for a term of nine years, which shall not be renewable. The Council shall act by simple majority.
2. The European Chief Prosecutor shall be selected from among candidates

¹⁹ Various opinions have been expressed as regards the wording and content of this provision. In particular, clear rules on conflict of interest have been called for. The Commission has suggested that the reallocation of a case could also be done to an EDP in another Member State. Some Member States would prefer to delete the last sentence of the Article.

²⁰ A number of delegations would prefer that the Chief Prosecutor is chosen from among the Members of the College.

- a) who are active members of the public prosecution service or judiciary of the Member States ;
 - b) whose independence is beyond doubt;
 - c) who possess the qualifications required for appointment, in their respective countries, to the highest prosecutorial or judicial offices and have relevant practical experience of national legal systems and of international judicial cooperation in criminal matters, or have served as European Prosecutors, and
 - d) who have sufficient managerial experience and qualifications for the position.
3. The selection shall be based on an open call for candidates, to be published in the Official Journal of the European Union, following which a Selection panel shall draw up a shortlist of qualified candidates to be submitted to the European Parliament and the Council. The panel shall comprise [...] persons chosen from among former members of the Court of Justice and the Court of Auditors, former national members of Eurojust, members of national supreme courts and lawyers of recognised competence, one of whom shall be proposed by the European Parliament. The Council shall ~~adopt a decision~~ establishing the panel's operating rules and adopt a decision appointing its members.²¹
4. The Court of Justice of the European Union may, on application by the European Parliament, the Council or the Commission, dismiss the European Chief Prosecutor [or a Deputy European Chief Prosecutor] if it finds that he or she no longer fulfils the conditions required for the performance of his or her duties or that he or she is guilty of serious misconduct.

²¹ The composition of the Selection panel remains to be determined. A Recital will be added to duly justify the conferral of implementing powers on the Council, in accordance with Article 291(2) TFEU.

5. If the European Chief Prosecutor, if his/her services are no longer necessary to fulfil the duties of the Office, if he/she is dismissed or leaves his/her position for any other reason, the position shall immediately be filled in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraphs 1 – 3 above.

Article 14²²

Appointment and dismissal of the European Prosecutors

1. Each Member State shall nominate three candidates for the position as European Prosecutor from among candidates which:
 - a) are active members of the public prosecution service or judiciary of the Member States ;
 - b) whose independence is beyond doubt, and
 - c) who possess the qualifications required for appointment, in their respective countries, to high prosecutorial or judicial office and have relevant practical experience of national legal systems and of international judicial cooperation in criminal matters.
2. The Council shall, after having heard the Selection panel²³, select and appoint one of the candidates to be the European Prosecutor of the Member State in question. If the Selection Panel finds that a candidate does not fulfil the conditions required for the performance of the duties of a European Prosecutor, its opinion shall be binding on the Council.
3. The European Prosecutors shall be selected and appointed for a non- renewable term of [nine] years by the Council, acting by simple majority.
4. Every [three] years there shall be a partial replacement of a third of the European Prosecutors. The Council, acting by simple majority, shall adopt transitional rules²⁴ for the appointment of European Prosecutors for and during their first mandate period.

²² Some delegations are of the opinion that it would be enough for each Member State to nominate one candidate for the position as European Prosecutor.

²³ The composition of the panel remains to be determined.

²⁴ A Recital will be added to duly justify the conferral of implementing powers on the Council, in accordance with Article 291(2) TFEU.

5. The Court of Justice of the European Union may, on application by the European Parliament, the Council or the Commission, dismiss a European Prosecutor if it finds that he or she no longer fulfils the conditions required for the performance of his or her duties or that he or she is guilty of serious misconduct.
6. If a European Prosecutor resigns, if his/her services are no longer necessary to fulfil the duties of the Office, if he/she is dismissed or leaves his/her position for any other reason, the position shall immediately be filled in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

Article 15

Appointment and dismissal of the European Delegated Prosecutors

1. The College shall, upon proposal by the European Chief Prosecutor, appoint the European Delegated Prosecutors nominated by the Member States. The College may reject the nominated person if he/she does not fulfil the criteria referred to in paragraph 2. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall be appointed for a term of five years, which shall be renewable.
2. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall be active members of the public prosecution service or the judiciary of the Member States which nominated them. Their independence shall be beyond doubt and they shall possess the necessary qualifications and relevant practical experience of their national legal system. Member States shall appoint a European Delegated Prosecutor as a Prosecutor under national law if at the time of his or her appointment as a European Delegated Prosecutor, he or she did not have this status already.
3. The appointment of European Delegated Prosecutors shall take effect upon the decision of the College.
4. The College shall dismiss a European Delegated Prosecutor if it finds that he or she no longer fulfils the requirements set out in paragraph 2 or the criteria applicable to the performance of their duties²⁵, or that he or she is guilty of serious misconduct.

²⁵ Some delegations have suggested that additional criteria should be added here.

5. If a Member State decides to dismiss or take disciplinary action against a national prosecutor who has been appointed as European Delegated Prosecutor, it shall consult the European Chief Prosecutor before taking action. A Member State may not dismiss or take disciplinary action against a European Delegated Prosecutor for reasons connected with his activities under this Regulation²⁶.
6. If a European Delegated Prosecutor resigns, if his/her services are no longer necessary to fulfil the duties of the Office, if he/she is dismissed or leaves his/her position for any other reason, the relevant Member State shall immediately inform the Central Office and, where necessary, nominate another prosecutor to be appointed as the new European Delegated Prosecutor²⁷ in accordance with paragraph 1.

SECTION 3

INTERNAL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Article 16

Internal rules of Procedure of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

1. The internal Rules of Procedure shall govern the organisation of the work of the Office²⁸.
2. A proposal for the internal Rules of Procedure of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be prepared by the European Chief Prosecutor and adopted by the College by two thirds majority without delay once the Office has been set up.

²⁶ Some delegations have noted that a differentiation between the respective roles of an EDP and of a national prosecutor may need to be spelled out in this context. A number of delegations have also underlined their view that the European Delegated Prosecutors will remain in the national prosecution structure and that national rules on disciplinary actions and other matters should apply to them. One delegation has noted that it must be clarified what the notion "connected with his activities" actually means.

²⁷ Some Member States have questioned whether the words "where necessary" are sufficient in order to clarify that Member States do not always need to replace EDP's that leave their position.

²⁸ It has been agreed that the Regulation will include very detailed rules on allocation of cases.

SECTION 4

COMPETENCE OF THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

Article 17

Criminal offences within the competence of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall have competence in respect of the criminal offences affecting the financial interests of the Union, which are provided for in Directive 2014/xx/EU ~~and as implemented by national law~~²⁹. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall exercise this competence on the basis of the applicable national law implementing this Directive.

*Article 18*³⁰

Ancillary competence

1. Where an offence constituting a criminal offence referred to in Article 17 is based on a set of facts which are identical or inextricably linked to a set of facts constituting, in whole or in part under the law of the Member State concerned, a criminal offence other than those referred to in Article 17, the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall also be competent for those other criminal offences, under the condition that the offence referred to in Article 17 is preponderant. Where the offence referred to in Article 17 is not preponderant, the Member State that is competent for the other offence shall also be competent for the offence referred to in Article 17³¹.

²⁹ The competence of the EPPO as determined by this Article raises complex legal issues that will need to be considered further. One of the open issues in this Article is whether a dynamic reference (the standard solution ensuring legal certainty) or a static reference to the substantive law should be chosen. Some delegations would prefer to see the offences defined in this Regulation directly.

³⁰ Many delegations continue to question whether the legal basis in Article 86 TFEU covers this Article.

³¹ The need for this provision has been questioned by some. Others have noted that it must be seen in the light of the right of evocation as foreseen in Article 21a.

2. When assessing whether two set of facts are inextricably linked within the meaning of paragraph 1, account shall be taken as to whether one of the relevant offences has been instrumental in committing the other offence or to whether one offence has been committed with a view to ensuring impunity³².
3. An offence in accordance with Article 17 shall be considered to be preponderant:
 - a) if the damage caused or likely to be caused to the Union exceeds the damage caused or likely to be caused by the same act to the Member State or a third party, or³³,
 - b) in case the same act, under the law of the Member State, constitutes a different type of offence: if the sanction that may be imposed in respect of the offence in accordance with Article 17 is³⁴ more severe than the sanction that may be imposed in respect of the other type of offence.
5. The European Public Prosecutor's Office and the national prosecution authorities shall consult each other in order to determine which authority should exercise its competence pursuant to paragraph 1. Where appropriate to facilitate this choice, Eurojust may be associated in accordance with Article [57].
6. In case of disagreement between the European Public Prosecutor's Office and the national prosecution authorities over the exercise of competence pursuant to this Article, the national authorities competent to decide on the attribution of competences concerning prosecution at national level³⁵ shall decide who shall exercise the ancillary competence.

³² A few delegations have suggested that this provision should rather be a recital. Others have suggested that the text should be given more detail.

³³ Many delegations have pointed out that it would be difficult to measure and compare the financial damage, or that it would at least be difficult to know what the damage is at an early stage of investigation. The assessment of the damage may also change during an investigation. It has been suggested that this rule should be seen as a hierarchical order of criteria. An explanatory recital could be considered to address these concerns.

³⁴ The Commission and some delegations would add the words "equal or" here.

³⁵ Some delegations would prefer to refer to the College or to the Court of Justice for these decisions (linked to Article 33 on judicial review).

Article 19

Exercise of the competence of the European Public Prosecutor's Office

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office has priority competence to investigate and prosecute any criminal offence referred to in Articles 17 and, where applicable, Article 18, where such offence^{36 37}
 - a) was committed in whole or in part within the territory of one or several Member States, or
 - b) was committed by a national of a Member State, or
 - c) when committed outside of these territories by a person who was subject to the Staff Regulations or Conditions of Employment of Other Servants, at the time of the offence, provided that a Member State, according to its law, has jurisdiction for such offences when committed outside its territory.
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall exercise its competence by initiating an investigation in accordance with Article 21 unless the Office has become aware that national authorities have already opened an investigation in respect of the same offence. If the European Public Prosecutor's Office decides to exercise its competence, the national authorities shall not exercise an own competence in respect of the same offence. If the national authorities have already started a criminal investigation in respect of the same offence, the European Public Prosecutor's Office may take over the investigation initiated by the national authority by exercising its right of evocation in accordance with Article 21a³⁸.

³⁶ This jurisdiction provision should at term be in principle identical with the corresponding jurisdiction provision in the PIF-Directive. Some delegations would introduce a reference to "participating Member States" in this and other provisions.

³⁷ One delegation has requested that non-serious offences for which intent is presumed according to national law should not be covered by the competence of the Office.

³⁸ One delegation has requested that non-serious offences for which intent is presumed according to national law should not be covered by the competence of the Office.

CHAPTER IV

RULES OF PROCEDURE ON INVESTIGATIONS, PROSECUTIONS AND TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

SECTION 1 CONDUCT OF INVESTIGATIONS

Article 20

Registration and verification of information

1. The institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union, and, in accordance with applicable national law, the competent authorities of the Member States shall inform³⁹ the European Public Prosecutor's Office of any conduct which might constitute an offence within its competence. Where the conduct caused or is likely to cause damage to the Union's financial interest of less than EUR 10 000, and the national authorities do not have reasons to assume that the Office will exercise its right of evocation in accordance with Article 21a for the reason that the case has ~~does not have~~ repercussions at Union level which require an investigation to be conducted by the Office or has been opened following suspicions that an offence has been committed by officials and other servants of the European Union or members of the institutions, the information obligation may be fulfilled through a summary report [every ~~three~~ months] of conduct which might constitute such offences.⁴⁰ [The report shall include all information that is relevant for the functions of the Office and may be presented in the form of an automatically generated information from a Member State's criminal case management system.⁴¹
2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office collects and may receive any necessary information on conduct which might constitute an offence within its competence.

³⁹ Some delegations have requested that the procedures for providing this information should be described in detail, in particular with a view of ensuring an uncomplicated reporting process.

⁴⁰ One delegation has requested that non-serious offences for which intent is presumed according to national law should not be covered by the information obligation.

⁴¹ This phrase will be developed further, in view of clarifying what information must always be included in the report.

3. Any information brought to the attention of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be registered and verified by the European Public Prosecutor's Office in accordance with the internal rules of procedure. The verification shall aim at assessing whether there are grounds for the European Public Prosecutor's Office to initiate an investigation under this Regulation.
4. Where, upon verification, the European Prosecutor's Office decides that there is no ground to initiate an investigation, the reasons shall be noted in the Case Management System. It shall inform the national authority, the Union institution, body, office or agency, and, where appropriate⁴², the persons who provided the information, thereof.

Article 21

Initiation of investigations and allocation of competences within the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

1. Where, in accordance with applicable national law, there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence within the competence of the European Public Prosecutor's Office is being or has been committed, a European Delegated Prosecutor in a Member State which according to its national law has jurisdiction in the case, or in cases referred to in Article 9(3)(a) a Permanent Chamber, shall initiate an investigation and note this in the Case Management System⁴³. If more than one Member State has jurisdiction, the competence shall in principle be exercised by ~~the European Prosecutor or a European Delegated Prosecutor~~ in from the Member State where the focus of the criminal activity is.

⁴² A few delegations would wish to delete "where appropriate", and a few others would prefer to introduce the words "at their request" as regards persons who provided information.

⁴³ It is the understanding of the Presidency that the notification in the Case Management System will cover the necessary information from the European Delegated Prosecutor to the Central Office.

2. Upon receipt of such information, the Central Office shall verify whether an investigation has not already been initiated by the European Public Prosecutor's Office. If an investigation in respect of the same offence had not already been initiated, the Permanent Chamber may, taking into account the criteria set out in paragraph 3, ~~allocate~~^{assign} the case to a European Delegated Prosecutor ~~with origin~~ in another Member State, which according to its law ~~would have~~^{has} jurisdiction in the case. If an investigation in respect of the same offence has already been initiated by the European Public Prosecutor's Office, the competent Permanent Chamber shall, after consultation with the European Prosecutors and/or European Delegated Prosecutors concerned and taking into account the criteria set out in paragraph 3 of this Article, allocate the case in accordance with Article 12(1).
3. A case shall in principle be handled by a European Delegated Prosecutor from the Member State where the focus of the criminal activity is or, if several connected offences within the competence of the Office have been committed, the Member State where the bulk of the offences has been committed. When allocating a case in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Article, the Permanent Chamber may deviate from that principle on sufficiently justified grounds, taking into account in particular the following criteria, in order of priority:
 - (a) the place where the accused person has his/her habitual residence;
 - (b) the nationality of the accused person;
 - (c) the place where the direct victim has its seat.
4. In the course of an investigation and until a decision to prosecute in accordance with Article 27 is taken, the Permanent Chamber ~~directing~~^{monitoring} a case concerning more than one Member State may, after consultation with the European Prosecutors and/or European Delegated Prosecutors concerned, decide to reallocate a case to a European Delegated Prosecutor in another Member State if such reallocation is in the interest of the efficiency of investigations and in accordance with the general criteria for the choice of competent European Delegated Prosecutor set out in paragraph 3 in this Article.

Article 21a

Right of evocation and transfer of proceedings to the European Public Prosecutor's Office

- ~~1.~~ When a judicial authority or a law enforcement authority of a Member State exercises a competence in respect of an offence referred to in Article 17 or 18, it shall without delay inform the European Public Prosecutor's Office so that the latter may decide whether to exercise its right of evocation. The European Public Prosecutor's Office shall take its decision as soon as possible, ~~but~~ The decision shall be taken no later than [14] days after having received the information from the national authority, unless the European Chief Prosecutor in a specific case takes a reasoned decision to prolong the time frame of [14 days] with a maximum of [14 days]. During this timeperiod the national authority shall refrain from taking any decision under national law which may have the effect of precluding the European Public Prosecutor's Office from exercising its right of evocation. ~~The Member States' judicial and law enforcement authorities are not required to inform the European Public Prosecutor's Office of cases where the damage caused or likely caused by the alleged offender does not exceed 10 000 Euros unless they have reasons to assume that the Office would exercise its right of evocation in accordance with paragraph 2 and 3 of this Article.~~
2. If the European Public Prosecutor's Office is informed in accordance with paragraph 1 or becomes otherwise aware of the fact that an investigation in respect of the same case is already undertaken by the judicial or law enforcement authorities of a Member State, the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall, where appropriate, consult with these authorities and shall thereafter decide⁴⁴ whether to open its own investigation by exercising its right of

⁴⁴ Some Member States would indicate certain conditions under which such a decision could be taken. It has also been suggested that it should be indicated who within the European Public Prosecutor's Office should be entitled to take such decisions. Others have strongly opposed any condition to the right of evocation; some have suggested that the national competence should only be exercised when EPPO has taken a formal decision not to use its own competence.

evocation. Where the European Public Prosecutor's Office exercises its competence, the competent authorities of the Member States shall transfer the proceedings to the Office and refrain from carrying out further acts of investigation in respect of the same offence except when acting on behalf of the European Public Prosecutor's Office in accordance with Article 23.

3. Where a criminal offence caused or is likely to cause damage to the Union's financial interests of less than EUR 10 000, the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall refrain from exercising its right of evocation~~competence~~, unless
 - (a) a case has repercussions at Union level⁴⁵ which require an investigation to be conducted by the Office, or
 - (b) a case has been opened following suspicions that an offence has been committed by officials and other servants of the European Union, or members of the Institutions⁴⁶.

The Office may consult relevant national authorities in view of establishing whether the criteria of the cases defined in (a) and (b) in this provision are fulfilled.

4. The European Public Prosecutor's Office may exercise the right of evocation at any time during the investigation. Where the Office, after having been duly informed by the national authorities in accordance with paragraph 1 in this Article, has refrained from exercising its right of evocation, the competent judicial or law enforcement authority shall at any time in the course of the proceedings inform the Office of any new facts which could give the Office reasons to reconsider its previous decision.
5. In case of an ancillary competence in accordance with Article 18, the European Public Prosecutor's Office ~~can~~may exercise its right of evocation in accordance with the conditions for the exercise of the said competence set out in the said Article.

⁴⁵ Some delegations request that a definition of this concept shall be introduced.

⁴⁶ A few delegations have questioned whether these cases always need to be handled by the Office. Many delegations would like to see a definition or explanation of the concept of "repercussions at Union level" included in the text.

6. The right of evocation in accordance with this Article may be exercised by a European Delegated Prosecutor from any Member State, whose judicial or law enforcement authorities have initiated an own investigation in respect of an offence in accordance with Articles 17 or 18. Article 21(2), (3) and (4) ~~shall~~ will apply when the right of evocation is exercised. When taking a decision to ~~allocate~~ assign the case to a European Delegated Prosecutor from another Member State, the Permanent Chamber shall take due account of the current state of the investigations. Where a European Delegated Prosecutor, who has received the information in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article considers not to exercise the right of evocation, he/she shall inform the competent European Prosecutor and await his/her instructions.

Article 22⁴⁷

Urgent measures

The competent national authorities shall take any urgent measures necessary to ensure effective investigation and prosecution with regard to an offence within the competence of the European Public Prosecutor's Office. If the European Public Prosecutor's Office decides to initiate the investigation or to exercise the right of evocation, it shall confirm, if possible within [48 hours] from the initiation of the investigations, the measures taken by the national authorities, even if such measures have been undertaken and executed under rules other than those of this Regulation.

⁴⁷ The added value of the provision has been questioned by a few delegations.

Article 23

Conducting the investigation⁴⁸

1. The European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case in accordance with Article ~~12(1)~~24 may, in accordance with national law, either undertake the investigation measures on his/her own or instruct the competent law enforcement authorities in the Member State where he/she is located. These authorities shall, in accordance with national law, ensure that all instructions from the European Public Prosecutor's Office, coming through the competent European Delegated Prosecutor, are followed and undertake the investigation measures ~~allocated~~signed to them. The European Delegated Prosecutor shall regularly report on significant developments to the Permanent Chamber, through the competent European Prosecutor.
2. In cross-border cases, where investigation measures need to be executed in another Member State, the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case in accordance with Article 21 shall act in cooperation with the European Delegated Prosecutor where the investigation measure needs to be carried out in accordance with Article 26a.
3. At any time during the investigations, the competent national authorities shall take urgent measures necessary to ensure effective investigations even where not specifically acting under an instruction given by the competent European Delegated Prosecutor. The national authorities shall without delay inform the European Delegated Prosecutor of the urgent measures taken.
4. ~~In the course of an investigation and until a decision to prosecute in accordance with Article 27 is taken, the Permanent Chamber monitoring a case concerning more than one Member State may, after having consulted the European Prosecutor and the European Delegated Prosecutor concerned, decide to reallocate a case to a European Delegated Prosecutor in another Member States, if such reallocation is in the interest of the efficiency of investigations and in accordance with the criteria for jurisdiction set out in Article 21(3).~~

⁴⁸ A general rule on the responsibility of the EDP's as regards the conduct of investigations can be found in Art 12(1). Some delegations have requested that chain of command, according to which EP's always are those instructing EDP's from their own state shall be mentioned explicitly in this provision.

5. The competent European Prosecutor may - with the approval of that Permanent Chamber - in exceptional cases take the decision to conduct the investigation himself/herself, if this appears necessary in the interest of the efficiency of the investigations or prosecution on the grounds of one or more of the following criteria⁴⁹:
- a) the seriousness of the offence, in particular in view of its possible repercussions on Union level;
 - b) when the investigation concerns Members of the institutions of the European Union;
 - c) when the competent European Delegated Prosecutor in the Member State cannot perform the investigation or prosecution.

When a European Prosecutor decides to conduct the investigation himself/herself, he/she will have all the powers of a European Delegated Prosecutor in accordance with national law.

The European Delegated Prosecutors concerned by the case shall be informed without delay of any decision taken under this paragraph.

6. Investigations carried out under the authority of the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall be protected by the rules concerning professional secrecy under the applicable Union legislation. Authorities participating in the investigations of the European Public Prosecutor's Office are also bound to respect professional secrecy as provided under the applicable national law.

⁴⁹ A number of delegations oppose that a European Prosecutor should have any right to take over the conduct of investigations, and argue that it is sufficient that they have the right to supervise and instruct. Some have also suggested that the provision should be more flexible. Many delegations have criticised the wording of the criteria in this provision and asked for better clarity. The Presidency considers that the whole provision will be developed further in detail, in particular as regards applicable national law and judicial review.

Lifting privileges or immunities

1. Where the investigations of the European Public Prosecutor's Office involve persons protected by privileges or immunities under national law, and such privilege or immunity presents an obstacle to a specific investigation being conducted, the European Chief Prosecutor⁵⁰ shall make a reasoned written request for its lifting in accordance with the procedures laid down by that national law.

2. Where the investigations of the European Public Prosecutor's Office involve persons protected by privileges or immunities under the law of the European Union, in particular the Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the European Union, and such privilege or immunity presents an obstacle to a specific investigation being conducted, the European Chief Prosecutor shall make a reasoned written request for its lifting in accordance with the procedures laid down by Union law.

⁵⁰ A number of delegations have suggested that this request should rather be made by European Delegated Prosecutors.

SECTION 2

INVESTIGATION MEASURES

Article 25

The European Public Prosecutor's Office's authority to investigate

1. The European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case shall be entitled to order the same types of investigative measures in his/her Member State which are available to investigators/prosecutors according to national law in similar national cases. In addition to the conditions set out in national law, such measures may only be ordered where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the specific investigation measure in question might provide information or evidence useful to the investigation, and where there is no less intrusive measure available which could achieve the same objective.
- ~~2. Before ordering any investigation measure referred to in Article 26, the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case shall request the authorisation of the competent national court.~~
3. Where the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case, or a competent authority acting on his/her instructions in accordance with Article 23(1), undertakes investigative measures, the law of the Member State in which the measures are undertaken shall apply.

Article 26

Investigation measures⁵¹

Where the offence subject to the investigation would cause or is likely to cause a damage of [100,000] EUR or more, Member States shall ensure that the following investigative measures are also available under their laws to the European Public Prosecutor's Office:

- a) search any premises, land, means of transport, private home, clothes and any other personal property or computer system, and any conservatory measures necessary to preserve their integrity or to avoid the loss or contamination of evidence;

⁵¹ There are many diverging views on the content of this provision. This text is an attempt by the Presidency to reconcile as many as possible of the views expressed by delegations. A recital similar to recital 10 in the EIO Directive will give an explanation of the term "available" in the first paragraph.

- b) obtain the production of any relevant object or document, or of stored computer data, including traffic data and banking account data, encrypted or decrypted, either in original or in some other specified form;
- c) freeze instrumentalities or proceeds of crime, including freezing of assets, which are expected to be subject to confiscation by the trial court and there is reason to believe that the owner, possessor or controller will seek to frustrate the judgement ordering confiscation;
- d) freeze future financial transactions, by ordering any financial or credit institution to refrain from carrying out any financial transaction involving any specified account or accounts held or controlled by the suspected person;
- e) intercept electronic communications to and from the suspected person, on any electronic communication connection that the suspected person is using.

Article 26a⁵²

Cross-border investigations

1. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall assist each other in cross-border cases. Where an investigation measure needs to be undertaken in a Member State other than the Member State of the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case, the latter (“handling European Delegated Prosecutor”) shall notify the European Delegated Prosecutor located in the Member State where that investigation measure needs to be carried out (“assisting European Delegated Prosecutor”).
2. The handling European Delegated Prosecutor may notify any investigation measure in his or her competence in accordance with this Regulation or with national law of the Member State where he or she is located. The adoption and justification of such measures shall be governed by the law of the Member States of the handling European Delegated Prosecutor. The enforcement of such measures conditions, modalities and procedures for taking such measures shall be governed by the law of the Member State of the assisting European Delegated Prosecutor.

⁵² There are many diverging views on the content of this provision. This text is an attempt by the Presidency to reconcile as many as possible of the views expressed by delegations.

3. Where ~~this Regulation~~ or the law of the Member State of the handling European Delegated Prosecutor requires a judicial authorisation for the measure in question, that European Delegated Prosecutor shall obtain the authorisation according to national law and/or in accordance with special procedural requirements provided for by the law of the Member State of the handling European Delegated Prosecutor.
4. The notification shall set out, in particular, a description of the investigative measures(s) needed, including the evidence to be obtained, and where necessary any specific formalities that have to be complied with, a description of the facts and the legal qualification of the criminal act which is the subject of the investigation. The request may call for the measure to be undertaken within a given time.
5. Where the law of the Member State of the assisting European Delegated Prosecutor requires judicial authorisation for a particular investigative measure, the said European Delegated Prosecutor shall seek such authorisation. The authorisation may only be refused if the measures are contrary to fundamental principles of law of the assisting State.
6. The assisting European Delegated Prosecutor shall undertake the notified measure, or another investigative measure that would achieve the same result, or ask the competent national authority to do so.
7. Where the assisting European Delegated Prosecutor considers that:
 - a) the notification is incomplete or contains a manifest relevant error,
 - b) the measure cannot be undertaken within the time limit set out in the notification for justified and objective reasons,
 - c) a less intrusive measure would achieve the same results as the measure requested, or
 - d) the notified measure does not exist or would not be available in a similar domestic case under the law of his or her Member State,he or she shall consult with the handling European Delegated Prosecutor in order to resolve the matter bilaterally. This consultation shall take no longer than [5] working days.

8. If the European Delegated Prosecutors cannot resolve the matter and the request is maintained, the matter shall be referred to the competent Permanent Chamber. The same applies where the notified measure is not undertaken within the time limit set out in the notification or within a reasonable time.
9. The competent Permanent Chamber shall decide without undue delay whether and by when the measure needed, or a substitute measure, shall be undertaken by the assisting European Delegated Prosecutor, and communicate this decision through the competent European Prosecutor.

Article 26b

Pre-trial arrest and cross-border surrender

1. The European Public Prosecutor's Office may request from the competent judicial authority the arrest or pre-trial detention of the suspected person in accordance with national law.
2. Where the arrest and surrender of a person who is not present in the Member State in which the European Delegated Prosecutor handling the case is located, is necessary, the latter shall request, for the purpose of conducting a criminal prosecution, the competent authority of that Member State to issue a European Arrest Warrant in accordance with Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States.

SECTION 3

TERMINATION OF THE INVESTIGATION AND POWERS OF PROSECUTION

Article 27⁵³

Prosecution before national courts

- ~~1. The European Delegated Prosecutors shall have the same powers as national public prosecutors in respect of investigations, prosecution and bringing a case to judgment in their Member States of origin, in particular the power to present trial pleas, participate in evidence taking and exercise the available remedies.~~

⁵³ It has suggested that a new Article with an enumeration of the decisions that the Office can take to terminate an investigation are indicated should be introduced before this provision.

2. When the competent European Delegated Prosecutor considers the investigation to be completed, he/she shall submit a summary of the case with, where applicable, a draft indictment and the list of evidence⁵⁴ to the competent European Prosecutor and Permanent Chamber for review. Where it does not instruct to dismiss the case pursuant to Article 28, the Permanent Chamber, acting through the competent European Prosecutor, shall instruct the European Delegated Prosecutor to bring the case before the competent national court with an indictment, or refer it back for further investigations. If the European Delegated Prosecutor has not received any instruction in this sense within [x working days], it may decide to bring the case to the competent national Court on its proper initiative.
3. The competent Permanent Chamber shall determine, in close consultation with the European Delegated Prosecutor submitting the case and bearing in mind the proper administration of justice, the Member State in which the prosecution shall be brought. The Permanent Chamber shall in principle bring the prosecution in the Member State of the European Delegated Prosecutor ~~allocated~~ signed the case in accordance with Article 21(2). The Chamber may determine another Member State if there are sufficiently justified grounds related to the criteria for determining the competent European Delegated Prosecutor in Article 21 (2) and (3)⁵⁵.
4. The competent national court is determined on the basis of national law.
5. Where necessary for the purposes of recovery, administrative follow-up or monitoring, the Central Office shall notify the competent national authorities, the interested persons and the relevant Union institutions, bodies, agencies of the decision taken by the European Public Prosecutor's Office in accordance with this Regulation.

⁵⁴ A number of delegations would prefer the deletion of the words "and the list of evidence"

⁵⁵ Many have called for specific rules on judicial review of the decision on jurisdiction of trial.

Article 28

Dismissal of the case

1. The competent Permanent Chamber shall, on proposal from the European Delegated Prosecutor, dismiss the case against a person where prosecution has become impossible on account of any of the following grounds⁵⁶:
 - a) death of the suspected person;
 - b) amnesty granted in the state which has jurisdiction in the case;
 - c) immunity granted to the suspect, unless it has been lifted.
 - d) expiry of the national statutory limitation⁵⁷ to prosecute;
 - e) the suspected person has already been finally acquitted or convicted of the same facts within the Union or the case has been dealt with in accordance with Article 29;
 - f) lack of relevant evidence.
- ~~2. The European Public Prosecutor's Office may refer cases dismissed by it to OLAF or to the competent national administrative or judicial authorities for recovery, other administrative follow-up or monitoring.~~
3. A decision in accordance with paragraph 1 shall not bar further investigations on the basis of new facts, which could not have been known to the European Public Prosecutor's Office at the time of the decision and which became known hereafter and before expiry of applicable statutory limitations in all Member States where the case can be brought to judgment.

⁵⁶ Delegations have made a number of suggestions as regards the grounds. A criterion regarding permanently deranged persons has been called for, and a link to the prescription rules has also been asked for.

⁵⁷ The question under which national law this should be assessed in cross-border cases has been raised.

4. Where a case has been ~~finally~~ dismissed, the Central Office shall officially notify the competent national law enforcement and judicial authorities and shall inform the relevant Union institutions, bodies and agencies, as well as the injured party, thereof.⁵⁸ The cases dismissed may also be referred to OLAF or to competent national administrative or judicial authorities for recovery, other administrative follow-up or monitoring.
5. Where an investigation initiated by the European Public Prosecutor's Office reveals that the conduct subject to investigation constitutes a criminal offence, which is not within its competence, the European Public Prosecutor's Office shall refer the case without delay to the competent national law enforcement and judicial authorities.

⁵⁸ ~~The right of victims of review of such decisions should be addressed here or in a general provision. A number of delegations have also requested that a more detailed rule on *ne bis in idem* should be inserted in this Article.~~