

91 W 7  
005

**EUROPEAN UNION  
THE COUNCIL**

**Brussels, 24 August 1994 (04.10)  
(OR. en/d)**

**8935/94**

**RESTREINT**

**ASIM 161  
(FX DOC)**

**NOTE**

---

**from : Presidency**

**to : Working Party on False Documents**

---

**No. prev. doc.: WGI 1324  
6367/94 ASIM 77**

---

**Subject: Membership of the Editorial Board (Fraud Bulletin)**

---

The Presidency has prepared the attached paper in preparation for the discussions to be held on the above topic by the Working Party on False Documents.

So far several suggestions have been made with a view to allowing as many Member States as possible to become involved on the Editorial Board in the choice of articles to be placed in the *Forgery Bulletin*, without prejudice to the need for editorial responsibilities to be restricted to a relatively small circle.

These suggestions ranged from having a simple rotating system involving two States being replaced by others each year, to maintaining a permanent core of Member States with the addition of "Troika" States, where these were not actually members of the core group, together with rotating observer States (6367 ASIM 77, page 2, paragraph 3).

So far, representatives of different delegations have indicated their interest and taken part as observers.

The German delegation has fleshed out the proposals referred to in 6367 ASIM 77 to clarify them for practical purposes.

The suggestions were essentially as follows:

**Suggestion 1: Rotating System for the core group**

i.e: Each year two States from the previous core group would be replaced by States which so far have not been represented.

To date the following countries have been represented on the Editorial Board

- Belgium
- Germany
- France
- Netherlands
- United Kingdom

were the rotation system to be organized according to alphabetical order, this would mean that the Editorial Board was made up as follows: (Members of the core group are indicated with an asterisk):

**Example for 1995:**

- Belgium and \*
- Germany \*

withdraw, to be replaced by

- Denmark and
- Greece

**Example for 1996:**

- France \*
- Netherlands \*

withdraw, to be replaced by

- Ireland
- Italy

**Composition in 1995**

- France \*
- Netherlands \*
- United Kingdom \*
- Denmark
- Greece

**Composition in 1996**

- United Kingdom \*
- Belgium \*
- Germany \*
- Ireland
- Italy

**Suggestion 2: Permanent core with rotating observer States**

i.e. the existing core of the Editorial Board together with representatives from

- Belgium
- Germany
- France
- Netherlands
- United Kingdom

remains. Two or three additional Member States are added as observers during the annual rotation. The Editorial Board would be composed as follows over the next few years (members of the core group are indicated with an asterisk):

**Example 1995:**

**Example 1996:**

observers added in alphabetical order are the following:

- |           |              |
|-----------|--------------|
| - Denmark | - Italy      |
| - Greece  | - Luxembourg |
| - Ireland | - Portugal   |

**Composition in 1995**

**Composition in 1996**

- |                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| - Belgium *        | - Belgium *        |
| - Germany *        | - Germany *        |
| - France *         | - France *         |
| - Netherlands *    | - Netherlands *    |
| - United Kingdom * | - United Kingdom * |
| - Denmark          | - Italy            |
| - Greece           | - Luxembourg       |
| - Ireland          | - Portugal         |

It should be noted that sometimes the delegation of the Member State holding the Presidency of the European Union during the period in question is still on the Board; so that there would

always be up to nine Member States on the Editorial Board with active responsibility.

With a view to solving this question, the German delegation submits the following compromise proposal which contains a flexible rule directly related to the extent of involvement with the European Forgery Bulletin.

**Compromise proposal: Core group and Contributors**

1. The existing core group should make a sustained effort to promote the hitherto generally undisputed positive further development and improvement of the Bulletin and ensure that a careful and judicious selection of articles is made in accordance with existing directives.
2. In addition, those Member States which have submitted contributions to the European Bulletin for the forthcoming meeting should be able to take part alongside the core group in the meeting of the Editorial Board in order to be able to explain the contributions which they have submitted.

This should also enable the legitimate interests in the selection procedure of those Member States who are not represented on the Editorial Board to be taken into account. A strict ruling would therefore be unnecessary and every Member State would itself have a say in its participation.

3. To request to be present when a given Member State's interests are affected, should be in the interests not only of the individual delegations but also in those of the General Secretariat as Member States' representatives can follow up individual contributions,

learning immediately of the reason(s) why their contribution may have been queried or not accepted.

This direct feedback to the individual Member States will

- prevent the continued recurrence of mistakes
- avoid the need for corrections, subsequent assessments, re-submission and further duplication at General Secretariat level
- cut costs and save time
- improve the uniformity and quality of the information collected
- ease the burden of work for the Editorial Board and reduce the length of the selection procedure.

4. To sum up, this proposal would ensure that the editorial board is staffed according to the requirements of each meeting, as in addition to the core group and the Presidency – should individual requests made to that effect – Member States' representatives who submitted contributions by the previous deadline would be present at the Editorial Board meeting.

The proposed ruling would always be confined to those Member States affected by the selection procedure and consequently able to justify an interest in an evaluation of their articles.

Under these arrangements, the core group would retain responsibility for the text, on generally recognized grounds of efficiency.

---