EUROPEAN UNION
THE COUNCIL

Brussels, 11 June 1999

9148/99

LIMITE

EVAL 38
ELARG 78

OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS

of :	Collective Evaluation Group
dated :	June 4, 1999
No. prev. doc.:	8867/99 EVAL 37 ELARG 73

I. Agenda item 1: Adoption of the agenda:

The agenda was adopted as set out in telex nº 2452 of 26 May 1999

The presidency informed the group about the discussion of the report of the group (doc. 7695/3/99 REV 3 EVAL 32 ELARG 47) at the Council of Ministers on May 28, 1999. This report was taken note of very positively by the Council of Ministers.

Some delegations favoured the idea of using the finalised country reports for evaluating the financing further Cupertino programmes with the respective country.

II. Agenda item 2: Preliminary draft country report on Estonia:

1. General discussion:

The presidency presented its revised draft country report on Estonia which contained comments given by some delegations be it in writing be it orally at the last meeting of the group.

The revised version of this report was very much welcome by the group.

One delegation stressed that its own embassy in Estonia reported a different overall picture of the situation in Estonia than given by the draft report and the various information given by other Member States and their embassies in Estonia. Also the report given by the Commission's delegation in Estonia is considered as too negative. The presidency invited this Member State to hand over to the group this report by its embassy.

Another delegation asked for taking into account also questions of data protection in the respective countries. Delegations were invited to hand over to the General Secretariat all available information on the method of data protection in Estonia.

The report was discussed in detail as described in the following:

2. ad Point B (Alignment with the acquis in certain areas):

In paragraph 3 the English version needs to be aligned with the German version. The text should further precise what kind of agreement had been concluded with Russia.

One delegation informed the group that the agreement on co-operation between four law-enforcement bodies of 1994 did not work very well in practise. This was the reason for another co-operation agreement concluded in 1998 between the police and the customs authorities, which works quite well.

3. ad Point C. I. (Safeguarding the external frontiers):

Delegations stressed that numbers should only be used, if they were necessary to indicate certain tendencies. The reference to the President of the Republic should be deleted, and also the word "urgently" on page 6 point 2. Also the reference to the way of border control in Latvia should be deleted.

One delegation informed the group that its embassy in Estonia has reported a different view of the situation than reflected in the draft report and the information given by the Commission delegation in Estonia. The presidency invited this delegation to hand over to the group this report by its embassy.

Clarification was given that the term "blue border" referred to sea borders alone and not to lake borders.

4. ad Point C. II (Migration):

Point 1 needs to be clarified. In point 4 the reference to EU standards was in this wording wrong, the sentence will be deleted. Also the question, whether the existence of readmission agreements with third countries is really necessary, will have to be discussed further, since some Member States themselves do not have concluded readmission agreements with third countries.

The difference in the time schedule on page 6 (year 2000) on the one hand and on page 8 (year 2002) on the other hand still needs to be clarified.

5. ad Point C. III (Asylum):

Some delegations stressed that there is a need to look for further sources of information on this issue. This concerns also the preparation for accession to the Dublin Convention.

One delegation expressed the wish to include into the report a statement that until now in no single case asylum had been granted.

6. ad Point C. IV (Police):

Agreement was reached that corruption as stated in point 6. was no "major" problem, but just a normal problem.

Discussion arose whether the use of intelligence service data for the fight against crime should be allowed or not, since in many Member States such a co-operation between services is done.

All delegations were again invited to hand over to the General Secretariat of the Council in writing all additional information concerning this report an their comments thereto before the next meeting.

III. Agenda item 3. Other business:

The Commission asked for another discussion of the preliminary draft country report on Poland, since some remarks made by the Commission had not been taken into account in that report. Agreement was reached to discuss the report briefly at the next meeting again. The Presidency underlined that it would take note of all wishes of amendments, however, the changes would not be anymore done under German Presidency. Since all country reports will have to be updated again, the necessary changes will be done under the following Presidencies.

Delegations also wished to discuss at the next meeting what to do with the country reports. The idea was pronounced to hand the reports over to the Council working group on enlargement. Issues of the second pillar of the European Union should not be taken up in this working group on collective evaluation.