

D1.8 Second Annual Periodic Activities

18/04/2019



**Best practices for EUROpean COORDination on
investigative measures and evidence gathering**

Version FINAL

Preparation date February 2019

Deliverable D1.8

Work Package Insert WS0

Authors: Sandra Vilaplana (External) on behalf of University of Burgos

Approved by Coordinator on: 18/04/2018

Dissemination level: CO (only project partners)

JUST/2015/ACTION GRANTS

Technical Report on Progress

Agreement Number	723198
Project Title	Best practices for EUROpean COORDination on investigative measures and evidence gathering
Name of the Beneficiary/Coordinator	Universidad de Burgos (UBU)

Contact details	Name: Universidad de Burgos Address: Hospital del Rey, Postal code: 09001 City: Burgos Country: Spain E-mail: mjimeno@ubu.es Phone:
------------------------	---

Co-beneficiaries and Associate Partners (Name + Country)	<i>Co-beneficiaries</i> 1. UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID (UCM) 2. UNIVERSITAT DEGLI STUDI DI PALERMO (UNIPA) 3. UNIWESYTET JAGIELLONSKY (UJ)
Dates of project implementation (Article I.2.2 of the Grant Agreement)	Start date: 01 – 12-2016 End date: 28- 12- 2019 (Amended, 17 Oct 2018)
Period covered by the report	01-12-2018 / 28-02-2019
Project website(s) (if applicable)	http://eurocoord.eu/

PART 1 – RESULTS AND IMPACT OF THE PROJECT

1.1. Present the main achievement of your project so far

Objectives

EUROCOORD main objective was to promote judicial cooperation by developing systematic research and generating specific knowledge and tools addressed to the different stakeholders to contribute to the efficient and coherent application of the Directive 2014/41/EU on the European Investigation Order (EIO) in criminal matters and other relevant regulations.

Concretely, the specific objectives of the project were

- a) to generate the required knowledge to optimise the implementation of the EIO in criminal matters, specifically, the transmission of evidence and its admissibility;
- b) to provide relevant stakeholders with the competencies and protocols needed in order to make easier the cooperation and admissibility of evidence across different countries and
- c) to raise awareness, disseminate the knowledge generated and train professionals with a multiplying potential.

In order to reach the mentioned objective, the activities achieved were:

- a) desk and qualitative research on the EOI judicial framework;
- b) development of a Code of Best Practices,
- c) training courses and seminars addressed to different target groups and
- d) launch of the European Observatory on EOI and beyond on criminal matters.

The final beneficiaries were more than 300 researches in the field of Criminal Law -300 prosecutors and judges, 800 law enforcement officers (100 people directly), 28 EU National Authorities, 400 defence lawyers, more than 30 NGOs (100 people directly) and even 200 accused individuals

The main expected results of the project were:

- a) Research reports on national and cross-border criminal proceedings;
- b) Code of Best Practices for the EIO in criminal matters;
- c) Open debate for assessment and implementation of the EIO and beyond through the European Observatory;
- d) Syllabus, training resources and training seminars addressed to target groups; f) Websites (4), Communication campaigns (2) -Press releases (4) -Newsletters (2) -Peer-reviewed articles (4) -Conference (1)

Impact: Results and impacts

- *Outcome of the project (so far) and its (actual and expected) impact*

The general outcome of the project was to improve and optimize judicial application of European Investigation Order. The time is right for purpose an in-depth research as long as mostly of the Member States (Spain included) they have not yet fully implemented EOI: the EOI will have been applied by **May 22, 2017**.

Due to the fact that national legal traditions in the area of investigative procedures and evidence gathering measures were highly diverse and the protection and transmission of evidence is sometimes an uncovered issue, a Code of Best Practice has long been needed, and developed as an outcome in Eurocoord project, which is Deliverable D4.3 and D4.4). In addition, there is a comparative analysis about the impact and effectiveness of existing measures taken and national legislation was adopted, from a comprehensive and integrative perspective (Deliverables 2.1,2.2, 3.1,3.2 and 3.3)

In addition, will be activated by the dissemination and communication activities performed around the website involving the entire community and stakeholders, providing to all European Society as a whole with a comprehensive framework of collaborative, scientific driven approach with the widest possible participation.

Main project website is English language; also, will be elaborated for the training courses and seminars that will be designed and implemented, focused on specific target groups and adapted to their requirements and needs.

Experts and professionals within and outside the initial Consortium will be engaged in a debate through the generation of the European Observatory of the EIO implementation focused on the enhancement of coordination initiatives on criminal matters across the EU. The activities developed in this proposal were aimed to enforce the experience and knowledge in legal background and practices for all stakeholders taken as a whole in relation with the topic of European Investigation Order. Most of the researchers involved in the project work on criminal procedure and arbitration, as well as fair trial rights, judicial organisation and have a wider experience on European framework for criminal matters, were being concerned about the main requirements of the Directives and the need for a well-balanced proportion among the investigative measures and civil rights.

Thus, in summary, concrete results from our project, were:

- Definition of a common methodology for the scientific research, assuring its validity through a systematic and scientific framework (WP₁, Task1; WP₃, Task1)
- Specific analysis of 3 countries, Spain, Poland and Italy on National jurisprudence and legal protection (WP₂- Jurisprudence: T3// Outputs 3 and 4; WP₃ – Legal protection: T2 and T3 // Output 4)
- Current situation of European Investigation Order at European level (WP₂, T5 and T6)
- Compilation of practices for evidence gathering and transmission in Europe as a whole, and, specifically, Spain, Italy and Poland (WP₄-T1 // Output 1)
- Code of Best Practice for evidence admissibility in cross-border criminal proceedings (WP₄-T3: Final version// Outputs 3 and 4)
- Dissemination of the research outputs among all the relevant stakeholders (WP₅ // Outputs 6,4 and 7)
- Training resources and courses implementation segmented accordingly to the target groups identified. (WP₄-T3: Syllabus; WP₅-T4: implementation, LMS and webinars // Output 5)
- The website EUROCOORD, it will include 4 online seminars as webinars through the website Moodle” in charge of UJ, UOP (UNIPA) and UCM
- European Observatory for European Investigation Order (WP₅-T5)
- Participation in international and national conferences with the highest impact on this field (WP₅-T7 and T8)
- Big impact event was organized by the consortium: “The European Investigation Order and the Code of Best Practices International Conference”, which was held in Madrid, Spain on 14th February 2019. (WP₅-T8)

- • Maintenance of web page <http://www.eurocoord.eu> , also after the conclusion of the project.

The Prosecutors, Courts, security forces and officers, State and Justice Administration and other associations focused on the human rights, as well as the accused parts, were directly benefited:

- Scientific researches in the field of Criminal Law, Procedural Law or European Judicial area (300 people).
- Judicial staff, including prosecutors and judges (300 people)
- National Authorities (28, as EU Member States)
- Law enforcements authorities and professionals with practical knowledge and expertise authorized to carry on coercive measures or enforcement actions, such as police officers and security officials (approx. 800 people); 100 individuals involved directly in the training courses. 700 people will be reached through the Dissemination actions and communication campaigns.
- Legal aid lawyers and defense lawyers (400 lawyers)
- NGOs and, as it expected via indirect impact, Social Services workers (100 people directly involved with training courses specifically focused on these requirements and 1000 people reached indirectly by communication campaigns)
- Accused individuals in foreign countries (approx. 200 individuals)

- *European added value*

EUROCOORD aimed to generate the knowledge and provide a forum to support the implementation and application of the EOI in criminal matters. The consortium, therefore, covered very different procedural and legal contexts, by including experts and researchers from 3 different countries (Italy, Spain and Poland) and professionals and interested stakeholders as associate partners.

Moreover, the outputs expected covered a wide range of tools and deliverables aiming to multiply the impact of the action taken and the final number of persons benefiting from the project activities. At this concern, part of the tasks implemented were directly addressed to ensure the transferability of the results. Thus, the Code of Best Practices provides concrete guidelines and harmonized proceeding recommendations to be used across Europe, in the countries involved in the project and beyond. In addition, key elements of EUROCOORD providing an extraordinary European value to this project were the design and implementation of an ambitious and comprehensive dissemination and exploitation strategy. Among the activities, the European Observatory of the EIO in criminal matters aimed to become a European platform not only for raising awareness and knowledge transfer, but also a reference site for Member States to get support and tools to adopt practices and procedures supporting the implementation of the mentioned Order.

Finally, and as part of the sustainability strategy, the project team will transfer the knowledge to other Universities (in EU but also internationally), by means of research stays (nationally funded), after the project ends.

1.2. Ethical issues (max. 1/2 page)

Were you faced with any ethical issues during the implementation of the project? How did you solve them?

No relevant ethical issues or concerns have arisen up to now in the development of the project. The only aspect that might indirectly have some impact on ethics, although it is more

an issue of data protection, was found while collecting data from professionals who have been interviewed in the framework of **WS2**. In this sense, the anonymity of each person who has been interviewed is assured in accordance with present Directive 95/46/EC of 24 October 1995 as well as Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of 27 April 2016 coming into force from 25 May 2018, providing that Member States jointly must set legally binding rules for the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data. These measures are necessary because of the nature of using real information to generate data and thus rely to a large degree on very sensitive information about and statements of individual persons.

In addition, compliance with this ethical commitment has been developed in accordance with the Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research (2010). According to section H “researchers must consider protection of personal data, but also data that refer to/is or has been obtained from various settings (such as cultural heritage, public space, video and audio recordings, mapping etc.). There are three different categories to which data protection refer: the users, the providers and the environment. All these different aspects must be taken into account when devising mechanisms for data protection in the course of research (including publication of findings and dissemination to the general public). There is an internationally recognized and globally accepted standard (such as ISO/IEC 27001:2005) that can be used by SSH researchers”.

In relation with the present research the ethical issue concerning the data protection as specified shall be solved with the internal employment of interviews answering the both model of questionnaires created by the team (first one addressed to judges and prosecutors, second one addressed to lawyers and NGOs). In this context both models of interviews are deliverables according the project description and shall be made public to European Commission as well as in EUROCOORD webpage. But it shall not be the case of the concrete interviews answered by addressees whose written text and even video-recording only shall be employed by researchers making publically available the further methodology and evaluation report.

<p>1.3. Conclusions and recommendations for the European Commission in terms of <u>legislation/policy-making</u> (if applicable)</p>



The conclusions drawn from the EUROCOORD Project as it were identified in the first progress report:

- The infringement of the maximum timeframe in implementing the European legislation by several Member States as it is here the case of Poland and Spain in relation with the EIO, which should be transposed by last 22 May 2017 according to Art. 36 (1) Directive 2014/41/EU. At the moment in relation with the countries participating in the present project only Italy has introduced a national legislation related to EIO as it is Legislative Decree n. 108 of 21 June 2017 (*Gazette Ufficiale* n. 162 on 13 July 2017), entered into force on 28 July 2017. Poland is carrying on amendment on Art.589 Criminal Procedure Code and Spain has a Draft Law now in Congress modifying Act 23/2014, of 20 November, on mutual recognition of judicial decisions in criminal matters in the European Union. This conclusion derives from WS1.
- The discordance between theoretical and practical background as far as, according to judicial practice, not always legislative prescriptions are observed; this causes sometimes reduction of procedural guarantees to parties, who are involved in criminal proceedings. In this context the aim to improve the international judicial cooperation is seen as a priority from the Spanish perspective but practice is different according to different policies in foreign countries. This conclusion derives from WS2.
- There is the need to provide a a guide in order to establish a common framework on the judicial practice related to application of European instruments of mutual recognition between Member States and different practitioners introducing best practices on it as it is here proposed. Also, relevant knowledge on European judicial area should be provided to some practitioners as far as not all of them are familiarized with EU Law as well as the need to establish coordination between different European mutual recognition instruments (eg between EAW and EIO). This is the task of WS3, whose conclusions shall be presented on due time.
- There is also need to spread information and knowledge on EU legal instruments on mutual recognition and approximation of legislations in order to guarantee procedural rights as it is here the future practice on EIO to different target groups (academia, practitioners,..). In this context the development of activities proposed under the dissemination plans carried out by different partners are essential and contain the package of WS4.

PART 2 – WORKSTREAMS AND ACTIVITIES

2.1. Implementation of the Workstreams

► Workstream 0 – Management and Coordination of the Project

I. Activities

Implemented activities

1. Brussels Kick-off meeting with the Commission
2. Project kick- off meeting in Burgos (M1).
3. 2nd project meeting in Palermo (M6).
4. 3rd project meeting in Madrid (M12).

5. 4th project meeting in Varsaw (M24)
6. Final project meeting in Madrid (M27)
7. Project monitoring and steering committee.
8. Administrative and financial management
9. Ethics management
10. Preliminary evaluation

Unforeseen activities

N/A

II. Output(s)

Output 1: Project Handbook

Output 2: Kick-off-meeting report and 2nd project meeting report

Output 3: First annual Periodic Activities report (M12)

Output 4: Second annual Periodic Activities report (M24)

Output 5: Monitoring meetings and external evaluations..

➤ Workstream 1: Title: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN JURISPRUDENCE AND LEGISLATION

I. Activities

Implemented activities

1. Comparative Research Methodology: A common methodology has been established in order to compile legislation, jurisprudence and references related to the implementation of Directive 2014/41/EU on the EIO in Italy, Spain and Poland in a uniform manner. In the first part, the text – departing from the experience in the application of FD 2002/584/JHA on the European Arrest Warrant – has focused on specific general issues which are deemed as problematic in the process of implementation of Directive, such as the concept of coercive measure, the definition of issuing authority, the role of defence, grounds for non-recognition or non-execution the EIO. In the second part, the text has highlighted some questions related to specific investigative measures in order to assess if the regulation at national level can affect judicial cooperation in this field. Among investigative measures, the one that poses more problems, especially at practical level, is the interception of telecommunications, on which is requested a detailed analysis. Another topic to investigate is related to the utilisation at national level of evidence gathered abroad through the EIO.

2. Jurisprudence Analysis at national (Spain, Italy and Poland) and European level. This activity was implemented first in Italy. Partners were monitoring how public prosecutors and judges are applying Legislative Decree of 21 June 2017, n° 108, entered into force on 28 July 2017, by which Italy has implemented Directive on EIO. At this regard it is useful the Handbook on the EIO addressed by the Minister of Justice to Public Prosecutors and judges with the aim to establish common practices in the application of this new instrument of judicial cooperation. The above mentioned Legislative decree is very recent so at the moment there is not any judgment of our Supreme Court.

3. Interview addressed to judicial authorities and involved juridical practitioners. This activity was implemented. Interviews were conducted with Italian, Spanish and Poland public prosecutors and judges who have experience in the field of judicial cooperation. Besides a interviews with defence lawyers were performed.

5. Comparative analysis and assessment of the results. A report on three countries national legislation regarding the EIO was carried out, following the structure defined in the Comparative Research Methodology.

Unforeseen activities

N/A

II. Output(s)

Output 1: Compilation Framework, only electronic.

Output 2: Research at EU level with specific analysis of 3 countries.

Output 3: Deliverable: Current legal and related situation of EIO, evidence gathering and accused protection

Output 4: National reports on EOI and common practices

➤ **Workstream 2:** Title: **COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH ON LEGAL PROTECTION IN THE EU MEMBER STATES UNDER THE EOI PROVISION**

I. Activities

Implemented activities

1. Elaboration of both models of open questionnaires in English addressed to judges and public prosecutors (model 1, 22 questions) and lawyers and NGOs (model 2, 18 questions) related to their training and practice on judicial cooperation, specifically on the topic of cross-border evidence. Both deliverables.

2. Interviews to the targeted practitioners have been carried out, either in person or via skype taking notes and even recording, whenever this was possible and consent was provided in national languages (Italian, Polish and Spanish). In the case of Spain 18 judges and public prosecutors have been interviewed as well as 6 independent lawyers and lawyers working in NGOs, mostly of them practising in Madrid. The partners faced great difficulty in identifying lawyers to be interviewed, either because not so many offer the adequate profile –for not so many deal with transnational criminal cases–, or because they were reluctant to share their experience, or did not want to expose themselves before University Professors.

3. The elaboration of a common methodology on judicial practice to assess the interviews carried out: one document common for all partners (deliverable).

4. The elaboration of assessment compiling and evaluating results derived from interviews to diverse practitioners in the participating countries: three documents, each for different partner.

Unforeseen activities

N/A

II. Output(s)

Output 1: Diagnosis of the current situation related to legal framework on judicial cooperation in criminal matters pointing the different international and European legal instruments at the moment employed.

Output 2: Diagnosis of the current situation related to judicial practice in international and European judicial cooperation in criminal matters specifically addressed to the admissibility and transmission of evidence; in sum, how it operates at the moment with illustrative experiences.

Output 3: Diagnosis of the current gaps related to legal framework and judicial practice to be used in the further elaboration of the Code of Best Practices (WS 3).

Other outputs associated to EUROCOORD as example:

- BACHMAIER WINTER, L., 'Cross-border investigation of tax offences in the EU: scope of application and grounds for refusal of the European Investigation Order', *European Criminal Law Review* 2017, vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 46-66.
- BACHMAIER WINTER, L., 'Mutual recognition and cross-border interception of communications: the way ahead for the European Investigation Order', in C. Brière and A. Weyembergh (eds.), *The needed balances in EU Criminal Law: past, present and future*, Hart Publishing, West Sussex, 2017, pp. 313-336.
- CAJI website: <http://www.ubu.es/la-cooperacion-judicial-civil-y-penal-en-el-ambito-de-la-union-europea-instrumentos-procesales-caji>
- Conference *Espacio judicial europeo y proceso penal*, Burgos, 4-5/5/17, 100 participants, <http://www.ubu.es/la-cooperacion-judicial-civil-y-penal-en-el-ambito-de-la-union-europea-instrumentos-procesales-caji/cursos-y-congresos/espacio-judicial-europeo-y-proceso-penal>
- EUROCOORD website: <http://eurocoord.eu>
- JIMENO BULNES, M. 'Orden europea de investigación en material penal', in M. Jimeno Bulnes (coord.), *Aproximación legislativa versus reconocimiento mutuo en el desarrollo del espacio judicial europeo: una perspectiva multidisciplinar*, Bosch, Barcelona, 2016, pp. 151-210. Printed in Spanish, 100 copies.
- JIMENO BULNES, M. 'Orden de investigación en material penal: una perspectiva europea y española', in T. Bene, L. Luparia and L. Marafioti (eds.), *L'ordine europeo di indagine. Criticità e prospettive*, Giappichelli Editore, Torino, 2016, pp. 24-56.
- JIMENO BULNES, M. 'Brexit and the future of European Criminal Law – A Spanish perspective', *Criminal Law Forum* 2017, vol. 28, n. 2, pp. 325-347.
- JIMENO BULNES, M. (coord.), *Espacio judicial europeo y proceso penal*, Tecnos, Madrid 2018, forthcoming. To be printed in Spanish, 350 copies.

► Workstream 4: Title: TRAINING AND DISSEMINATION

I. Activities

Implemented activities

1. Main project website published (English language)
2. Establishment of presence, communication and debate on social media channels (twitter)

3. Offline communication campaigns: newspapers, professional publications. Eg: Publications in widely read press such as „Rzeczpospolita”, about polish legislative undertakings in implementation of EIO (accepted, ahead of print, authors: Professor Adam Górski, PhD Ariel Falkiewicz).
4. Events and conferences.
5. Promotion of judicial cooperation by developing systematic research and generating specific knowledge and tools addressed to the different stakeholders to contribute to the efficient and coherent application of the Directive 2014/41/EU on the European Investigation Order (EIO) in criminal matters and other relevant regulations;
6. Social media campaign – due to inappropriateness of measures to main, scientific, objectives (short messages, rapid exchange of information);
7. Training courses
8. European Observatory on EIO
9. Exploitation and dissemination focused on policy makers and non-judicial authorities

Unforeseen activities:

N/A

II. Output(s)

Output 1: Project website (www.eurocoord.eu). And social media presence. The partners have disseminated the activities and results of the project through their social networks and platforms.

Output 2: Social media presence. Partners has disseminate the project activities using online and Media Tools.

Output 3: Dissemination plan

Output 4: Scientific dissemination

Output 5: Training materials

Output 6: Report on dissemination activities, participation in events, articles published.

2.2. Timeline (max. 1 page)

Please confirm that the project will be completed by the deadline set in the Agreement. Which corrective measures were taken to make up for any delays ?

The EUROCOORD project will be carried out within the duration established in the Agreement and later amended 3 more months.

Consortium meetings have been held with to compensate for delays. In these meetings, action plans such as dedication of more efforts to each task have been established to compensate for these deviations.

2.3. Visibility of EU funding (max. 1/2 page)

How was the visibility of the European Union's financial support ensured throughout the project?

The visibility of the European Commission's funding has been ensured by mentioning it and also by publishing the commission's logo, as is showed in the following image.



Co-funded by the Justice
Programme of the European Union.
n° ref. 723198

Written material, press conferences, presentations, publications, in summary in every dissemination and communication event where Eurocooord project was involved, the European commission was mentioned.

2.4. Main problems/difficulties in the implementation (max. 1/2 page)

Were you faced with any problems/difficulties during the implementation of the project? How did you solve them?

The main problems encountered have been mentioned above, when describing the activities carried out and the provisional outcomes of the project. In general, it can be affirmed that the main difficulty lies in the delay of two of our three target countries, in transposing the EIO Directive. This has put the partners before the difficult decision, of either waiting until a legal text is in place or working with the draft law and facing the additional burden of updating the reports at a later moment, once the legislative process has ended.

The uncertainty of the legislative process has caused delays in completing WS1 and WS2. As WS3 relies greatly upon the outcomes of those WSs, the timetable regarding WS3 – elaboration of Code of Best Practices–,also suffered delay.

Finally, the process of hiring the research assistants presented also several problems, at least at Complutense University: first, the process for announcing the offer of the posts could not be done until the relevant Universities signed the EU contract, which did not happen until



approx. March; second, due to the rigid and completely outdated proceedings for public contracts in Spanish universities, the whole process for hiring a person took several months; third, the selection of the research assistant is not done by the project leader, but by a commission of the University, upon criteria that not necessarily match with the needs of the project; and finally, there are fixed durations for the contracts, therefore if the person “assigned” is not fit for the work, another six months have to pass until another person can be hired. This has caused the work to advance at a slower pace than planned.

Regarding Italy, in the implementation of the project we faced some difficulties related to the enactment of several new laws in the field of judicial cooperation in the gathering of evidence. Alongside Legislative Decree no. 108 of 2017 aimed at implementing Directive 2014/41/UE, are to mention Legislative Decree no. 52 of 2017 aimed at implementing the European Convention on judicial assistance in criminal matters of 2000 – that still regulates matters not covered by Directive on the EIO - and Legislative decree no. 149 of 2017 on “jurisdictional relationship with foreign authorities”. Lastly, by Legislative decree no. 216 of December 2017 has been approved a comprehensive reform of interceptions of telecommunications, that could have an influence on the application of the EIO. These reforms have posed practical problems of coordination among different sources. We are monitoring instructions given by Eurojust as well as by our Minister of Justice in order to solve these problems. Another problem is to find lawyers with specific experience in the field of judicial cooperation with particular reference to letters rogatory. We are solving the problem addressing questions to lawyers involved in NGO.

2.5. Cooperation within the partnership (max. 1/2 page)

How did the Co-beneficiaries and Associate Partners participate in the project and what was their role?

The internal collaborative approach and continuous networking has been assured with the following actions:

- Close communication with project coordinator (vía skype, phone and emails)
- Execution of all contractual obligation according to the agreement
- Internal work plan development and task allocation organisation

All co-beneficiaries and associate partners have work together for accomplish common goals and objectives. EUROCOORD consortium is formed by 4 Universities as full partners and 2 Associate partners: UBU (ES), experts on human rights protections applied to criminal proceedings; UCM (ES) with a wide expertise on EIO and several papers published on this field; UOP (IT) joins the theoretical foundation and practical know-how due to the main researcher’s work as deference lawyer, also publishing several papers in the EIO scope; and UJ (PL) with a proven experience on the scope of European Justice and its judicial framework.

Also, the associate partners’ profiles will assure the scientific robustness and sustainability of the outputs, the resources and knowledge generated and the European Observatory for the EOI: Fiscalía General del Estado, the Spanish Prosecutor General's Office, (FGE) will be the main reviewer of the Ws1, Output 3; and Fondazione Rocco Chinnici (FC), fighting against the organized crime, will contribute on Italian judicial framework and legal protection (Ws2). Both associate partners, will contribute to Code of Best Practice, and a little contribution is expected for the Dissemination activities.

- University of Burgos (UBU): Leading researcher for this Project is PhD. Mar Jimeno Bulnes, Professor of Procedural Law,



EUROCOORD

University of Burgos - Faculty of Law since 2011. Until then, she has worked as temporary judge for the Provincial Court of Burgos (Spain) for more than 10 years. She was also visiting Professor of Law Chicago-Kent College of Law (USA) in 2012.

She has participated in important international committees and fellowships, including the Collaborative Research Network (CRN) on Law Participation in Legal Decision Making, Law and Society Association, European Arrest Warrant Project, TMC Asser Institut (webpage: www.eurowarrant.net), European Criminal Law Academic Network (ECLAN), among others. She has published more than 80 publications in Spanish and English language and got two Nationals honour awards (www.ubu.es/caji).

- University Complutense of Madrid (UCM): UCM team will be leaded by PhD. Lorena Bachmaier Professor. She is Professor at the Faculty of Law at Complutense University since 1996, where she has taught criminal procedure, civil procedure and arbitration, publishing a huge number of papers on Journals, Conferences Book chapters and comments and notes on case law. Recently, she has participated on EU Grant DER 2009-11243 as Director (Fight against terrorism and restriction of fundamental rights in the criminal proceedings) and, currently, is being involved, as Director, with DER 201344888-P (Investigation and evidence in the criminal proceedings in Europe)
- University of Palermo (UOP) in this particular case leaded by PhD. Annalisa Mangiaracina will contribute on the juridical practices analysis: the UOP position and her career gives us the opportunity to get a closely communication with nonacademic stakeholders, such as NGOs or defines lawyers. Annalisa is Researcher in Criminal Procedure since 2012 and has practiced as defence lawyer from 1999 to 2012. She has published more than 20 publications and was involved on 5 transnational projects, among then the Cori Project (2008-2009) on the impact of the European Court of Justice case-law within the national criminal proceedings.
- Jagiellonian University (JU) team is leaded by PhD Adam Stanisław Górski, assistant professor and chair for Criminal Law, Nominated Member of Studies an Research Unit for the Supreme Court of Poland since 2011. His research outputs on the scope of European Arrest Warrant, European Prosecution, Juridical cooperation and cross-border criminal proceedings and his participation on several research projects demonstrate his vast experience, for instance Study on the future institutional and legal framework of judicial cooperation in criminal matters in the EU, 2010/S 77-113934 or Study on disqualifications as a sanctioning measure in the national systems of the Member States, 2010/S 114-171916